

Backgrounder: Local 3011's Concerns regarding the appointment of Stan MacLellan as PIPSC COO

Purpose

This backgrounder compiles documented facts, decisions, and reports relevant to the appointment of Stan MacLellan as PIPSC's Chief Operations Officer (COO). It is intended to provide context for concerns about the implications of this hiring decision on PIPSC's credibility, bargaining capacity, and values.

Staff are profoundly concerned regarding the Aug 12, 2025, announcement regarding the hiring of Stan MacLellan as PIPSC's new Chief Operations Officer (COO). As both union members and committed employees who work for a union, PIPSC, we feel compelled to address what we view as a deeply troubling appointment that fundamentally contradicts PIPSC's values and mission.

Our concerns stem from Mr. MacLellan's documented history as Chief Administrative Officer with Durham Regional Police Service (DRPS), where serious allegations have been raised regarding his conduct and leadership.

Background

There have been numerous documented cases that give rise to our concerns.

An arbitration decision in 2011 found that Mr. MacLellan implemented policies that violated the collective agreement between the DRPS and the union. The arbitrator ruled that his vacation scheduling policy was "contrary to this process and violates the collective agreement."¹

In 2016 there was a conflict-of-interest issue with Constable Phil Edgar and Mr. MacLellan. At the time, Mr. Edgar co-owned an unlicensed marijuana company whose website offered products "illegal to sell because of concerns

¹ <https://www.policearbitration.gov.on.ca/search/documents/awards/11-018.pdf>

of overdose or unintentional ingestion by children.”² Mr. Edgar sponsored a girls competitive soccer team for at least three seasons, a team where Mr. MacLellan coached and his daughter was a player. In order to have permission to have a side job, Mr. Edgar was required to file a request with the human resources unit at DRPS, a unit under Mr. MacLellan’s management. HR’s role is to send a recommendation to the police chief who makes the final decision. At no time did Mr. MacLellan declare a conflict of interest.

In 2018, the union that represents uniform and civilian employees, the Durham Regional Police Association, participated in a survey conducted by the polling firm Pollara regarding the working environment at the DRPS. The survey had a response rate of 36 per cent, with 418 out of 1,150 police association members participating. The survey found the following:

- 85% felt officer morale was worse than it had been five years prior.
- 70% experienced bullying or harassment in the past three years.
- 80% want MacLellan removed from his position as soon as possible and placed, with 67 per cent strongly feeling this way.
- 66% are dissatisfied with the performance of the police services board.
- 60% are satisfied with their jobs, while 30 per cent are dissatisfied.
- 56% are proud to work for the Durham police.³

In 2019, the Ontario Civilian Police Commission (OCPC) was asked to conduct a preliminary review, prior to a formal investigation into the DRPS. The report names Mr. MacLellan as one of three senior managers when assessing numerous allegations.

The OCPC made the following findings:

1. The circumstances at DRPS required a systemic investigation (para 4);
2. There is a crisis of confidence within the DRPS;
3. The crisis of confidence constitutes an emergency (para 6)

² https://www.durhamregion.com/news/port-perry-pot-shop-cop-gave-money-to-team-run-by-durham-police-official/article_76304d11-f507-5420-86fd-bd2220598a98.html

³ <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/durham-police-association-online-survey-chief-replaced-board-dissatisfaction-low-morale-1.4579597>

4. There is widespread and deep sense of mistrust in the Service's leadership amongst sworn officers and civilian employees.⁴

The OCPC put the DRPS into a type of trusteeship so that a more fulsome investigation could be conducted, called 'administration.' The OCPC's reasoning for the investigation is that they found widespread mistrust at the DRPS based on a number of **unproven allegations**, including:

1. **Allegations of cronyism manifested as favouritism** regarding decisions of the senior management of the service including:
 - a. **Allegations** that senior management allowed, tolerated, encouraged, participated in, and/or was willfully blind to:
 - i. workplace harassment of all kinds,
 - ii. intimidation of subordinates,
 - iii. retaliatory discipline, and
 - iv. potential alleged criminal conduct and/or misconduct under the *Police Services Act* (para 9)
2. **Allegations of retaliatory or suppressive discipline implicating same members of Service's leadership**, specifically:
 - a. that the Service's morale "suffers from a prevalent perception that advancement and preferential treatment within the Service is restricted to individuals favoured by certain members of the Service's leadership;" (para 10);
 - b. that there is "considerable and consistent information that these favoured individuals, known within the Service as the "untouchables", **are believed to be**
 - i. impervious to workplace harassment complaints, and
 - ii. to allegations of criminal activity
 - iii. and/or misconduct due to their relationship to the Service's leadership;" (para 10)
 - c. There is a "**widespread belief** that the members of the Service who make formal or informal complaints against the

⁴

<https://www.canlii.org/en/on/oncpc/doc/2019/2019oncpc3/2019oncpc3.html?resultId=29b3bb2293d94daf9fdb5c5c7208841&searchId=2025-08-13T17:16:56:413/782323e4a93a47819d7af364d7dc8306&searchUrlHash=AAAAAAQAIIN0YW4gTWFjTGVsbGFuIgAAAAAB>

“untouchables” are targeted for bullying, harassment, social and professional marginalization, and even formal disciplinary processes;” (para 11)

- d. That there is “evidence that members of the Service are deterred from reporting workplace harassment because they fear retaliation;”
- e. There is “credible information that **suggests** certain members of the Service’s leadership **might have**
 - i. covered-up, attempted to cover-up, allowed, tolerated, encouraged, or participated in the
 - 1. alleged misconduct or criminal conduct
 - a. committed by and/or directed towards their subordinates, and
 - b. that they may have interfered in previous external and internal investigations.” (para 12)

The DRPS was put into administration on May 23, 2019. The Toronto Star reported on Aug 14, 2025, more than six years later, that the investigation has been completed and that the report has been released to the DRPS Board and the Ontario Solicitor General⁵. The Star further reported that the report had been declared privileged by the DRPS and would not be shared with the public.⁶

The Star article also indicated that the DRPS had announced that Mr. MacLellan retired the week of Aug 4-8, 2025. **This was 4-9 days after the Board’s Aug 12 ,2025, announcement that Mr. MacLellan was the new PIPSC COO.**

Concerns regarding the appointment of Mr. MacLellan as COO

Mr. MacLellan occupied a senior management in Canada’s ninth-largest police force. During his tenure serious allegations have been made against the senior management of the DRPS. **It bears emphasizing that a allegation or an accusation is not a conviction.** As noted above, there

⁵ See PDF attachment

⁶ See PDF attachment, para 9

has been no findings made against Mr. MacLellan or other senior managers at the DRPS that local 3011 is aware of.

However, while the bulk of the OCPC report largely consists of allegations, it should be noted that for a police force to be put into “administration” is a serious measure, akin to the trusteeship process the PIPSC Board can use for its Locals. The legislation in force at the time permitted the OCPC to put the DRPS into administration:

If the Commission is of the opinion that ...a **municipal police force has flagrantly or repeatedly failed to comply with prescribed standards of police services or standards**... (s. 23(1)- Police Services Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.15)

emphasis added

The fact that the DRPS was put into administration while Mr. MacLellan was one of the key senior managers of the DRPS is of serious concern when hiring a senior executive at PIPSC. The **allegations outlined by the OCPC reveal at best a dysfunctional workplace and at worst a toxic and chronically broken workplace.**

It now seems that the Board has chosen to hire an employee who led an organization that suffered from chronic dysfunction and mismanagement as the organization’s most senior non-elected officer. We believe that this has the potential for the following impacts on PIPSC.

#1 Negative impact on Staff

While it must be emphasized that the bulk of the **2019 OCPC report documents concerning allegations, they remain allegations**. Without a public release of the investigation report, we cannot know if Mr. MacLellan has been found to have committed any wrongdoing at this time.

However, the **nature of the allegations, including cronyism, favouritism, harassment, intimidation of subordinates, retaliatory discipline are very concerning to PIPSC staff.**

Overall, it seems that Mr. MacLellan was in the senior leadership team for years of an organization with a very troubling and arguably toxic work environment.

In our view, the hiring of Mr. MacLellan represents a fundamental contradiction to PIPSC's core mission and values.

PIPSC staff, like PIPSC members, expect leadership that reflects PIPSC's values and professional standards. The troubling allegations and the serious crisis of morale at the DRPS surrounding Mr. MacLellan and the senior management, as reflected by the 2018 survey of DRPS employees and the 2019 OCPC report, risks eroding the trust that is fundamental to effective union representation.

#2 Negative impact on PIPSC's Collective Bargaining work

In 2011, Arbitrator Johnston found that the management at the DRPS Mr. MacLellan, in his role as Chief Administrative Officer, implemented policies that violated the collective agreement.

PIPSC regularly files policy grievances challenging employer overreach. For example, in June 2025, the CRA denied a policy grievance filed by PIPSC on behalf of AFS members regarding the CRA's decision to lay off term PIPSC members without paying them severance. This was an unjust decision and will be heard at the FPSLREB. Having Mr. MacLellan as the most senior, non-elected leader of PIPSC could significantly affect PIPSC's credibility when PIPSC pushes back against the CRA's unjust decision to deny our members' severance.

More broadly speaking, how will PIPSC's overall credibility be affected, with Mr. MacLellan as the head of PIPSC, when PIPSC's bargaining groups are facing off against TB for the next bargaining round.

PIPSC bargaining teams will be pushing back against with cuts, with the COO of the second-largest union in the public service who has a documented history of violating collective agreements.

#3 Negative impact on PIPSC's Consultation work

There are further concerns about Mr. MacLellan's appointment relating to the important work of PIPSC's National Consultation Teams (NCTs). NCTs advocate for PIPSC members at the senior levels of the public service, challenging employer overreach and arbitrariness. In their important work, NCT regularly cite the Public Service Employee Survey (PSES) when advocating for PIPSC members.

In 2024, the PSES:

- Had a response rate of 50.5% (with 86,635 employees in 93 federal departments and agencies participating).
- Found that 26% of participants would not describe their workplace as being psychologically healthy.
- Found that 12% of participants identified themselves as victims of harassment.
- Found that 9% of participants identified themselves as victims of discrimination⁷

NCTs cite the PSES regarding job dissatisfaction, harassment and racism when arguing that senior leadership at the federal public service need to do more to improve morale in the workplace linking survey results to issue important to PIPSC members like mental health and RTO.

As outlined above, the union representing employees at the DRPS conducted a survey of their workplace in a 2016 survey. Below is a comparison between the results of the survey of the unionized employees at the DRPS in 2016 and the latest PSES of members of the federal public service. While PIPSC's NCTs do a great job of raising important concerns at senior levels of the federal public service, the discrepancy between the results of the 2024 PSES and the 2018 survey conducted on the membership of the union representing DRPS employees is alarming:

9-12% of federal public servants **experienced harassment and discrimination** (respectively) in 2024

versus

70% experienced bullying or harassment at the DRPS from 2015-2018, under PIPSC's new COO's leadership

26% of federal public servants would **not describe their workplace as being psychologically healthy**

versus

85% of DRPS employees who felt **officer morale was worse than it had been five years prior.**

These are startling numbers, supporting the OCPC's findings of a "crisis of confidence" (para 5) and widespread and deep sense of mistrust in the DRPS's leadership (para 9).

⁷ <https://www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pses-saff/2024/results-resultats/en/bt-pt/org/00#i5-s20>

As with PIPSC's bargaining groups, PIPSC NCTs are faced with a difficult task of arguing for PIPSC's members' interests in a climate of austerity and budget cuts.

- How are PIPSC NCTs to credibly argue for measures that increase PIPSC members job satisfaction, when the COO of PIPSC has a demonstrated record of managing/leading a workplace that seems to be a chronically dysfunctional/broken workplace?
- How can NCTs' credibility argue for improvements in the harassment polices in the fed PS, when PIPSC's COO's last job involved overseeing/managing an organization replete with allegations of favouritism, harassment, intimidation of subordinates and retaliatory discipline?

PIPSC MEMBERS ARE HELD TO HIGH STANDARDS OF ETHICS AND ACCOUNTABILITY

In addition, Mr. MacLellan's involvement in the 2016 conflict of interest allegation relating to an illegal, unlicensed marijuana shop is concerning. In particular, the fact that the employee in question donated funds to the soccer team where Mr. MacLellan is a coach and the same team Mr. MacLellan's daughter played.

At best it points to a serious lapse in judgment, at worst suggests ethical lapses relating to the approval of an employee to have a 2nd business for an illegal, unlicensed marijuana shop coupled with the donation to Mr. MacLellan's daughter's soccer team.

The vast majority of PIPSC members are subject to stringent rules in the public service regarding conflicts of interest, ethics and integrity. PIPSC members take these rules seriously.

Moreover, NCTs play an important role regarding public service rules regarding integrity, conflict of interest and ethics. During consultation, NCT's push back against employer overreach when those rules are used not for ethical and accountability purposes but as disguised discipline to punish PIPSC members. **How are NCTs credibly able to push back against employer policies cloaked in the guise of accountability and transparency when PIPSC's new COO has demonstrated failed to**

disclose a concerning conflict of interest? This is made all the more concerning given Mr. MacLellan's then role in law enforcement.

#4 Negative impact on Staff's ability to represent members in collective bargaining, grievances and arbitration

As outlined above, 3011 believes that the hiring of Mr. MacLellan impedes PIPSC member's important work in bargaining and consultation. The same concern applies to staff working in Collective Bargaining and Labour Relations.

PIPSC as a union exists to protect workers' rights and advocate for fair treatment in the workplace.

How can staff credibly advocate against workplace harassment and abuse of power in the public service when we've appointed someone at PIPSC's most senior level surrounded by troubling allegations relating to abuse of authority and conflict of interests?

Hiring a COO with documented allegations of workplace intimidation and harassment undermines staff's credibility with employers, PIPSC members (particularly inactive members) and the broader labour movement.

5 Progressive Values:

As a union representing federal public service professionals, PIPSC has historically championed progressive workplace policies and social justice.

[PIPSC's work with Know History](#) is a testament to PIPSC commitment to true reconciliation by acknowledging the role of our members past involvement in residential schools, forced relocations and the Sixties Scoop.

This appointment sends a troubling message about our commitment to these principles.

Conclusion

PIPSC's Stewards see firsthand the damage that poor leadership creates. The most difficult cases involve workplaces where senior management has created – through action, inaction, or ineptitude – a toxic environment. Senior management's failure to address the causes of the dysfunction and

toxicity in these workplaces consume a considerable amount of Steward, LRO and ERO time.

These are the workplaces where the highest number of grievances are filed, and where stewards, LROs and EROs must spend countless hours addressing problems rooted in leadership failures. The Board has now hired a senior manager who appears to have overseen a workplace on par with the least positive environments our members face.

Instead of hiring a leader with strong trade union values, a commitment to workers' rights and PIPSC's values, the decision has been made to hire someone, who at the very least, oversaw an alarming breakdown of staff morale and organization dysfunction over the course of many years.

We are frankly at a loss regarding this decision.

We remain committed to serving PIPSC's membership with professionalism and dedication, despite our serious concerns about this leadership decision. However, we believe it is our duty to speak out when we see actions that threaten the integrity and effectiveness of our organization.