

PH: 2024-01 OPCC Files: 2022-21398

2023-25106 2023-25107

IN THE MATTER OF THE PUBLIC HEARING INTO THE CONDUCT OF SERGEANT KEIRON MCCONNELL OF THE VANCOUVER POLICE DEPARTMENT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE POLICE ACT, RSBC 1996, C. 367 AS AMENDED

Note: There is a Section 150 Order in place that includes a publication ban on the names and other identifying information of the complainants and certain witnesses.

AGREED STATEMENT OF FACTS

Member history and training

- 1. Sergeant Keiron McConnell (the "Member") is 56 years old. He became a Vancouver Police Department ("VPD") Reserve Constable in 1988, and a regular member in 1990. He attained the rank of sergeant in 2004. In 2009 the Member joined the VPD's Gang Crime Unit ("GCU"). He led a team at the GCU from 2012 to 2019. In 2019, the Member was assigned to Patrol, where he remained until he was suspended as a result of these allegations.
- 2. In addition to being an actively serving police officer, the Member has taught courses for almost two decades at colleges and universities on the topics of policing, criminology, and gangs.
- 3. In 2013, the Member undertook training courses entitled "Respectful Workplace Workshops Supervisors & Managers" and "Respectful Workplace Training (VPD Version)". He attended an additional workshop on respectful workplaces in 2019.
- 4. In January 2022, a female member of the VPD assigned to the Youth Services Section became concerned about information that had come to her attention about the Member. To her credit, she conveyed her concerns to VPD's Professional Standards Section.

5. On April 13, 2022 after reviewing the information provided by the VPD, the Police Complaint Commissioner issued an order for Investigation into the conduct of the Member pursuant to section 93(1) of the *Police Act*. The investigation was assigned to the VPD and VPD's Professional Standards Section investigated the matter. These investigations identified allegations involving the subject officer, former students and female members of the VPD.

VPD Policy and Training

- 6. The VPD does not have a standalone policy regarding sexual harassment. It is currently addressed as part of the VPD Regulations & Procedures Manual, Chapter 4.3 "Respectful Workplace." That chapter consists of a "Respectful Workplace Policy" (ch. 4.3.1), "Informal Resolution Processes" (ch. 4.3.1(i)), and "Formal Investigation Process" (ch. 4.3.1), enacted on December 27, 2023. Copies of these documents are attached as Appendix 1.
- 7. Copies of prior versions of the VPD's "Respectful Workplace Policy" effective September 18, 2013, and August 31, 2016, are attached as **Appendices 2** and **3**, respectively.
- 8. During his career, the VPD has not provided the Member with a training course focused specifically on sexual harassment.

Member 1

- 9. In September, 2016 Member 1 joined the GCU of the VPD, as a member of Team 2. In April, 2017 Member 1 was transferred to Team 1, which was led by the Member.
- 10. After Member 1 joined the GCU, the Member sent her electronic messages, some of which were sexual in nature. These messages of a sexual nature were unsolicited and unwelcome. Screenshots of the messages and some of Member 1's replies are attached as Appendix 4.

- 11. The Member's conduct caused Member 1 to feel degraded, and she suffered anxiety as a result. She was concerned about raising the issue with the Member because of his position in the VPD and the GCU. Eventually, Member 1 confronted the Member about his behaviour, and he apologized. Member 1 was satisfied at the time that they had dealt with the matter informally.
- 12. The Member acknowledges that at the relevant time he was senior to Member 1 in rank, and that he was in a position of authority at the VPD and in the GCU, generally. He understands that his behaviour was unwanted and inappropriate in the circumstances, and it amounts to discreditable conduct.

Member 2

13. In 2017, Member 2 was assigned to a mentorship with the Member's GCU team. In March 2019, after the mentorship, she was successful in securing a spot with Team 2 of the GCU.

of KING BAS

- 14. Between 2017 and March, 2019, the Member sent Member 2 electronic messages that included sexual content. The content included sexual remarks about her underwear, her sexual preferences, and his sexual fantasies. These messages were unsolicited and unwelcome. Screenshots of some but not all of the messages between Member 2 and the Member are attached as **Appendix 5**.
- 15. The Member's comments caused Member 2 to feel degraded, and she suffered anxiety as a result. She was concerned about raising the issue with him because of his position in the VPD.
- 16. The Member acknowledges that he was senior to Member 2 in rank, and that he was in a position of authority at the department and in the unit generally. He understands that because of this Member 2 felt that she could not raise the issue with him because of his

position in the GCU and her desire to advance in the GCU. The Member acknowledges that his behaviour was unwanted and inappropriate in the circumstances, and it amounts to discreditable conduct.

Student 1

- 17. In the autumn of 2015 or the spring of 2016, Student 1 took two classes which were taught by the Member at a British Columbia university.
- 18. The following autumn, the Member invited some former students, including Student 1 to a social gathering at a pub. The social gathering occurred on November 8, 2016. Student 1 was 25 years old at the time.
- 19. On November 8, 2016 Student 1 attended the event at the pub. Several other students also attended. Student 1 joined the group and sat next to the Member. After the other students had left the pub, Student 1 remained, as did the Member, to watch the televised U.S. election coverage.
- 20. Later that evening, while one of the two was in the washroom and the other in the pub, Student 1 received a text message from the Member in which he inquired what colour underwear she was wearing. A follow-up message from him suggested different colours, such as white, pink and Irish green.
- 21. The Member and Student 1 then left the pub. Student 1 flagged a taxi. When the taxi arrived, they both got in. Once the taxi reached Student 1's destination, the Member leaned toward Student 1 and attempted to kiss her. She deflected him and got out of the taxi.
- 22. The Member contacted Student 1 the next day to apologize for his conduct. Student 1 did not respond.

- 23. Student 1 did not report this incident at the time to anyone at the university as she was afraid of the impact that reporting the Member could have on her career prospects.
- 24. Later in 2017, Student 1, along with Student 2, reported the Member's conduct to an official in the administration at the university.
- 25. As Student 1's former instructor, and a senior member in the policing world, the Member accepts that she viewed him as in a position of authority. He now understands Student 1's perspective about his ability to affect her career. He understands that his actions were unwanted and inappropriate in the circumstances. They amount to discreditable conduct.

Student 2

- 26. Student 2 took a course taught by the member at a British Columbia university. In February, 2017, when the Member was no longer Student 2's instructor, she received a series of unsolicited Facebook messages from the Member. Student 2 was 23 years old in February 2017.
- 27. The messages from the Member to Student 2 included sexual content and innuendo. Student 2 told the Member that his communications made her uncomfortable, and asked that their relationship remain professional. The Member then sent her additional messages containing sexual content and innuendo. Screenshots of the electronic messages between the two are attached as **Appendix 6**.
- 28. At the time of the messages, Student 2 wanted to be a police officer. She was concerned that if she did not respond it would impact her future career options if the Member were to speak negatively about her to VPD personnel. Student 2 did not report this incident at the time to anyone at the university as she was afraid of the impact that reporting the Member would have on her career prospects.

- 29. Later in 2017, Student 2, along with Student 1, reported the Member's conduct to an official in the administration at the university.
- 30. As Student 2's former instructor, and a senior member in the policing world, the Member accepts that she viewed him as being in a position of authority. The Member acknowledges and understands Student 2's perspective about his ability to impact her future career and now recognizes his error. His actions were unwanted and inappropriate in the circumstances. They amount to discreditable conduct.

Student 3

- 31. Between 2011 and 2018, Student 3 was a student at a British Columbia university and took courses taught by the Member.
- 32. Student 3 asked the Member whether he would be her honours supervisor. The Member agreed.
- 33. Student 3 and the Member communicated regularly outside of business hours due to the nature of her educational program. They met virtually over videoconferencing platforms and exchanged messages through Facebook messenger, text message, and WhatsApp.
- 34. During the time he was supervising her honours project, the Member sent messages to Student 3 that commented on her physical attractiveness. The messages were unsolicited and unwelcome. Student 3 was in her mid twenties at the time. Screenshots of the electronic messages are attached as **Appendix 7**.
- 35. At the time of the exchanges, Student 3 aspired to become a police officer. Student 3's experience with the Member was one factor in her decision not to pursue a career in policing.

36. As Student 3's instructor and supervisor, and a senior member in the policing world, the Member accepts that she viewed him as being in a position of authority. The Member now acknowledges that the messages he sent to Student 3 about her physical appearance were entirely inappropriate, and not consensual. They amount to discreditable conduct.

The Member's Acknowledgment

37. In 2021, the Member started counselling with a psychologist about matters including workplace interactions with women, and social media communications, cues, and boundaries. He has come to understand and accept that by virtue of his rank and professional stature, some women who found his comments unwelcome were unable to express their discomfort to him about the content of those comments.

Date: April 9, 2025

Marilyn Sandford K.C.

Public Hearing Counsel

Brian Smith

Commission Counsel

Anila Srivastava and Cait Fleck

Counsel for Sgt. McConnell