



Office of the Public Sector
Integrity Commissioner
of Canada

Commissariat à l'intégrité
du secteur public
du Canada

Findings of the Public Sector Integrity Commissioner in the Matter of an Investigation into a Disclosure of Wrongdoing

Canadian Museum of Immigration at Pier 21

Case Report
December 2025

The report is available on our website: www.psic-ispcc.gc.ca

You may request a copy of the report in alternate formats (print, large print, Braille, audio format or electronic format) using the contact information below:

Email: accessible@psic-ispcc.gc.ca

Telephone: 613-941-6400 or 1-866-941-6400 (toll-free in Canada)

Or by mail:

Accessibility Representative

Office of the Public Sector Integrity Commissioner of Canada

PO Box 987

Ottawa PO B, Ontario K1P 5R1

Ce document est également disponible en français.

©Office of the Public Sector Integrity Commissioner of Canada, 2025

Cat. No. PG4-33/2025E-PDF

ISBN 978-0-660-78371-0

Public Sector
Integrity Commissioner



Commissaire
à l'intégrité du secteur public

Ottawa, Canada K1P 5R1

The Honourable Raymonde Gagné, Senator
Speaker of the Senate
The Senate
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0A4

Dear Speaker:

I have the honour of presenting you with the Office of the Public Sector Integrity Commissioner of Canada's Case Report of findings in the matter of an investigation into a disclosure of wrongdoing at the Canadian Museum of Immigration at Pier 21. The report is to be laid before the Senate in accordance with the provisions of subsection 38(3.3) of the Public Servants Disclosure Protection Act.

The report contains the findings of wrongdoing, the recommendation made to the Chief Executive, the Chief Executive's written comments and my opinion as to whether the Chief Executive's response to my recommendation is satisfactory.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'H. Solloway'.

Harriet Solloway
Public Sector Integrity Commissioner
Ottawa, December 2025

Public Sector
Integrity Commissioner



Commissaire
à l'intégrité du secteur public

Ottawa, Canada K1P 5R1

The Honourable Francis Scarpaleggia, M.P.
Speaker of the House of Commons
House of Commons
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0A6

Dear Speaker:

I have the honour of presenting you with the Office of the Public Sector Integrity Commissioner of Canada's Case Report of findings in the matter of an investigation into a disclosure of wrongdoing at the Canadian Museum of Immigration at Pier 21. The report is to be laid before the House of Commons in accordance with the provisions of subsection 38(3.3) of the Public Servants Disclosure Protection Act.

The report contains the findings of wrongdoing, the recommendation I made to the Chief Executive, the Chief Executive's written comments and my opinion as to whether the Chief Executive's response to my recommendation is satisfactory.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'H. Solloway'.

Harriet Solloway
Public Sector Integrity Commissioner
Ottawa, December 2025

Table of Contents

Foreword	1
Our Mandate	2
About the Museum	3
Results of Our Investigation	3
Overview of Our Investigation	3
Factors Considered in Determining Wrongdoing	4
Serious Breach of a Code of Conduct	4
Summary of Findings	4
Inappropriate Language and Comments.....	5
Raised Voice and Feelings of Fear and Intimidation	5
Treatment of ERC Unit Employees.....	6
Targeting Employee X	8
Environment of Fear	8
Conclusion.....	8
The Commissioner’s Recommendation and the Museum’s Response.....	10

Foreword

This Case Report of founded wrongdoing, which has been tabled in Parliament as required by the Public Servants Disclosure Protection Act (the Act), presents the findings of our investigation into an allegation that Ms. Marie Chapman, Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the Canadian Museum of Immigration at Pier 21 (the Museum) and a Governor in Council appointee, engaged in a pattern of inappropriate behaviour that had a significant impact on Museum employees.

Harriet Solloway
Public Sector Integrity Commissioner

Our Mandate

Established under the Act as an independent agent of Parliament, the Public Sector Integrity Commissioner of Canada and her Office contribute to strengthening accountability and increasing oversight of government operations by:

- providing an independent and confidential process for investigating disclosures of wrongdoing in, or relating to, the federal public sector;
- issuing quasi-judicial decisions on allegations of wrongdoing, reporting founded cases to Parliament and making recommendations concerning corrective measures to Chief Executives;
- investigating complaints of reprisal from public servants and former public servants, supporting resolution through conciliation when possible and referring cases to the Public Servants Disclosure Protection Tribunal when necessary.

The Office is an independent organization that was created in 2007 pursuant to the Act.

Section 8 of the Act defines wrongdoing as:

- (a) a contravention of any Act of Parliament or of the legislature of a province, or of any regulations made under any such Act, other than a contravention of section 19 of this Act;
- (b) a misuse of public funds or a public asset;
- (c) a gross mismanagement in the public sector;
- (d) an act or omission that creates a substantial and specific danger to the life, health or safety of persons, or to the environment, other than a danger that is inherent in the performance of the duties or functions of a public servant;
- (e) a serious breach of a code of conduct established under section 5 or 6;
- (f) knowingly directing or counselling a person to commit a wrongdoing set out in any of paragraphs (a) to (e).

According to case law, the Act “addresses wrongdoings of an order of magnitude that could shake public confidence if not reported and corrected. When the Commissioner is ‘dealing with’ an allegation of wrongdoing, it is something that, if proven, involves a serious threat to the integrity of the public service.”¹

The Act is also intended “to enable federal government employees to bring to light wrongdoings in the public sector without fear of reprisal.”² It is “designed to ensure that Canadians are protected by a lawful, transparent and uncorrupted public service.”³

1 Canada (Attorney General) v. Canada (Public Sector Integrity Commissioner), 2016 FC 886, para 106

2 Ibid, para 78

3 Swarath v. Canada (Attorney General), 2015 FC 963, para 1

About the Museum

Under the Museums Act, the Museum is a distinct legal entity, wholly owned by the Crown, and operates at arm's length from the government in its day-to-day operations and in its activities and programming. There are approximately 56 permanent employees at the Museum.

The Museum's Board of Trustees (the Board) serves as its governing body and is accountable to Parliament for the stewardship of the Museum through the Minister of Canadian Heritage. The Board members are Governor in Council appointees and are all part-time. While the Board is accountable for the results and business activities of the Museum, the CEO is accountable to the Board for the day-to-day administration of the Museum's performance and the achievement of objectives.

Ms. Chapman received her first mandate as CEO of the Museum on October 20, 2011. She was appointed for a second five-year term in 2016 and reappointed for a four-year term in 2021.

Results of Our Investigation

Our investigation found that Ms. Chapman committed serious breaches of the Values and Ethics Code for the Public Sector (the PS Code) and the Canadian Museum of Immigration at Pier 21's Code of Conduct (the Museum's Code) pursuant to paragraph 8(e) of the Act when she engaged in a pattern of inappropriate behaviour causing emotional harm to multiple employees over an extended period of time. This was characterized by:

- using inappropriate and offensive language,
- raising her voice and yelling,
- instilling fear and intimidating employees, and
- mistreating and targeting some employees.

Overview of Our Investigation

On May 23, 2023, my Office received a disclosure of wrongdoing relating to several alleged incidents of misconduct by Ms. Chapman. In November 2023, my Office launched an investigation that was led by Ms. Christine Denis, Senior Investigator, with support from Mr. Maxim Trépanier, Investigator. Our investigators interviewed 20 individuals and examined numerous documents.

In keeping with our obligation to uphold natural justice and procedural fairness, my Office provided Ms. Chapman with an opportunity to respond to the allegations, initially through an interview with our investigators and again by providing an opportunity to review and comment on a preliminary investigation report.

In arriving at my findings, I have given due consideration to all information collected throughout the course of our investigation, including comments received in response to the preliminary investigation report.

Factors Considered in Determining Wrongdoing

To make a finding that wrongdoing was committed, as defined under section 8 of the Act, the standard of proof that applies is a balance of probabilities. In Canadian law, this standard of proof is defined as meaning that one conclusion is more probable than another or, in other words, that there is a greater likelihood of one thing than another.

Serious Breach of a Code of Conduct

The factors that my Office considers in making a finding of a serious breach of a code of conduct under paragraph 8(e) of the Act include, but are not limited to:

- A significant departure from generally accepted practices within the federal public sector;
- The impact or potential impact of the breach on the organization's employees, clients and the public trust is significant;
- The alleged wrongdoer occupies a position that is of a high level of seniority or trust within the organization;
- There are serious errors which are not debatable among reasonable people;
- The breach of the applicable code(s) of conduct is systemic or endemic;
- There is a repetitive nature to the breaches of the applicable code(s) of conduct or they have occurred over a significant period of time;
- There is a significant degree of willfulness or recklessness related to the breach of the applicable code(s) of conduct; and
- The breach poses a serious threat to public confidence in the integrity of the public service, and does not primarily concern a personal matter such as individual harassment complaints or individual workplace grievances.

Summary of Findings

After interviewing 19 witnesses (more than one third of the Museum's workforce) plus Ms. Chapman and considering written submissions provided by Ms. Chapman, the evidence obtained during our investigation shows that, for over a decade, Ms. Chapman committed serious breaches of codes of conduct within the meaning of paragraph 8(e) of the Act.

Ms. Chapman's actions resulted in multiple breaches of the Museum's Code and the PS Code, including:

- Failure to demonstrate at all times behaviour in the workplace that affords respect, equality and dignity to everyone they interact with;
- Engaging in inappropriate behaviour toward others, for example, by creating an intimidating environment;
- Failure to treat every person with respect;

- Failure to work together in a spirit of openness, honesty and transparency that encourages engagement, collaboration and respectful communication; and
- Failure to act at all times with integrity and in a manner that will bear the closest public scrutiny.

While each incident on its own might not rise to the level of a serious breach of a code of conduct, the repeated nature of Ms. Chapman’s actions impacting multiple employees elevates their severity.

Inappropriate Language and Comments

Our investigation revealed that Ms. Chapman referred to her “Senior Leadership Team” (or “S.L.T.”) using the term “sluts”. Notably, Ms. Chapman used this term in public and in the presence of Museum employees. This included an incident in which she informed a delegation from another country that “I call them sluts” and laughed about it. While some witnesses recounted that Ms. Chapman was trying to be funny, the use of such language in the workplace is inappropriate and inconsistent with the standards expected of someone in a leadership position in the federal public sector.

Additionally, Ms. Chapman made comments about employees such as:

- Ranking women working at the Museum by age;
- Noting there are “no good-looking men” at the Museum; and
- Referring to some employees not by their names, but by pseudonyms relating to her perception of their physical or behavioural traits, which in some cases led to hurtful nicknames.

Further, Ms. Chapman expressed that a famous female athlete looked too masculine to be featured in a Museum product and that the athlete “looks like a man”, making a face of disgust when she said it.

Suggesting that a woman does not have the right appearance to be able to be representative of women is offensive, and it is even more problematic coming from a Chief Executive like Ms. Chapman.

Raised Voice and Feelings of Fear and Intimidation

Dating back to 2012, Ms. Chapman raised her voice in anger on more than one occasion. In one case, she threw a stack of union cards at an employee and accused them of using the Museum’s equipment to create them. Ms. Chapman’s raised tone caused the employee to feel so afraid they had to take leave for the rest of the day.

In another instance, Ms. Chapman shouted at employees about the door to the Museum being locked, noting that they were making her look bad in front of a client.

On another occasion, Ms. Chapman raised her voice at an employee because a kiosk had the wrong content.

Our investigation further revealed that Ms. Chapman’s conduct intimidated employees. Nine employees

described instances in which they felt fearful and intimidated by her behaviour. One employee testified that they suffer from panic attacks when going to work, that they close their office door to protect their mental health, and that their level of stress and anxiety is “through the roof”.

Some employees stated that they had explored financial options for retirement or departure from the Museum. Others testified about mental health struggles with some reporting that her conduct impacted them so deeply to the point of contemplating self-harm.

Treatment of ERC Unit Employees

The ERC Unit is composed of three teams: Exhibitions, Research and Collections. The team managers reported to the Vice-President of ERC, whose employment was terminated in May 2023, following which the ERC Unit began directly reporting to Ms. Chapman.

The problematic dynamic between Ms. Chapman and the ERC Unit was long-standing and included tensions between Ms. Chapman and the former Vice-President. The Museum and the former Vice-President entered into a separation agreement entitled “Minutes of Settlement”, which included the following terms, among others:

“9. NO CRITICISM OF THE EMPLOYER AND/OR ITS EMPLOYEES

I hereby undertake that at all times, I will not in any negative way, either with or to any director or employee of the Museum, or any other person, discuss any director or employee of the Museum, including, but not limited to directors or employees, past, present or future, employed by the Museum, nor will I criticize the Museum. I further agree that I shall not at any time commit any act or fail to act such as to cause or calculated to cause damage to the Museum or to discredit the reputation or business of the Museum or any of its affiliates.”

It should be noted that my Office contacted both parties to the separation agreement. The Museum responded by stating that they were unable to release the former Vice-President from the obligations under paragraph 9 (above), even for the limited purpose of our investigation. Consequently, my Office was precluded from obtaining either corroboration or denials regarding incidents that the former Vice-President might have witnessed.

Ms. Chapman targeted and treated employees of the ERC Unit differently, which, witnesses stated, intensified after the departure of the Vice-President. In addition, Ms. Chapman attributed project failures specifically to ERC employees.

On different occasions, Ms. Chapman referred to the ERC Unit as “eurk” saying it in a disgusted tone. Ms. Chapman has had a long history of not getting along with the Research team, which contributed to unease in the workplace. Evidence revealed that Ms. Chapman treated that team “differently” and was

“harsher” to them, to the point that they avoided bringing issues to Ms. Chapman’s attention for fear of reprimand.

With respect to the Research team, Ms. Chapman openly and repeatedly called them “troublemakers” and said they “don’t play well with others”. She also referred to the Research team as a “blister that did not heal over”.

During her interview, Ms. Chapman noted that Research team members “talk to people like they outsmart them, and they make people feel small”. Despite her assertion that the team was problematic, our investigation did not reveal any records of such issues for Research team members.

In June 2023, during Ms. Chapman’s absence, a conflict involving the Research team occurred during a project meeting and was resolved by three managers.

Upon Ms. Chapman’s return, one of the managers informed Ms. Chapman that there had been an issue and that it had been resolved and addressed. As acknowledged by Ms. Chapman, she called the three managers to her office where they confirmed that the conflict had been resolved. During the meeting, Ms. Chapman stated, “You guys have no idea what trouble you’re in.” Two of the managers were afraid that they were going to be fired, one of whom expressed being afraid of Ms. Chapman. The witness added that “I’m always looking over [my] shoulders”, and looking at options to leave the Museum because of Ms. Chapman’s behaviour.

It is worth noting that this meeting occurred approximately two months after the departure of the Vice-President.

After the meeting with the managers, Ms. Chapman barred the Research team from participating in the project altogether. A member of the Research team, who was upset by the conflict, testified to having felt insulted and dismissed.

A witness noted that it is odd that the CEO got involved in the matter. They added that Ms. Chapman created conflict and was very divisive. Another witness stated that Ms. Chapman’s response was disproportionate, and that excluding the Research team did not foster a good working environment. A third witness stated that this was an example of how Ms. Chapman tended to punish rather than find solutions.

Subsequently, Ms. Chapman moved the Research team to the same floor as hers. This included the removal of a closed office from Employee X, a member of the team who happened to be the one who, according to Ms. Chapman, was “influencing” people and who had been involved in unionization efforts. She placed the employee near her office. Two employees stated that Ms. Chapman told them that she wanted them to be “closer to her” and that it was to “keep a close eye on them” because she felt they were troublemakers, particularly Employee X who had been involved in union organizing, because according to Ms. Chapman, he “influences people”. These two employees stated that they have never seen Employee X influence anyone, that he is an asset at the Museum and that none of the Research team members deserved this treatment by Ms. Chapman.

Targeting Employee X

Five employees stated that Ms. Chapman “hates” a particular employee because he “challenges” her. Of these five, one stated that Ms. Chapman sees him as the “root of all problems” and that her reactions to him are “so disproportionate”, which makes other employees fear Ms. Chapman.

Another employee stated that Ms. Chapman told them something like, “I’m sorry for you because you have him in your team” and that Employee X overheard this comment about himself. One employee stated that Ms. Chapman referred to him as the “biggest problem” in the Museum. Employees noted that Ms. Chapman does not like this employee because he encouraged other employees to join the union and she believed he had also made a complaint against her.

Environment of Fear

Employees noted that they are fearful of Ms. Chapman, with one of them describing themselves as “terrified”. Some employees avoided Ms. Chapman as much as possible and were not comfortable sharing ideas or opinions, with one stating that it was “not safe to share ideas” and another that they were “walking on eggshells”. Others stated that Ms. Chapman targeted them, cultivated a culture of fear, and created a “toxic work environment”. As such, she used her power to limit, punish and intimidate some employees.

A witness noted that Ms. Chapman frequently said, “everyone is replaceable”, which made it a “palpable concern that people could lose their jobs”. This same witness also stated that the culture of fear intensified when Ms. Chapman “fired” the Vice-President of ERC, who had been at the Museum for approximately 13 years.

Conclusion

Based on the totality of the evidence, including the evidence provided by Ms. Chapman, I conclude that her repeated comments and mistreatment of various employees over a period of years demonstrate a pattern of inappropriate behaviour.

Ms. Chapman’s conduct included making inappropriate remarks to employees, targeting a specific group in a manner intended to be hurtful, treating certain individuals differently that resulted in feelings of isolation and exclusion, raising her voice and yelling at staff, and displaying clear animus toward a particular employee. In addition, her reference to her “Senior Leadership Team” (or “S.L.T.”) as “sluts”, her tendency to label individuals based on perceived personal traits, her assertion that a woman was not sufficiently feminine in appearance to represent women, and her frequent expression of negative views about employees, collectively demonstrate behaviour that falls short of the standards of professionalism, respect and attitude expected of someone in a leadership role.

Ms. Chapman created a climate in which staff members felt that they could be labelled at any time and feared what that label would be. Her response to these allegations reinforced her consistent approach to dismissing the impact of her words on the feelings of others.

The Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety defines bullying as follows:

“Bullying is usually seen as acts or verbal comments that could psychologically or ‘mentally’ hurt or isolate a person in the workplace. [...] Bullying usually involves repeated incidents or a pattern of behaviour that is intended to intimidate, offend, degrade or humiliate a particular person or group of people. It has also been described as the assertion of power through aggression.

[...] While bullying is a form of aggression, the actions can be both obvious and subtle.

[...] Examples include:

- Excluding or isolating someone socially.
- Intimidating a person.
- Making jokes that are ‘obviously offensive’ [...].
- Yelling or using profanity.
- Criticizing a person persistently or constantly. [...]”

Based on this definition of bullying, some of Ms. Chapman’s actions may reasonably be characterized as such.

Ms. Chapman’s actions constitute a serious breach of the PS Code and the Museum’s Code. Her behaviour is a significant departure from generally accepted practices within the federal public sector, and there was a negative impact on many employees. The situation was particularly troubling, given that Ms. Chapman occupied the most senior position at the Museum, and many employees were reluctant to raise concerns, for fear of negative consequences.

Ms. Chapman’s breach of the PS Code was not a one-time lapse in judgment, but a repeated problem that persisted for over a decade. This sort of breach poses a serious threat to public confidence in the integrity of the public sector, and specifically the Museum.

Employees and Canadians have a right to expect Governor in Council appointees and CEOs will behave in a manner that can bear the closest public scrutiny. In this case, Ms. Chapman used her authority to strike fear into employees and to target individuals, showing a lack of professionalism in direct violation of the public sector values of “Respect for People”, “Integrity” and “Excellence”. In addition, her behaviour was not trivial, but a repeated demonstration of poor judgment.

The Commissioner's Recommendation and the Museum's Response

In accordance with paragraph 22(h) of the Public Servants Disclosure Protection Act, I have made one recommendation concerning corrective measures to Ms. Marie Chapman, in her capacity as Chief Executive of the Canadian Museum of Immigration at Pier 21 (the Museum). My recommendation follows:

1. I recommend that an external expert assess the employees' wellness at the Museum to determine appropriate support measures.

While Ms. Chapman acknowledges my recommendation, she falls short of accepting it and committing to implement it. She merely expresses that she welcomes "opportunities for learning and improvement" and that she looks "forward to engaging an external expert to guide us in the process." Moreover, Ms. Chapman's justifications of the impugned conduct demonstrate that she is failing to take responsibility, and does not reflect the degree of accountability that is expected of her as the Chief Executive.

Consequently, in my opinion, Ms. Chapman's response is not satisfactory. I will be requesting an update in the next six months to ensure the recommendation is properly addressed.

To avoid identifying certain individuals, names have been redacted by the Office. Ms. Chapman's response follows:

I am asking you to amend your Case Report to correctly reflect the facts and to clarify the timing and frequency of incidents, some of which date as far back as 2004, when the Museum was not within federal jurisdiction and was a Nova Scotia not-for-profit Society.

Any uninformed reader would not be aware of the aged and infrequent nature of many of the events described in the November 19, 2025 Case Report (the "Case Report"). Given the comprehensive evidence provided in my May 29, 2025 Response (the "Chapman Response"), I respectfully urge you to reconsider your findings to ensure the Case Report is fair, factual and transparent.

Summary of Findings

While I do not intend to repeat all the arguments made in the Chapman Response and my December 1, 2025 letter, I want to emphasize that I continue to rely on those points.

To begin, you mention that twenty people were interviewed during the Investigation, including myself. However, the first line of the Summary of Findings on Page 5 of the Case Report states: "After interviewing 19 witnesses (more than one third of the Museum's workforce) ..." In fact, several interviewees were not part of the Museum workforce. By my calculation, it is actually closer to fourteen current staff, which is only a quarter of the Museum workforce. Not only is this statement factually incorrect, but by attempting to qualify the number of people interviewed as representing "a third of the Museum's

workforce” it seems as though the writer is attempting to advocate for a given result as opposed to fairly and neutrally presenting findings. This leads the reader to assume that every one of those witnesses shared the same views – which is not accurate and is deeply concerning.

The lack of specific dates and actual numbers in the Case Report creates a false impression of the frequency and scale of these events, suggesting a much larger pattern than the evidence supports. By failing to clearly document when and how often these occurrences took place, the Case Report continues to mislead the reader.

Overview of Investigation Process

On Pages 3 and 4 of the Case Report, you discuss the Results and Overview of the Investigation, including references to the inclusion or exclusion of witnesses, documents, and prior reports. While you have outlined your approach to these elements, it is important to highlight several discrepancies in the investigation process. The identification of witnesses, the selection and weight given to certain documents are among many of the factors which collectively raise concerns about the objectivity and fairness of the investigative process, which should be reflected in any comprehensive review of the Case Report.

At the outset of this Investigation, several witnesses informed Investigator Denis of procedural concerns regarding the conduct of the former Vice Chair of the Museum’s Board of Trustees, [redacted] (the “Board”), specifically noting that his behaviour may have been inappropriate and appeared to be directed towards me. The Investigator was aware that [redacted] carried out his own initial investigation, and during this process, some interviewees felt uneasy to the extent that they needed someone to accompany them for their interviews.

These circumstances raise significant questions about the impartiality and objectivity of [redacted]’s investigation report, which was marked by both actual and perceived bias against me and lacked a fair and neutral approach. Unfortunately, the recent Case Report does not reflect any of this important context.

It is also concerning that, throughout the Commissioner’s investigation, [redacted] was the only representative of the Museum Board who was interviewed. At the time of his interview, he was no longer a sitting member of the Board. Despite this, his comments are referenced in your April 22nd report, even though they included inaccurate statements regarding his departure, his assessment of my leadership, and the nature of his preliminary investigation. Both former Chair [redacted] and current Chair [redacted] expressed concerns about not being interviewed.

It is standard practice, in the interest of procedural fairness, to seek input from a diverse range of witnesses to ensure a balanced and comprehensive understanding of events.

However, the investigation did not include interviews with these key Museum Board members, despite their willingness to participate and provide insight into the circumstances. This omission further calls into question the fairness and thoroughness of the investigative process and should be noted as a significant procedural concern in any comprehensive review of the Case Report.

Results of the Commissioner's Investigation

In the following section, I will comment on each of the findings outlined in the Case Report, addressing them under the same subheadings as presented in the Case Report:

Inappropriate Language and Comments

I referred to the Senior Leadership Team as “sluts”, but it was not directed specifically at “MY senior leadership team” as is cited. This distinction is important because I always considered myself part of the group. If I had been questioned about my wording, I would have clarified immediately. However, I was never asked. The Case Report mentions this point twice. Some responses from the Chapman Response also explained that the comment was made in solidarity, not intended to disrespect our team. Additionally, I thoroughly discussed how including more women in the Museum's film's sports section could discourage comments about [redacted]. As noted in several Senior Leadership Team meetings (these discussions did not include other staff), there was no intent to harm in my remark.

Additionally, on Page 6 of the Case Report, regarding the three listed items, the second item (“no good-looking men”) refers to an interaction at a Toronto fundraising event among staff in 2009, which occurred prior to my appointment as Chief Executive of the Museum, was not initiated by me, and predated our organization's status as a federal entity. The third item involved a 2004 work trip to North Carolina, during which a colleague and I discussed hair humidity. As clarified in the Chapman Response, no individual, had ever heard me – or anyone else – refer this person's hairstyle as a Mohawk, yet this reference remains cited in the Case Report as a “hurtful nickname”. These incidents would have occurred when the Museum was a not-for-profit society incorporated pursuant to the Nova Scotia Societies Act and not within federal jurisdiction.

Raised Voice and Feelings of Fear and Intimidation

The initial three paragraphs suggest that these are select examples from an extensive list. However, these are the only instances identified, originating from 2012 and 2015, and have been formally addressed and contested, with specifics, in at least four of the Appendices

included in the Chapman Response, including evidence of my approach to managing conflict without resorting to demeaning behaviour.

Treatment of ERC Unit Employees

Regarding these findings, I want to emphasize that I did not treat any employees in the Museum's Exhibition, Research and Collections ("ERC") teams differently from others. To clarify, all decisions, including the termination of the Vice-President of Exhibitions, Research and Collections, were made collectively, with oversight from the Board. The termination was based strictly on performance, not personal reasons, and was carried out transparently with full knowledge of the Board.

After the termination, with both parties represented by external legal counsel, a mutually acceptable settlement was reached through negotiation between the Museum and the former employee's legal counsel. The minutes of settlement included a standard provision prohibiting criticism of the employer or its employees, which such clause is not only standard, but also essential to ensuring a respectful resolution in any settlement process.

This provision was not intended, nor was it used, to obstruct or limit the Commissioner's office in its ability to access information about incidents witnessed by the former VP of the ERC. Rather, the settlement terms were reached to protect the interests of all parties.

Furthermore, the first paragraph of Page 8 states that there are no records of such issues for the Museum's Research team. During my interview with Investigator Denis and in the Chapman Response, I named several. There were four separate occasions between 2016 and 2020 alone when Employee X's manager and VP of the ERC sought assistance to address Employee X's performance issues or to inform me of decisions they made in that regard:

- Employee X's manager met with me to inform me that they barred Employee X from accessing the Museum's exhibit halls without permission, as they were intimidating the Heritage Interpreters;
- Employee X's expressed concern about Employee X's repeated failure to attend their scheduled Saturday shifts;
- On another occasion, their manager and VP of the ERC met with me and another member of the SLT necessitating engagement with the Museum's legal counsel because their manager believed they had uncovered dishonesty regarding Employee X's use of sick days, a pattern of behaviour that had persisted for years; and

- I was directly approached at a conference in British Columbia by a Museum professional leading a project involving Employee X, who specifically requested that I prevent them from attending future meetings due to their “overbearing and dismissive” attitude towards colleague’s ideas. Upon my return and subsequent discussion with their manager, they confirmed familiarity with this conduct and immediately assigned Employee X to a constructive communication course instead of attending the meetings.

It was noted that many employees, including the VP of the ERC, refer to the team as “ERC”, pronouncing it as “Eurk”. The same statement is reflected in subsequent Appendices from the Museum’s Senior Leadership Team. Any comments about the Museum’s Research team were addressed directly to the Manager or discussed within the Museum’s Senior Leadership Team when a member raised an issue relating to the team’s conduct, as documented in the Appendices of the Chapman Response.

I contest the assertion that I excluded the Museum’s Research team from project participation, as outlined on Page 8, paragraphs 2 through 5 of the Case Report. The available evidence clearly refutes this claim. In an email I received, which I referenced in the Chapman Response, the senior manager who attended the contested meeting was going to request that the Research Manager serve as the Research team’s representative on the project. At that time, I was on vacation and entirely unaware of any conflict until my return. It is therefore unreasonable and factually indefensible to attribute the decision, and the subsequent feelings of upset and dismissal, to me. The documentation, including the referenced email and the detailed account provided in Appendix F of the Chapman Response, in paragraphs 13 and 14, corroborates this sequence of events. To continue to misattribute responsibility to me not only distorts the facts but also undermines the fairness and accuracy expected in this process.

The Case Report also perpetuates a problematic pattern, one already identified as a theme in the Chapman Response, where decisions are erroneously attributed to me, despite clear evidence to the contrary.

Furthermore, it is entirely reasonable, and in fact necessary, that I got involved with this matter. As I clearly stated in the Chapman Response, the Research team reports directly to me and the seriousness of the incident was such that a manager present at that meeting felt compelled to email me and to conclude that the Research Manager should be the representative at future meetings. There were significant concerns for the well-being of those present at the meeting, which demanded my attention and oversight.

Paragraph 6 of the Case Report, which alleges that I excluded the Museum Research team, is inaccurate. At no time did I exclude the Research team from participation. To this day, they are still represented on this project team.

Additionally, paragraph 6 on page 8 of the Case Report states that two members of the Museum's Research team have never witnessed Employee X influence people. In the Chapman Response, three people, each providing examples, explicitly contradict this claim. I am concerned that the responses to these allegations from the Chairs of the Board, both past and present (neither of whom were interviewed), and the Museum's Senior Leadership Team, have not been given enough weight. These responses are not only detailed but also highlight a shared concern and, in several cases, outright surprise at not being interviewed as part of Investigator Denis' investigation.

The final paragraph on Page 8 of the Case Report notes two of the Museum's Research team employees deny "Employee X influences people"; however, in my interview with Investigator Denis, I provided examples to the contrary, and three Senior Leadership Team responses reference instances where Employee X silenced others.

Targeting Employee X

I deny ever targeting Employee X. The reality is that many employment matters during my tenure with the Museum, both documented and undocumented, involved Employee X. Such circumstances necessitated appropriate management responses over the years.

Therefore, what may appear as targeting reflects the difficult management challenges that were not only felt by me, but all other members of the SLT during this period.

Environment of Fear

At no point have I threatened anyone's employment or fostered a climate of fear. There is an abundance of evidence that contradicts those claims. This is supported not only by interviews and reports from the Museum's Senior Leadership Team, but also by the fact that each member of the Research team either received promotions, benefited from exceptional professional development, and were offered opportunities for both short- and long-term leaves for study and other work-related pursuits.

In the final paragraph of the Case Report, examples are used that imply plural when they are not.

Museum's Response to the Commissioner's Recommendation

During my nearly two decades at the Museum, my conduct and performance have never been questioned by the Board, to whom I report. Year after year, I have achieved excel-

lent ratings under the Privy Council Office's performance management system. I have not received any warnings, disciplinary actions, or negative evaluations, nor have I been subject to performance management measures. My performance has consistently met and exceeds the expectations of the Board.

While I disagree with the findings outlined in the Case Report, I acknowledge and embrace my responsibility as a leader of the Museum. I acknowledge the Commissioner's recommendation to retain an "external expert to assess employee wellness and support measures". I welcome opportunities for learning and improvement and I look forward to engaging an external expert to guide us in the process. In addition, after reading the Case Report and upon reflection, I will also commit to additional leadership training to enhance my self-awareness and to better understand how my actions and words may be perceived by others. As the Chief Executive of the Museum, I remain fully committed to leading our team forward with positivity and continuous improvement.

Given the gravity of the situation, I hope that the Commissioner will revisit this Case Report and its findings.