Office of the
Saskatchewan Information
and Privacy Commissioner

DISREGARD DECISION 306-2025

Saskatchewan Polytechnic

December 12, 2025

Summary: Saskatchewan Polytechnic (Sask Polytech) applied to the Commissioner for authorization to disregard one access request made by the Applicant, which Sask Polytech received on October 25, 2025. The application was made under section 43.1(1) of *The Local Authority Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (*LA FOIP*).

The Commissioner granted the Sask Polytech application to disregard the Applicant's access request pursuant to section 43.1(2)(b) of *LA FOIP*.

I BACKGROUND

[1] On November 20, 2025, Saskatchewan Polytechnic (Sask Polytech) applied to the Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner (OIPC) to disregard an access to information request it received from the Applicant on October 25, 2025. Sask Polytech claimed the Applicant amended the October 25th access request on November 6, 2025.[1] The application from Sask Polytech is made pursuant to section 43.1(1) of *The Local Authority Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (*LA FOIP*).[2]

[1] The Appendix to this Decision includes verbatim reproductions of the Applicant's multiple access requests. OIPC has only amended the Applicant's access requests to the degree that the names of individuals associated with Sask Polytech have been reduced to first and last name initials to protect their anonymity. In terms of acronyms used, GBL is not an individual's initials, it is an acronym for "game based learning". EE is an acronym for "employee engagement". The Applicant's submission to this office failed to define the following acronyms that were used repeatedly in the access requests: AVP, EDI, DL, AI, PH MD or TEL. We cannot presume to guess.

[2] In its application, Sask Polytech referenced eight earlier access requests from the Applicant between September 16, 2025 and October 17, 2025. These requests are also recorded verbatim in the Appendix. Sask Polytech submits that two of the eight prior requests are "amendment requests" on the part of the Applicant.[3] Sask Polytech provided this information to buttress its assertion that the Applicant's access request of October 25, 2025 should be disregarded pursuant to section 43.1(2)(a) and/or (b) of *LA FOIP*.

[3] On November 25, 2025, OIPC notified Sask Polytech and the Applicant that the legislative timeline with respect to processing the Applicant's access request of October 25, 2025, was paused pursuant to section 43.1(3) of *LA FOIP*.

[4] Also on November 25, 2025, this office notified Sask Polytech and the Applicant that the Sask Polytech application to disregard would be considered. OIPC provided the Applicant with an opportunity to provide a response to the Sask Polytech application to disregard by December 8, 2025. The Applicant provided a written response on November 26, 2025.

II DISCUSSION OF THE ISSUES

1. Jurisdiction

[5] Sask Polytech is a "local authority" under section 2(1)(f)(x) of *LA FOIP*. Therefore, OIPC has jurisdiction to consider this application to disregard under PART VI of *LA FOIP*.

---

[2] *The Local Authority Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* , SS 1990-91, c. L-27.1, as amended.

[3] Sask Polytech takes the position that the Applicant amended the September 14, 2025 access request on September 16, 2025, and the October 15, 2025 access request on the same date. As noted Sask Polytech argues that the November 6, 2025 access request amends the October 25, 2025 access request. The Applicant disputes that the November 6, 2025 access request is an amendment of the October 25, 2025 access request. The Applicant claims that the November 6, 2025 request amended one of the two October 15, 2025 requests. Nothing turns on this factual dispute, but the submission of the Applicant hints at a pointedly illogical situation in that there were two amendments to the original October 15, 2025 access request – the first following close on the heels of the original on the very same day and the second some *three weeks* later in time without specific reference to the earlier request.

2. Should the application to disregard from Sask Polytech pursuant to sections 43.1(2)(a) and (b) of *LA FOIP* be granted?

[6] Sask Polytech submitted that the access to information request it received from the Applicant on October 25, 2025, should be disregarded pursuant to sections 43.1(2)(a) and (b) of *LA FOIP*. These sections provide a local authority with the ability to apply to the Commissioner with a request to disregard an access to information request. Section 43.1 of *LA FOIP* provides as follows:

> **Power to authorize a local authority to disregard applications or requests**
>
> **43.1**(1) The head may apply to the commissioner to disregard one or more applications pursuant to section 6 or requests pursuant to section 31.
>
> (2) In determining whether to grant an application or request mentioned in subsection (1), the commissioner shall consider whether the application or request:
>
> (a) would unreasonably interfere with the operations of the local authority because of the repetitious or systematic nature of the application or request;
>
> (b) would amount to an abuse of the right of access or right of correction because of the repetitious or systematic nature of the application or request; or
>
> (c) is frivolous or vexatious, not in good faith or concerns a trivial matter.

[7] An application to disregard is a serious matter as it removes an applicant's express right to seek access to information. However, *LA FOIP* recognizes that not all access to information requests are legitimate. Section 43.1 of *LA FOIP* exists to preserve the intent and principles inherent in the access to information legislation in this Province. Former British Columbia Information and Privacy Commissioner (BC OIPC), David Loukidelis, noted the following about the role of the equivalent provision in British Columbia's Act:[4]

> …Access to information legislation confers on individuals such as the respondent a significant statutory right, *i.e.*, the right of access to information (including one's own personal information). All rights come with responsibilities. The right of access should only be used in good faith. It must

[4] BC OIPC Order 99-01 at pages 7 and 8.

> not be abused. By overburdening a public body, misuse by one person of the right of access can threaten or diminish the legitimate exercise of that same right by others, including as regards their own personal information. Such abuse also harms the public interest, since it unnecessarily adds to public bodies' costs of complying with the Act. Section 43 exists, of course, to guard against abuse of the right of access…

[8] We will commence with an analysis of section 43.1(2)(b) of *LA FOIP* and the facts as accepted from the written submissions of both parties in this matter.

[9] For this provision to be found to apply, Sask Polytech must demonstrate that the Applicant's access to information request is of such a repetitious or systematic nature that it can be said to be an abuse of the right of access. Both parts of the following test must be met:[5]

> Are the requests for access or correction repetitious or systematic?
>
> Do the repetitious or systematic requests amount to an abuse of the right of access or correction?

a. Is the request for access or correction repetitious or systematic?

[10] OIPC refers to the following definitions as helpful in the first part of the two-part test:[6]

- "Repetitious" requests are requests that are made two or more times.
- "Systematic" requests are those made according to a method or plan of acting that is organized and carried out according to a set of rules or principles. It includes a pattern of conduct that is regular or deliberate; to be methodical, arranged, and/or conducted according to system. The local authority needs to identify any of the following factors that may apply:
  - Are the requests similar in nature or do they stand alone as being different, or is there some overlap?
  - Are the requests close in their filing time.

[5] OIPC Disregard Decision 122-2021 at paragraph [8].

[6] *Ibid*, at paragraphs [9] to [11].

- Does the applicant continue to engage in a determined effort to request the same information (an important factor in finding whether requests are systematic, is to determine whether they are repetitious).

- Is there a pattern of conduct on the part of the applicant in making the repeated requests that is regular or deliberate. Does the applicant methodically request records or information in many areas of interest over extended time periods, rather than focusing on accessing specific records or information of identified events or matters.

- Has the applicant requested records or information of various aspects of the same issue.

- Has the applicant made a number of requests related to matters referred to in records already received.

- Does the applicant follow up on responses received by making further requests.

- Does the applicant question the content of records received by making further access requests.

- Does the applicant question whether records or information exist when told they do not.

- Can the requests be seen as a continuum of previous requests rather than in isolation.

[11] The first phase of this analysis considers the Applicant's access request of October 25, 2025, and whether it is repetitious or systematic. The wording of this access request must be reviewed against the wording contained in any previous access requests submitted by the same Applicant to Sask Polytech.[7] In its submission, Sask Polytech argued that the Applicant has been repetitious and overlapping with respect to the issues raised in their access requests as follows:

> In the case at hand, the Applicant has made 12 access to information requests between the dates of August 16, 2025 – October 25, 2025. Attached to these

[7] In Disregard Decision 225-2025 at paragraph [16] recommended that the access request being considered for a disregard should be considered against any previous access requests by the same applicant.

> submissions as Appendix "A" is a chart outlining the requests made by the Applicant to Sask Polytech.
>
> As you can see, there is a clear pattern of repetitious requests, a series of amended requests, and significant overlap in the type of information requested.
>
> For example, the September 9, October 16, October 17, and October 25, 2025, requests all pertain to game-based learning documents, specifically pertaining to the Applicant's use and evaluation relating to game-based learning.

[12] As noted, the full wording of the Applicant's access requests, including the one considered under this Decision, can be found in the Appendix. Sask Polytech summarized the Applicant's sequence of applications and subsequent amendments as follows:

Date of Application	**Description by Sask Polytech**
August 16, 2025	Initial application
August 26, 2025	Second application
August 27, 2025	Third application
September 9, 2025	Fourth application
September 14, 2025	Fifth application
September 15, 2025	Sixth application (*amendment* to September 14, 2025 application)
October 15, 2025	Seventh application
October 15, 2025	Eighth application (*amendment* to October 15, 2025 application)
October 16, 2025	Ninth application (unrelated to the two previous applications)
October 17, 2025	Tenth application
October 25, 2025	Eleventh application
November 6, 2025	Twelfth application (*amendment* to October 25, 2025 application)

[13] On first review, the access requests Sask Polytech received from the Applicant on October 16 and 17, 2025 contain duplicate wording under the first item on each document, so there is a clear repetition between the two. What must be analyzed is whether there is repetition between prior requests and the Applicant's October 25, 2025 application.

[14] The individual items sought by the Applicant in their October 25, 2025 request are different from the items listed in the other requests. This does not change the fact that *all* the Applicant's requests center around the exact same issues and topics. These issues/topics

are all related to the themes of their work evaluation and/or work training and they all owe their origin from their dismissal from their employment at Sask Polytech. The requests are structured in such a way that they appear to be a repetitive and ongoing continuum of the same topics. In the October 25, 2025 access request the following themes are raised and they have been raised previously:

- documents related to "game based learning" and the coaching of the Applicant with respect to "game based learning";
- the assessment of the Applicant in general and with respect to "game based learning";
- management documentation/policies for the liaising of staff, for the "purpose" of the head of a department, for the investigation of employees, for the investigation of breaches of the Code of Conduct, for the rules of procedural fairness in the workplace; and
- various evaluations of the Sask Polytech institution (that the Applicant concedes are available online).

[15] In this way, the Applicant's requests can be said to be sufficiently connected. Requests that are sufficiently connected can be said to be repetitious.[8] Thus the threshold for the Applicant's request of October 25, 2025 is met, in that it is repetitious.

b. Do the repetitious or systematic requests amount to an abuse of the right of access or correction?

[16] The second phase of the analysis considers whether the Applicant's request amounts to an abuse of the right of access. An "abuse of the right of access" occurs when an applicant uses the *LA FOIP* provisions in a way that is contrary to its principles and objectives. The principles and objectives of privacy legislation in Canada was framed upon by the Supreme Court of Canada in *John Doe v Ontario (Finance).*[9] Even though Justice Rothstein wrote

[8] BC OIPC Decision F05-01 at paragraph [17]. This office has adopted the same threshold for "sufficiently connected" in Disregard Decision 225-2025 at paragraph [19].

[9] *John Doe v. Ontario (Finance),* [2014] 2 SCR 3 at paragraphs [1] and [2].

with respect to Ontario legislation that dealt with government institutions, these words apply with just as much force to local authorities across Canada:

> [1] Access to information legislation serves an important public interest: accountability of government to the citizenry. An open and democratic society requires public access to government information to enable public debate on the conduct of government institutions.
>
> [2] However, as with all rights recognized in law, the right of access to information is not unbounded. All Canadian access to information statutes balance access to government information with the protection of other interests that would be adversely affected by otherwise unbridled disclosure of such information.

[17] A repetitious access request within a short period of time that derives from a personal crusade of an applicant certainly constitutes an abuse of the right of access. Another consideration is whether the access requests are filed with the prime motive of disrupting/frustrating the ordinary activities of a local authority.

[18] A "pattern of conduct" requires recurring incidents of related or similar requests made on the part of the applicant. The time span of the requests is also a significant factor. Other relevant factors to consider, which can appear alone or in combination with other factors, include:[10]

- **The number of requests**: are they excessive by reasonable standards?
- **Nature and scope of the request**: are they excessively broad and varied and varied in scope or unusually detailed?
- **Purpose of the request**: are the requests intended to accomplish some objective other than to gain access? For example, are they made for nuisance value, or if the applicant's aim to harass or break or burden the system?
- **Timing of the request**: is the timing connected to the occurrence of some other related event, such as a court or tribunal proceeding?
- **Wording of the request**: are the requests or subsequent communications in their nature offensive, vulgar, derogatory or contain unfounded allegations?

[10] OIPC Disregard Decision 204-2020, et al at paragraphs [39] to [41].

i. Number of Requests/Nature and Scope of Requests

[19] Sask Polytech submitted that the Applicant's motives fell outside the four corners of the principles of *LA FOIP*:

> In response to the second part of the test, Sask Polytech submits that 12 requests within a two-month period is excessive. As outlined above, the nature and scope of requests are excessively broad, and unusually detailed. More examples of the level of detail and description in the requests can be found in Sask Polytech's attached documentation.
>
> Sask Polytech submits that the purpose of the requests are intended for a purpose other than to gain access. It is clear that the Applicant is not simply trying to make requests for a "nuisance" value, but the nature and language in the requests clearly relates to [their][11] grievances against Sask Polytech regarding [their] former employment.
>
> For example, in the October 17, 2025, application, the Applicant again raised previous grievances and makes requests of Sask Polytech that are outside the scope, and outside the spirit of LA FOIP:
>
> > 2. Documentation from the Library on what learning technologist JM's provided in terms of his experiential teaching methods and on what aspect of game-based learning so that I had "experiential learning" as Director AM's previously stated that my participation in his GBL working group was "Experiential learning" and attending meetings where we talked about what tasks to complete was considered training. I have repeated said to PH MD, manager RB, and director AM that JM provided no coaching as that is not his role and there is no documentation from him on his teaching. For me to have experiential learning, there needs to be experiential teaching,
> >
> > Feel free to interview JM.
>
> Requesting that Sask Polytech interview "JM" in relation to an information request that clearly tries to re-litigate grievances the Applicant may have with Sask Polytech relating [their] employment is wholly inappropriate, and outside the scope of Sask Polytech's duty to respond to access to information requests.
>
> The correspondence in Appendix B highlights the language used by the applicant, specifically in raising [their] concerns with her previous employment with Sask Polytech:

[11] We take the liberty of amending the Sask Polytech submissions to preserve the anonymity of the Applicant.

> My request for documentation on the extensive coaching that I had received specific to GBL has not been sent despite the Library Leadership Team saying I had received extensive coaching hence my reprimand and suspension was warranted…..
>
> - One-to-one meeting notes: These are regularly scheduled meetings the PH has with all the librarians every two weeks for us to report our work to her and for her to ask us questions. This was required attendance. None of these meetings were specific to GBL. None were about coaching related to GBL. I made numerous comments about my concerns about the assignment and I asked questions that PH MD during these meetings but these were not coaching meetings about GBL
>
> The Applicant consistently uses language relating to [their] previous grievances, as well as expresses [their] discontent with the management of [their] previous employment. These comments illustrate that the requests are not made in the spirit of the legislation, but rather to attempt to re-litigate or raise grievances with Sask Polytech.
>
> The Applicant's actions have been consuming a significant amount of Sask Polytech's time. The Applicant's approach involves a series of communications with Sask Polytech, beginning with the initial request. Subsequently the Applicant proceeds to amend or add to the requests. Following this, a new request is submitted once again for similar documents and including language seeming to criticize Sask Polytech and further grieve the circumstances of [their] employment.
>
> While applicants have a statutory right for access to information, LA FOIP must not become "a weapon for disgruntled individuals to use" against a local authority for reasons that have nothing to do with the Act.

[20] The Applicant responded by asserting the October 25, 2025 access request is for access to records they have not previously requested and received. Still, this office has already concluded that the Applicant's October 25, 2025 access request is sufficiently connected to their other requests such that it is repetitious. Just the nature and scope of the October 25, 2025 request, when compared to the past requests, clearly indicates that the Applicant's motives are beyond a simple request for information and relate back to an employment dispute with an added sense of outrage present in the actual wording of the requests.

[21] Further, the nature and scope of the Applicant's access requests are broad and detailed. For example, the Applicant's request of October 25, 2025 contains nine separate segments with a timeframe for records that span the course of four years (2021 to 2025). This access

request demands overwhelming detail in places. For example, segment five requests a type of service evaluation report that evaluates library services "in all of its parts and as a whole."

ii. Purpose of the Requests

[22] Sask Polytech submitted that the Applicant's prime motive in filing access request stems from a desire to re-litigate old employment grievances with respect to their termination of employment by Sask Polytech.

[23] The Applicant submitted that they have "no past or current litigations with Sask Polytech so what am I trying to relitigate?" They also claimed that Sask Polytech has accused them of "harassing them before in response to their third LRB [Saskatchewan Labour Relations Board] case where I self-represented and won." It is the Applicant who raised the issue of the Saskatchewan Labour Relations Board.

[24] In fact, as of the date of this Decision, we note a total of five completed hearings before the Saskatchewan Labour Relations Board spanning from 2022 to 2025 and involving the Applicant and Sask Polytech/Sask Polytech faculty association.[12] In these matters the Applicant grieved various issues, among them several production applications for documents including the production of a performance improvement plan and a "list of coaching provided by [their] manager to [them]". Based on a review of the LRB decisions, the Applicant's historical employment relationship with Sask Polytech is a recurrent and hotly contested theme.

[25] The Office of the Alberta Information and Privacy Commissioner (AB OIPC) reviewed a request by a public body to disregard an applicant partly on the basis that their access requests were an abuse of the right of access. The Applicant submitted multiple access requests to the public body. The public body asked the AB OIPC to disregard several requests, most filed on the same date. The requests were detailed in nature, and many

[12] Search carried out on the CanLII database for the Saskatchewan Labour Relations Board. We cannot reproduce the citations here in order to preserve the anonymity of the applicant.

involved "cumulative" and "continuous" requests. The AB OIPC found the applicant's access requests abused the right to access information largely because the requests were nothing more than an airing of a prior grievance:[13]

> [25] An individuals' right of access to information is not unlimited. No one has a right to make abusive access requests. The Alberta Legislature recognized this through incorporating various provisions in the FOIP Act, including section 55(1). Courts have also recognized the necessity of gatekeeping in appropriate circumstances. For example, the Supreme Court of Canada has stated, "There is no constitution right to bring frivolous or vexatious cases, and measures that deter such cases may actually increase efficiency and overall access to justice".[14]
>
> [26] In previous decisions, I have held that section 55(1)(a) of the FOIP Act clearly contemplates that the systematic nature of access requests, in and of themselves, may amount to an abuse of the right to make those access requests. Further, although section 55(1)(a) says nothing about an improper motive, an improper motive would clearly establish abuse.
>
> [27] In the circumstances of this case, the repetitious and systematic nature of the Applicant's access request is an abuse of the right to make requests. The language used by the Applicant in some of her access requests includes various allegations of wrongdoing by the Public Body. In my view, some of these appear to be not only request for information, but a means for the Applicant to air her grievances against the Public Body.
>
> [Emphasis added]

[26] There are some similarities between the matter the AB OIPC considered and the matter before this office.

[27] Sask Polytech submitted that the Applicant's suggestion that it interview "JM" in relation to the October 17, 2025 information request[15], "clearly tries to re-litigate grievances the Applicant may have with Sask Polytech" and is related to [their] previous employment

[13] AB OIPC, Request to Disregard F2020-RTD-04 at paragraphs [25] to [27].

[14] *Trial Lawyers Association of British Columbia v. British Columbia (Attorney General), 2014*, SCC 59, [2014] 3 SCR 31 at paragraph [47].

[15] See Appendix – October 17, 2025 segment 2.

with that institution. The Applicant's written response evidences that this point is clearly beyond comprehension:[16]

> 5. AM Said that I was part of a working group lead by learning technologist JM on the topic of game-based learning theory which constituted as training, and she doesn't have his coaching documentation. I explained to her that the project charter and the meeting notes for the working group will provide no evidence of training, coaching or mentorship. I suggested AM or SM interview JM.
>
> 6. Then she said my participation in that group constitute as experiential learning but factually, experiential learning means that it is taught using experiential teaching strategies and no training, coaching, and mentorship was provided by the group leader, learning technologist JM, let alone taught using experiential teaching strategies. I suggested AM or SM interview JM.
>
> …

[28] Further, the Applicant's response to this office indeed corroborates the Sask Polytech assertion that the access requests are motivated by unresolved issues related to employment rather than from a simple desire to obtain the records for informational purposes.

[29] We also note in the Applicant's October 25, 2025 access request, where they asserted the following:

> 8. Library management's investigative procedure for investigating employees on violations of the Code of Conduct that ensures procedural fairness. A procedure is not an activity of a Q&A and having union present nor is it assurance that the manager will not have predetermined judgements. There's millions of example of what a process or procedure looks like if you google it.
>
> 9. HR's investigative procedure for investigating employees on violations of the Code of Conduct that ensures procedural fairness. A procedure is not an activity of a Q&A and having union present nor is it assurance that the manager will not have predetermined judgements. There's millions of example of what a process or procedure looks like if you google it. Note: I have already explained that procedural fairness and what an investigative procedure is to manager RB and HR giving them links as examples.
>
> [Emphasis added]

[16] We note that one of the individuals that was suggested to "interview" JM is, most likely, the Sask Polytech privacy officer. This individual could not be expected to play a role in the *creation* of documentation to fulfill an access request.

[30] The Applicant's access request of October 25, 2025, is dedicated to a wider consideration of Sask Polytech policies, procedures and evaluative materials as they would apply to faculty and students. From the parts of that request that are replicated above, the Applicant requested copies of specific investigative procedures. It is worth noting that the Applicant believes it necessary to explain the nature of policies, processes and procedures to Sask Polytech. The Applicant does not trust Sask Polytech and is issuing access requests from a combative viewpoint.

iii. Timing of the Request

[31] Based on the arguments and information from both Sask Polytech and the Applicant, the timing of the access requests is not an issue.

iv. Wording of the Request

[32] The wording of an access request can reveal the motives behind. We refer once again to helpful guidance from the AB OIPC:[17]

> [28] The Public Body made arguments about the Applicant's motives in the context of section 55(1)(b). Submissions about an improper motive are also applicable to the analysis of whether there is an abuse of the right to make requests under section 55(1)(a). Although an Applicant is not obligated to explain the reason for their access requests, where an Applicant chooses to make a submission, I can consider what they have said. In this case, the Public Body's position on improper motive receives some support from the Applicant's own submission as it is replete with inflammatory language, and confirms that the majority of her access requests are for the purpose of an anticipated legal or administrative proceeding against the Public Body.
>
> [Emphasis added]

[33] On several occasions, the Applicant's written submission to this office outrightly questioned the credibility and capability of Sask Polytech and revealed a distinctly combative approach. The Applicant has corroborated the very assertions as alleged by Sask Polytech:

[17] *Supra,* footnote 13 at paragraph [28].

- *LA FOIP* affords a local authority 30 days to respond to an access request. In the Applicant's written submission to this office there was a suggestion that if Sask Polytech could not complete the Applicant's access request of October 25, 2025, in "2 hours max", an explanation for the delay should be forthcoming. In fact, the Applicant provided this office with the detailed steps required to complete the search for the record and pointedly questioned the ability of the privacy officer to respond to an access request in general.

- The Applicant suggested in their written submission that Sask Polytech has "missed the deadline to complain" about the October 25, 2025 access request, and they then suggested this office dismiss the application to disregard and direct the October 25, 2025 access request be completed forthwith.

- The Applicant demanded this office investigate Sask Polytech on the grounds that it is "frivolous, vexatious and acting in bad faith". The Applicant also suggested that this office direct Sask Polytech to "investigate me and them for harassment with an external investigator of their choosing at a time that is convenient for them and I will consent."

[34] The purpose of an access request made under *LA FOIP* is to seek access to records, and not to lecture a local authority on its perceived inefficiencies or flawed procedures. Surprisingly, the Applicant was willing to make one concession and that was that Sask Polytech has "complied or agree to comply with all of my previously requests without complaint." The fact that Sask Polytech responded to the Applicant's subsequent requests and amendments illustrates that Sask Polytech has indeed acted in good faith.

[35] While it is normal for local authorities to expect some criticism from the public, when an applicant displays a pattern of conduct that goes beyond a request for information and becomes an opportunity to air grievances or lecture the local authority, the regulator has reason to disregard.[18]

[36] In this matter, the Applicant is most certainly asking for access to records. However, they are airing grievances against their former employer in the same breath. This is demonstrated through the recurring themes. This is improper conduct on the part of an

[18] *Supra,* footnote 13 at paragraph [27].

applicant and will not be tolerated in the access to information scheme. This approach achieves nothing other than exhausting the resources of a local authority. An applicant who wants access to records simply needs to ask for those records – they do not need to include rhetoric suggestive of an ulterior motive. If an applicant is not satisfied with a local authority's response, they have the right to request that this office review the local authority's decision. The access and privacy legislation in this province does not envision that applicants harass local authorities on a repeated basis and/or instruct local authorities on how to fulfill the access request.

[37] This Decision has highlighted several instances where the Applicant has gone beyond the principles and spirit of *LA FOIP*. The Applicant's approach and motivation in this instance has been repeated and, at times, vexatious. The Applicant has abused the right to access scheme as set out in *LA FOIP*. Sask Polytech has met the threshold for a finding that the access request of October 25, 2025 is repetitious and amounts to an abuse of the right of access under section 43.1(2)(b) of *LA FOIP*. In making this finding, there is no need to consider section 43.1(2)(a) of *LA FOIP*.

[38] Based on this, I grant the Sask Polytech application to disregard the Applicant's access request of October 25, 2025 pursuant to section 42.1(2)(b) of *LA FOIP*.

III DECISION

[39] Sask Polytech's application to disregard the Applicant's access request of October 25, 2025 is granted.

Dated at Regina, in the Province of Saskatchewan, this 12th day of December, 2025.

Grace Hession David
Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner

Appendix

Summary of Applicant's Access Requests

Date Received by Sask Polytech	Details of Access Request
August 16, 2025	I am a member of the public requesting access to the following information: 2024 Library and Testing Department Employee Engagement Results, 2024 Learning and Teaching Division EE plan, 2024 Library and Testing Department EE plan, the Library's 2024-2025 annual priorities, any 2024 annual report about Library and Testing department submitted by library director AM to AVP Dr. MG, Library and Testing Department powerpoint presentations, documentation, and meeting notes from the all of the Divisional Meetings under the Government of Saskatchewan access to information request. [timeframe 2025-2025]
August 25, 2025	2023-2024 and 2024-2025 -annual strategic and operational plans -annual report on the systematic reviews and assessment of Library initiatives with all stakeholders -Report on technologies used for library instruction such as game-based learning approaches -Budget reports -EDI plans for library staff, faculty or students -Job description for the director of Library and Testing Services and any reports that she produces as listed in her job description -Employee Engagement (EE) Survey for Library and Testing Department at the Division Planning Event where all three departments meet in either Saskatoon or Regina (I can't remember the years) [timeframe included in access request]
August 27, 2025	Survey results after the three or four? Divisional Meetings that have been held. The Divisional Meetings are meetings that are held in the Division of Teaching and Learning and comprise of the departments of: Library and Testing, ILDC, and Learning Technologies. These departments get together in-person in the city of Saskatoon or Regina for in-person meetings for 1.5 days of meetings. After these meetings, Academic Vice-President MG sends out a poll. I am asking for the survey results for these three meetings divisional meetings. I can't remember what years these meetings took place. [no timeframe given]
September 9, 2025	Any recording or documentation of mentorship, coaching, professional development provided to me, [name of Applicant], from library director AM, out of scope manager RB, or program head MD regarding game based learning and RB's reprimand and suspension of letters of [name of Applicant] for failing her assigning on game based learning where she stated she and MD provided extensive coaching and Library Director AM

	said this was substantiated. Any EDI plan related to my development for this game based learning report was I was supposed to do for RB.
September 14, 2025	Division Teaching and Learning Under Academic Vice President MG The following reports: -operational plans -strategic plans -Service evaluation reports for each departments and the division as a whole -budget reports -employee engagement results for the division -employee engagement plan and evaluation reports -cost of the each divisional planning events, 3-4, to date -any other reports submitted to the provost and Dr. R [timeframe 2019-2024]
September 16, 2025 (noted by Sask Polytech as an addition to the September 14, 2025 request)	2021-2024 or the 3 most recently completed reports or similar type of reports (again the title of the reports might not be exactly named as I have named them but it's the content of the materials that I am after). None of my F22.01 requests should take more than 30 min. max to compile as there are admin assistants working for out of scope managers who file and keep records of these e-documents.
October 15, 2025	Library Dpt documents: 1. Library Services usage stats for services: instruction, reference, circulation stats, collection resources usage Stats, attendance at library events, self-check out ipad, people counter stats. 2. Evaluation reports customer satisfaction with: instruction, reference, circulation stats, collection resources usage Stats, attendance at library events, self-check out ipad, people counter stats. 3. Evaluation reports on instruction: assessment of learning Division of Teaching and Learning 1. Evaluation report on the Technology Enhanced Learning Plan: faculty and students satisfaction and impact on student's learning, professional development, work skills or professional success [timeframe “3 most recent consecutive reports” or “for the following years: 2024, 2022, 2020”]
October 15, 2025 (Sask Polytech noted this request was an amendment	Library Dpt documents: 1. Library Services usage stats for services: instruction, reference, circulation stats, collection resources usage stats, attendance at library events, self-check out ipad, people counter stats.

to the previous request received the same day)	2. Evaluation reports of customer satisfaction with: instruction, reference, circulation stats, collection resources usage stats, attendance at library events, self-check out ipad, people counter stats. 3. Evaluation reports on instruction: assessment of student learning 4. Service design plans and evaluation 5. Annual priorities for the library, plan, and evaluation of plan Division of Teaching and Learning 1. Evaluation report on the Technology Enhanced Learning Plan: faculty and students satisfaction and impact on student's learning, professional development, work skills or professional success [timeframe "3 most recent consecutive reports or "for the following years: 2024, 2022, 2020"]
October 16, 2025	All documents related the training, mentorship, and coaching of [name of Applicant] re: game-based learning. The documents must be about "game-based learning" 2. Documentation of coaching on where to find the answers to PH MD deliverables. For example, "give me a list of games that would teach to a list of 30 learning outcomes" when no literature exists an using videogames to teach library skills and there are millions of games out there. 2. Sask Polytech or the Library's documented model for staff training and development. 3. Documentation on formal staff training re: GBL Please see attached document. Please do not: refer me to Leaming Technologist JM for documentation on his coaching his working group on GBL because they do not exist. Please do not send me any documents about what PH MD wanted in an assignment because they are not about GBL, they are simply documents tolling me what she wants on an assignment. This information might help the Library Leadership Team find the documents I am looking for: Training, Coaching and Mentoring: What's the Difference? Building on from "What is coaching?" itis important to differentiate coaching from other development approaches to understand the different roles and approaches of each. Training, Coaching and Mentoring all have

	their place in organisations to develop employees, but they all are different requiring different skills, approaches and outcomes. A brief overview of the styles is identified in the table. [timeframe 2024-2025]
October 17, 2025	Library Testing Documents 1. All documents related the training, mentorship, and coaching of [name of Applicant] re: game-based learning. The documents must be about "game-based learning" 2. Documentation from the Library on what learning technologist JM's provided in terms of his experiential teaching methods and on what aspect of game-based learning so that I had "experiential learning" as Director AM's previously stated that my participation in his GBL working group was "experiential learning" and attending meetings where we talked about what tasks to complete was considered training. I have repeated said to PH MD, manager RB, and director AM that JM provided no coaching as that is not his role and there is no documentation from him on his teaching. For me to have experiential learning, there needs to be experiential teaching, Feel free to interview JM. 3. Documentation of coaching on where to find the answers to PH MD numerous deliverables. For example, "give me a list of games that would teach to a list of 30 learning outcomes" when no literature exists on using commercial videogames to teach library skills and there are millions of games out there when the Library Leadership Team directed me not to do a lit search for the second part of the assignment. The first part of the assignment, they allowed me to do a lit search and no literature exists. 4.. Sask Polytech or the Library's documented model for staff training and development. 5.. Documentation on formal staff training re: GBL. 6. Library's staff development plan on emerging technology and GBL. 7. Documentation of [name of Applicant][19] master's prepared education and work experience on GBL and using commercial video games to teach library skills when no literature exists on using commercial video games to teach li6. rary skills. HR has my resume and the Library Leadership Team is aware of what librarian do on a daily basis. [timeframe 2024-25]
October 25, 2025 (access request under	Documents related to the following:

[19] Words in square brackets are OIPC's redaction of the Applicant's name to protect their identity.

consideration to disregard]	1. Plans for integrating emerging technologies like AI, game-based learning (GBL), virtual reality, augmented reality etc. into library services like events, instruction etc. 2. Policies or procedures or service delivery model written my management to communicate to the library staff who, what, how, level of service, conditions for serving faculty and students regarding teaching them DL and AI skills 3. Documents regarding the DL or AI skills taught to faculty and students • The skills taught • The learning outcomes for these skills • Assessment of learning • Customer satisfaction • Stats how many skills sessions for DL and AI etc. and for what group : individual students, classroom sessions, or faculty (students vs. faculty) and events on these topics • Stats on the number of attendees 4. Staff development plan re: emerging technologies 5. Service evaluation report (a report on the state of library services and evaluating library services in all of its parts and as a whole) 6. Documentation from management on what the liaising model is or what the liaising structure is • Evaluation of the liaising model in meeting goals etc. 7. Business case or similar documentation on the need and purpose for a program head • Evaluation on if the program head position (not the person) has achieved the intended goal 8. Library management's investigative procedure for investigating employees on violations of the Code of Conduct that ensures procedural fairness. A procedure is not an activity of a Q&A and having union present nor is it assurance that the manager will not have predetermined judgements. There's millions of example of what a process or procedure looks like if you google it. 9. HR's investigative procedure for investigating employees on violations of the Code of Conduct that ensures procedural fairness. A procedure is not an activity of a Q&A and having union present nor is it assurance that the manager will not have predetermined judgements. There's millions of

	example of what a process or procedure looks like if you google it. Note: I have already explained that procedural fairness and what an investigative procedure is to manager RB and HR giving them links as examples. Sask Polytech Institution 1. Any evaluation report on if the goals of their strategic plan has been achieved 2. Any evaluation report on if the goals of their EDI plan has been achieved 3. Any evaluation report on if the goals of their TEL has been achieved Note: All three of these documents are published on their website [timeframe 2021-2025 or "3 of the latest documents"]
November 6, 2025 (amendment)	For the reference stats could I please have the total number of reference stats per time frame breakdown as specified by the Library. The Library uses this software called "Springshare" and it takes a few clicks to give you these immediate stats. It also will give you instructional stats. To simplify the work and decrease my cost, could I please just have the stats I asked for but only for Saskatoon Library.