

[Redacted]

Via email: [Redacted]

Dear [Redacted]

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION (FOI) REQUEST

I refer to your application under section 30 of the *Freedom of Information Act 2016* (the FOI Act), received by the Education Directorate (the Directorate) on 19 January 2026, in which you sought access to records relating to:

Communications (emails and attachments only) from 1 July 2025 to 24 December 2025 between the Registrar of Non-Government Schools (including any acting Registrar) and the ACT Minister for Education and/or the Minister's Office that refer to BCEL and/or BCC relating to the following terms:

- *Show cause*
- *RSAB*
- *Registration amendment*
- *Revocation*
- *Section 125A*
- *Section 125C*
- *Investigation*
- *Administrator*
- *Deloitte*

Exclusions identified: drafts not sent externally, duplicate copies of emails, newsletters/media clippings, publicly available material and purely administrative scheduling emails.

I am an Information Officer appointed by the Director-General under section 18 of the FOI Act to deal with access applications made under Part 5 of the FOI Act.

In accordance with section 40 of the FOI Act, the Directorate was required to provide a decision on your access application within 30 working days of receipt, being 3 March 2026.

On 2 March 2026, the Directorate contacted you to seek an extension to 31 March 2026. As you did not refuse our request for additional time within 7 working days, you are taken to have agreed to the extension request under section 41(4)(a) of the FOI Act.

Decision on access

Searches were completed for relevant records and five records were identified that fall within the scope of your request.

I have included as Attachment A to this decision the schedule of relevant records. This provides a description of each record that falls within the scope of your request and the access decision for each of those records.

In summary, my decision is:

- full access to one record, and
- partial access to four records with deletions applied.

The records released to you are provided as Attachment B to this letter.

My access decisions are detailed further in the following statement of reasons.

Material considered

In reaching my access decision, I have taken the following into account:

- the FOI Act, particularly sections 16, 17, 35 and 50, and schedules 1 and 2,
- the content of the records that fall within the scope of your request,
- the Human Rights Act 2004,
- the *Information Privacy Act 2014*, and
- the FOI Guidelines issued under section 66 of the FOI Act by the Ombudsman.

Reasons for decision

I have considered the records that are relevant to your request in accordance with the requirements of the FOI Act.

Section 6(a) of the FOI Act provides for a right of access to government information unless access would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest. Contrary to the public interest information is defined at section 16 of the FOI Act as information that is taken to be contrary to the public interest to disclose under Schedule 1; or the disclosure of which would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest under the test set out in section 17.

Section 50 of the FOI Act provides for records to be partially released with deletions applied where they contain contrary to the public interest information that can be removed, which enables the remainder of the record to be released. This provision has been applied where appropriate.

Information taken to be contrary to the public interest to disclose

Some of the records contain information that is taken to be contrary to the public interest under Schedule 1 of the FOI Act. Schedule 1, 1.2 specifies that information that would be privileged from production or admission into evidence in a legal proceeding on the ground of legal professional privilege is taken to be contrary to the public interest to disclose. The information concerned is communication between a legal professional acting for the ACT Government and the ACT Government as the client. The communication between ACT Government and legal professionals was confidential in nature and for the dominant purpose of providing legal advice or professional legal services. For these reasons, legal professional privilege applies, resulting in redaction of this information.

Information, the disclosure of which would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest

The public interest test requires the identification of factors favouring disclosure and non-disclosure, the balancing of those factors, and a decision whether, on balance, disclosure of the information would be contrary to the public interest.

I have decided that the factors favouring disclosure, as listed at Schedule 2.1 of the FOI Act, are that disclosure of the information could reasonably be expected to:

- *promote open discussion of public affairs and enhance the government's accountability (Schedule 2, 2.1(a)(i))*
- *contribute to positive and informed debate on important issues or matters of public interest (Schedule 2, 2.1(a)(ii))*
- *reveal the reason for a government decision and any background or contextual information that informed the decision (Schedule 2, 2.1(a)(viii))*

These factors are relevant because there is considerable public interest in matters relating to Brindabella Christian College and Brindabella Christian Education Limited. Therefore, I give strong weight to the factors favouring disclosure.

I have decided that the applicable factor favouring non-disclosure, as listed at Schedule 2.2 of the FOI Act, is that disclosure of the information could reasonably be expected to:

- *prejudice the protection of an individual's right to privacy or any other right under the Human Rights Act 2004 (Schedule 2, 2.2(a)(ii)).*

The consideration of the right to privacy of individuals and their right to have their personal information protected activates provisions of the *Human Rights Act 2004* and the *Information Privacy Act 2014*. Section 12(a) of the Human Rights Act provides that everyone has the right '*not to have his or her privacy, family, home or correspondence interfered with unlawfully or arbitrarily*'. Ombudsman review decisions addressing this matter have stated that this "can essentially be viewed as the right of an individual to

preserve their personal sphere from interference by others". In addition, the Territory Privacy Principles contained in the *Information Privacy Act 2014*, set out the expectation that, in ordinary circumstances, individuals are required to give consent before their personal information, which includes information that could lead to them being identified, is disclosed. Consequently, I have decided that the right to privacy of individuals in relation to their personal information as a factor favouring non-disclosure has significant weight.

- *prejudice trade secrets, business affairs or research of an agency or person (Schedule 2, 2.2(a)(xi))*

Entities with a business relationship with government will have some expectation that aspects of their dealings are subject to scrutiny and may be publicly disclosed. However, businesses would also expect that government would protect their sensitive information and, unless legally required, not disclose the information arbitrarily without having regard to potential impacts on the business. Therefore, I give significant weight to the protection of business information that would be prejudicial to the business if it were disclosed.

I have considered the factors favouring disclosure and the factors favouring non-disclosure.

As the factors favouring non-disclosure have been given significant weight and the factors favouring disclosure have strong weight, information within the records has been redacted where it has been deemed contrary to the public interest to disclose.

In addition, information that is outside of the scope of your request has been redacted from the records released.

Charges

Processing charges are not applicable for this request because the number of pages involved that are material to your request does not exceed the threshold of 50 pages as set out at section 104(4) of the FOI Act.

Online publishing – disclosure log

Under section 28 of the FOI Act, the Directorate maintains an online record of access applications called a disclosure log. Information about your request, my decision and records released to you in response to your access application will be published in the Directorate's disclosure log between three and 10 working days after a decision on access has been provided to you.

Your personal information has been redacted in one of the records to protect your personal privacy. This measure ensures that your identity is not publicly disclosed as part of the publication process.

You may view the Directorate's disclosure log at www.act.gov.au/open/foi-disclosure-logs/education-foi-disclosure-logs.

Review of decision

Ombudsman review

My decision on your access request is a reviewable decision as identified in Schedule 3 of the FOI Act. You have the right to seek Ombudsman review of this outcome under section 73 of the FOI Act within 20 working days from the day my decision is provided to you, or a longer period allowed by the Ombudsman.

If you wish to request a review of my decision you may write to the Ombudsman at:

The ACT Ombudsman
GPO Box 442
CANBERRA ACT 2601

Email: actfoi@ombudsman.gov.au

ACT Civil and Administrative Tribunal (ACAT) review

Under section 84 of the FOI Act, if a decision is made under section 82(1) on an Ombudsman review, you may apply to the ACAT for review of the Ombudsman decision.

Further information may be obtained from the ACAT at:

ACT Civil and Administrative Tribunal
Allara House, 15 Constitution Ave
GPO Box 370
Canberra City ACT 2601

Telephone: (02) 6207 1740
<http://www.acat.act.gov.au/>

If you have any questions concerning the Directorate's processing of your request, please contact the Directorate's FOI team on 02 6205 0720 or email EducationFOI@act.gov.au.

Yours sincerely



Paula Murray
Information Officer

30 March 2026