



OFFICE *of the* ATTORNEY GENERAL  
GREG ABBOTT

June 9, 2003

Ms. Carol Longoria  
University of Texas System  
201 West Seventh Street  
Austin, Texas 78701-2981

OR2003-3946

Dear Ms. Longoria:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 182384.

The University of Texas at San Antonio (the "university") received a request for any and all documents relating to a named individual "in his capacity as a student in the graduate studies program and as an employee with the College of Liberal and Fine Arts." You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code and the federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"). We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

The submitted information contains information within the purview of sections 552.026 and 552.114 of the Government Code and the federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), 20 U.S.C. § 1232g. Section 552.026 of the Government Code provides as follows:

This chapter does not require the release of information contained in education records of an educational agency or institution, except in conformity with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, Sec. 513, Pub. L. No. 93-380, 20 U.S.C. Sec. 1232g.

Gov't Code § 552.026. FERPA provides that no federal funds will be made available under any applicable program to an educational agency or institution that releases personally identifiable information (other than directory information) contained in a student's education records to anyone but certain enumerated federal, state, and local officials and institutions, unless otherwise authorized by the student's parent. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(b)(1). "Education records" means those records that contain information directly related to a student and are maintained by an educational agency or institution or by a person acting for

such agency or institution. *Id.* § 1232g(a)(4)(A). This office generally applies the same analysis under section 552.114 and FERPA. *See* Open Records Decision No. 634 at 5 (1995).

In Open Records Decision No. 634 (1995), this office concluded that (1) an educational agency or institution may withhold from public disclosure information that is protected by FERPA and excepted from required public disclosure by sections 552.026 and 552.101 without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision as to those exceptions, and (2) an educational agency or institution that is state-funded may withhold from public disclosure information that is excepted from required public disclosure by section 552.114 as a "student record," insofar as the "student record" is protected by FERPA, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision as to that exception. In this instance, however, you have submitted the documents at issue to this office for consideration. Therefore, we will consider whether these documents contain information that is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.026 and 552.114 of the Government Code.

Information must be withheld from required public disclosure under FERPA only to the extent "reasonable and necessary to avoid personally identifying a particular student." *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 332 (1982), 206 (1978). Information that does not *directly* identify a student but would nevertheless make a student's identity easily traceable must be withheld. *See* Open Records Decision No. 224 (1979) (finding student's handwritten comments making identity of student easily traceable through handwriting, style of expression, or particular incidents related in comments protected under FERPA). The information submitted as Tab 4 is related to a student and directly identifies that student. Thus, we have marked the student identifying information that the university must withhold under FERPA. We have also marked a name and telephone number that potentially identifies a student. If the information relates to a student, it must be withheld under FERPA; however, if it does not relate to a student, you must release the information. The remainder of the information in Tab 4 is not confidential under FERPA.

You also assert that the information at Tab 4 is confidential under section 552.101 and the doctrines of common law and constitutional privacy.<sup>1</sup> Common-law privacy protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace,

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 552.101 excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision."

illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. 540 S.W.2d at 683.

Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy" which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5 (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)).

This office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under common law and constitutional privacy: some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps), personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990), information concerning the intimate relations between individuals and their family members, *see* Open Records Decision No. 470 (1987), and identities of victims of sexual abuse, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393 (1983), 339 (1982). In this instance, the identity of the individual whose privacy interests would be implicated is being withheld from disclosure. Therefore, the individual's right to privacy will not be impacted by release of the information. Thus, you may not withhold the information at Tab 4 under section 552.101 and common law or constitutional privacy.

Finally, you assert that the documents submitted at Tab 5 are excepted from disclosure by section 552.107 of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made "for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services" to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Texas Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in

capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a *confidential* communication, *id.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the *intent* of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no writ). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

You state that the documents at issue reflect communications between the university’s EEO officer and an attorney for the university for the purpose of providing legal advice. You further state that the parties to the communications intended that the information remain confidential and that this confidentiality has not been waived by the university. Therefore, we agree that the information submitted at Tab 5 may be withheld under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

To summarize, you must withhold the student’s identifying information in Tab 4 that we have marked under FERPA. If the additional information that we have marked in Tab 4 relates to a student, you must withhold it under FERPA. You may withhold the information at Tab 5 under section 552.107. You must release the remaining information to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov’t Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days.

*Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Jennifer E. Berry  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JEB/lmt

Ref: ID# 182384

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Lisa A. Vance  
San Antonio Technology Center  
3463 Magic Drive, Suite 300  
San Antonio, Texas 78229  
(w/o enclosures)