



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 8, 2014

Ms. Cynthia Tynan
Attorney and Public Information Coordinator
Office of General Counsel
The University of Texas System
201 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2014-11743

Dear Ms. Tynan:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 528729 (UT OGC# 155423).

The University of Texas at Arlington (the "university") received a request for certain information pertaining to the requestor's denial of tenure.¹ You state the university has released some of the requested information. Additionally, you state the university will redact information under section 552.137 of the Government Code pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).² You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.111 of the Government Code. You also state you have notified third parties of the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested third party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have

¹You state, and provide documentation demonstrating, the university sought and received clarification of the request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used); *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380 (Tex. 2010) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

²Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold specific categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision, including an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also received and considered comments from one of the third parties.

You raise section 552.111 of the Government Code for the information you have marked. We note the third party who submitted comments also raises section 552.111. However, section 552.111 is a discretionary exception that protects only the interests of a governmental body, as distinguished from exceptions that are intended to protect the interests of third parties. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 592 (1991), 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). Therefore, we only address the university's argument under section 552.111. Section 552.111 excepts from disclosure "[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency[.]" Gov't Code § 552.111. Section 552.111 encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. *See Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615, this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). ORD 615. We determined section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *Id.* at 5; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 364 (Tex. 2000); *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Texas Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.). A governmental body's policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body's policy mission. *See* Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995). However, a governmental body's policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. ORD 615 at 5-6; *see also Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d at 364 (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). Further, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 37 S.W.3d at 157; ORD 615 at 5. But, if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

Section 552.111 can also encompass communications between a governmental body and a third party, including a consultant or other party with a privity of interest. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with

which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process). For section 552.111 to apply, the governmental body must identify the third party and explain the nature of its relationship with the governmental body. Section 552.111 is not applicable to a communication between the governmental body and a third party unless the governmental body establishes it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the third party. *See id.*

You explain some of the information you have marked consists of internal university communications regarding the tenure review of a university professor. Additionally, you explain the remaining information consists of external tenure evaluations communicated to the university by professors from other institutes of higher education for the purpose of providing recommendations and opinions regarding the tenure of the university professor. As previously stated, the deliberative process privilege only excepts communications pertaining to administrative and personnel matters of a broad scope that affect a governmental body's policy mission. *See* ORD 631 at 3. You assert external tenure evaluations are matters of a broad scope that affect the policy missions of the university and The University of Texas System. Upon review, however, we find the information reflects it pertains to administrative and personnel issues involving only one university employee, and you have failed to explain how the information pertains to administrative or personnel matters of a broad scope that affect the university's policy mission. Therefore, you have failed to demonstrate how the deliberative process privilege applies to the information at issue. Accordingly the university may not withhold the information you have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrines of constitutional and common-law privacy. 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 (quoting *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)).

The doctrine of common-law privacy protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information

considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation. Id.* at 683. However, this office has noted the public has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employees and their conduct in the workplace. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (1990) (personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern), 470 at 4 (1987) (job performance does not generally constitute public employee's private affairs), 444 at 3 (1986) (public has obvious interest in information concerning qualifications and performance of government employees), 405 at 2 (1983) (manner in which public employee's job was performed cannot be said to be of minimal public interest), 329 (1982) (reasons for employee's resignation ordinarily not private).

You and the third party who submitted comments raise privacy. Having considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the information at issue, we find neither you nor the third party has demonstrated any of the information at issue falls within the zones of privacy or otherwise implicates an individual's privacy interests for the purposes of constitutional privacy. We also find neither you nor the third party has demonstrated the information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. We therefore conclude the university may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional or common-law privacy. As no further exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the university must release the submitted information.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Lindsay E. Hale". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Lindsay E. Hale
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LEH/akg

Ref: ID# 528729

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

bc: Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)