



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 28, 2016

Ms. Katherine Antwi Green
Associate General Counsel
University of North Texas System
1155 Union Circle, #310907
Denton, Texas 76203

OR2016-09633

Dear Ms. Green:

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# 608061 (UNTHSC PIR No. 001670).

The University of North Texas Health Science Center (the "university") received a request for (1) all personnel files on the requestor's client; (2) all documents forming the basis for the decision to recommend disciplinary action against the requestor's client; (3) all documents forming the basis for the decision to recommend the termination of the requestor's client's tenure appointment; (4) a list of names of the members of the university's Faculty Grievance and Appeal committee for the 2015-2016 academic year. You state you will make some information available to the requestor. You claim the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹ We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

¹We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” *Id.* § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes, including section 51.971 of the Education Code. Section 51.971 of the Education Code provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) In this section:

(1) “Compliance program” means a process to assess and ensure compliance by the officers and employees of an institution of higher education with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and policies, including matters of:

(A) ethics and standards of conduct;

(B) financial reporting;

(C) internal accounting controls; or

(D) auditing.

(2) “Institution of higher education” has the meaning assigned by Section 61.003.

...

(e) Information is excepted from disclosure under [the Act] if it is collected or produced:

...

(2) by a systemwide compliance office for the purpose of reviewing compliance processes at a component institution of higher education of a university system.

Educ. Code § 51.971(a), (e)(2). You state the university is an institution of higher education for purposes of section 61.003 of the Education Code. *See id.* § 51.971(a)(2). You indicate the information you marked pertains to allegations of violations of the university’s standards of conduct by a university employee. In response to the allegations, you state the university’s human resources department, as part of the university’s compliance program, is conducting an investigation to ensure employees’ compliance with applicable laws and policies. You explain the information at issue was collected or produced pursuant to this investigation. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude the university must withhold

Exhibit A under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 51.971(e)(2) of the Education Code.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov't Code § 552.107(1). 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 “to facilitate 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 Tex. 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: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit 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, orig. proceeding). 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 Exhibit B consists of communications between attorneys in the University of North Texas System Office of General Counsel and university officials. You state the communications were made in order to provide legal advice on institutional compliance to the university. You state these communications were intended to be confidential and these communications have not been disclosed to any third parties. Upon review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the submitted

communications in Exhibit B. Therefore, the university may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code 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. This exception 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). 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. *See* ORD 615 at 5. 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. *Id.*; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). 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).

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); *see* 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).

You state Exhibit C consists of communications among university officials. You further state the communications encompass policymaking recommendations and directives. Based on your representations and our review, we find the university may withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit C under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we find the remaining information is general administrative and purely factual information, or does not pertain to policymaking. Therefore, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations regarding policymaking matters. Consequently, the university may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, the university must withhold Exhibit A under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 51.971(e)(2) of the Education Code. The university may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The university may withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit C under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The university must release the remaining 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,



Abigail T. Adams
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ATA/akg

Ref: ID# 608061

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)