



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 21, 2017

Mr. Kevin L. Williams  
Associate General Counsel  
Texas Tech University System  
3601 4th Street, STOP 6237  
Lubbock, Texas 79430-6237

OR2017-03817

Dear Mr. Williams:

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# 646368.

The Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center (the "university") received a request for specified documents created by named individuals and specified academic records of the requestor. You state the university has released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should or should not be released). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office has informed this office the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code, does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental or an adult student's consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act.<sup>1</sup> Consequently, state and local educational authorities that receive a request for education records from a member of the public under the Act must not submit education records to this office in

---

<sup>1</sup>A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website at <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/og/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

unredacted form, that is, in a form in which “personally identifiable information” is disclosed. *See* 34 C.F.R. § 99.3 (defining “personally identifiable information”). You have submitted unredacted education records for our review. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing these education records to determine whether appropriate redactions under FERPA have been made, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to any of the submitted records. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(1)(A). Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. However, we will consider your arguments against disclosure of the submitted information.

Next, we must address the requestor’s contention the university did not comply with the procedural requirements of the Act. Section 552.301 of the Government Code prescribes the procedures a governmental body must follow in asking this office to determine whether information is excepted from public disclosure under the Act. *See id.* § 552.301(a). Pursuant to section 552.301(b), within ten business days of receipt of the request, the governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state which exceptions apply to the requested information. *Id.* § 552.301(b). Pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body is required to submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (1) written comments stating the reasons why the claimed exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. *See id.* § 552.301(e). The requestor asserts she submitted a request for the same information on November 5, 2016 and the university received the request the same day. However, the university states it did not receive the November 5, 2016 request and received the instant request on November 22, 2016. The determination of whether the university received the November 5, 2016 request and when it received the instant request are questions of fact. This office cannot resolve factual disputes in the opinion process. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 592 at 2 (1991), 552 at 4 (1990), 435 at 4 (1986). Where a fact issue is not resolvable as a matter of law, we must rely on the facts alleged to us by the governmental body requesting our decision, or upon those facts that are discernible from the documents submitted for our inspection. *See* ORD 552 at 4. Thus, we must accept the university’s representations it did not receive the November 5, 2016 request and received the instant request for information on November 22, 2016. You inform us the university was closed for business on November 24 and November 25, 2016. Accordingly, the university’s ten-business-day deadline was December 8, 2016, and its fifteen-business-day deadline was December 15, 2016. The envelope in which you sent the university’s request for a ruling bears a postmark of December 8, 2016, and the envelope in which you submitted the information required by section 552.301(e) bears a postmark of December 15, 2016. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.308 (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Thus, we conclude the university complied with the requirements of sections 552.301(b) and 552.301(e) of the Government Code. Accordingly, we will address the university’s arguments against disclosure.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code. Section 161.032 addresses a broad category of medical committees and provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) The records and proceedings of a medical committee are confidential and are not subject to court subpoena.

...

(c) Records, information, or reports of a medical committee, medical peer review committee, or compliance officer and records, information, or reports provided by a medical committee, medical peer review committee, or compliance officer to the governing body of a public hospital, hospital district, or hospital authority are not subject to disclosure under [the Act].

...

(f) This section and Subchapter A, Chapter 160, Occupations Code, do not apply to records made or maintained in the regular course of business by a hospital, health maintenance organization, medical organization, university medical center or health science center, hospital district, hospital authority, or extended care facility.

Health & Safety Code § 161.032(a), (c), (f). A “medical committee” is any committee, including a joint committee of a hospital, medical organization, university medical school or health science center, health maintenance organization, extended care facility, a hospital district, or a hospital authority. *See id.* § 161.031(a). The term also encompasses “a committee appointed *ad hoc* to conduct a specific investigation or established under state or federal law or rule or under the bylaws or rules of the organization or institution.” *Id.* § 161.031(b) (emphasis added).

The precise scope of the “medical committee” provision has been the subject of a number of judicial decisions. *See, e.g., Mem’l Hosp.—The Woodlands v. McCown*, 927 S.W.2d 1 (Tex. 1996); *Barnes v. Whittington*, 751 S.W.2d 493 (Tex. 1988); *Jordan v. Fourth Supreme Judicial Dist.*, 701 S.W.2d 644 (Tex. 1986). These cases establish “documents generated by the committee in order to conduct open and thorough review” are confidential. *Mem’l Hosp.*, 927 S.W.2d at 10; *Jordan*, 701 S.W.2d at 647-48; *Doctor’s Hosp. v. West*, 765 S.W.2d 812, 814 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1988, no writ). This protection extends “to documents that have been prepared by or at the direction of the committee for committee purposes.” *Jordan*, 701 S.W.2d at 647-48. Protection does not extend to documents “gratuitously submitted to a committee” or “created without committee impetus and purpose.” *Id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 591 (1991) (construing statutory predecessor to Health & Safety Code § 161.032). Additionally, we note section 161.032

does not make confidential “records made or maintained in the regular course of business by a hospital[.]” Health & Safety Code § 161.032(f); *see also Mem’l Hosp.*, 927 S.W.2d at 10 (stating reference to statutory predecessor to section 160.007 of the Occupations Code in section 161.032 is clear signal records should be accorded same treatment under both statutes in determining if they were made in ordinary course of business). The phrase “records made or maintained in the regular course of business” has been construed to mean records that are neither created nor obtained in connection with a medical committee’s deliberative proceedings. *See Mem’l Hosp.*, 927 S.W.2d at 10 (discussing *Barnes*, 751 S.W.2d 493, and *Jordan*, 701 S.W.2d 644).

You inform us the university’s School of Nursing’s Progressions Committee (the “committee”) is responsible for reviewing nursing students’ academic and clinical progress and determining students’ ability to meet certain performance standards. You state the submitted information consists of records created by university faculty members for the use of the committee in reviewing a student’s performance and making a determination regarding whether the student should be dismissed from the university. Based on your representations and our review, we agree the submitted information consists of confidential records of a medical committee under section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code. *Cf. Texarkana Mem’l Hosp., Inc. v. Jones*, 551 S.W.2d 33, 35 (Tex. 1977) (defining records made or maintained in regular course of business). Therefore, we conclude the university must withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code.

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](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,



Kieran Hillis  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KH/sb

Ref: ID# 646368

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)