



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 29, 2020

Ms. Cynthia Tynan
Assistant General Counsel & Public Information Coordinator

Ms. Jennifer Burnett
Senior Attorney & Public Information Coordinator
The University of Texas System
210 West 7th Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2903

OR2020-14965

Dear Ms. Tynan and Ms. Burnett:

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# 830402 (OGC Nos. 196100, 196175, 196176, and 196178).

The University of Texas at Arlington (the "university") received four requests from three different requestors for information pertaining to a specified investigation.¹ You state the university has redacted certain information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a).² You also state the university will release

¹ You state, and provide documentation demonstrating, the university sought and received clarification of the information requested with respect to one of the present requests 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).

² The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") has informed this office FERPA 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. The DOE has determined FERPA determinations must be made by the educational authority in possession of the educational records. A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website at

some information to the requestors. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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 “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). 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.*, 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 assert the information you marked consists of privileged communications between university attorneys and university employees in their capacities as clients. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the university. Further, you state these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the university may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 51.971 of the Education Code, which provides, in relevant part:

(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.

...

(c) The following are confidential:

(1) Information that directly or indirectly reveals the identity of an individual who made a report to the compliance program office of an institution of higher education, sought guidance from the office, or participated in an investigation conducted under the compliance program; and

(2) information that directly or indirectly reveals the identity of an individual as a person who is alleged to have or may have planned, initiated, or participated in activities that are the subject of a report made to the compliance program office of an institution of higher education if, after completing an investigation, the office determines the report to be unsubstantiated or without merit.

(d) Subsection (c) does not apply to information related to an individual who consents to disclosure of the information.

Educ. Code § 51.971(a), (c)-(d). You state the university is an institution of higher education under section 61.003 of the Education Code. *See id.* § 51.971(a)(2), 61.003. You also state the information you marked relates to a closed internal compliance investigation conducted on behalf of the university. You further state the investigation was initiated in response to complaints alleging misconduct by university employees and was conducted in

order to assess and ensure compliance with all applicable laws, rules, regulations, and policies. Based on your representations, we find the information at issue relates to an investigation conducted under the university's compliance program. *See id.* § 51.971(a)(1).

You state the remaining information pertains to a completed investigation, portions of which are subject to section 51.971(c). Section 51.971(c)(1) makes confidential information that identifies individuals as complainants, as having sought guidance from a compliance program, or as participants in an investigation conducted under a compliance program. *Id.* § 51.971(c)(1). Section 51.971(c)(2) makes confidential information that identifies individuals alleged to have committed the activities that are the subject of a complaint made to a compliance program office if the office determines the report is unsubstantiated. *Id.* § 51.971(c)(2). However, subsection (c) does not apply to information related to an individual who consents to disclosure of the information. *Id.* § 51.971(d).

You explain the information at issue pertains to an investigation that concluded in a determination the allegations were substantiated in part and unsubstantiated in part. You assert release of the information you marked would directly or indirectly reveal the identity of the individuals who participated in the compliance program investigation. You inform us none of the individuals whose information you marked have consented to release of their information. Upon review, we agree release of the information at issue would directly or indirectly identify individuals as participants in the compliance program investigation. *See id.* § 51.971(c). Accordingly, the university must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 51.971(c)(1) of the Education Code.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code provides, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a government body is confidential.”³ Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Accordingly, the university must withhold the account numbers within the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the university may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The university must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 51.971(c)(1) of the Education Code. The university must withhold the account numbers within the remaining information under section 552.136 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.

³ The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Blake Brennan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BBX/rm

Ref: ID# 830402

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 3 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)