



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 15, 2020

Ms. Nelly R. Herrera  
Vice Chancellor and General Counsel  
Texas State University  
601 Colorado Street  
Austin, Texas 78701-2904

OR2020-31289

Dear Ms. Herrera:

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# 857042 (Ref. Nos. 20069.17, 20069.18, 20069.19, 20069.20, 20069.22, 20069.23, 20069.25, 20069.26, 20069.27, 20073.8, and 20073.8).

Texas State University (the "university") received eleven requests from nine different requestors for 1) a specified investigation pertaining to a named former employee, 2) the named former employee's resignation letter and personnel file, and 3) the contract for another named employee. You state you will release some information with redactions pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a).<sup>1</sup> You state you will redact information protected by section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code pursuant to section 552.024(c)(2) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and

---

<sup>1</sup> 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. We have posted a copy of the letter from the DOE on the Attorney General's website at <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/sites/default/files/files/divisions/open-government/20060725-USDOE-FERPA.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> Section 552.024(c)(2) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact information protected by section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting a decision under the Act if the current or former employee or official to whom the information pertains timely chooses not to allow public access to the information. See Gov't Code § 552.024(c)(2).

552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>3</sup>

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. This exception encompasses 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.

...

(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[.]

...

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

---

<sup>3</sup> We 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.

Educ. Code § 51.971(a), (c)(1), (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 state Attachment B relates to an internal compliance investigation conducted by the university's Office of Equal Opportunity and Title IX in response to a complaint of misconduct by a university employee 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 information at issue 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). However, subsection (c) does not apply to information related to an individual who consents to disclosure of the information. *Id.* § 51.971(d). You assert release of some of the information at issue would directly or indirectly identify individuals making a report to, seeking guidance from, or participating in the compliance program investigation at issue. You state none of the individuals at issue in the investigations have consented to the disclosure of their identifying information. *See id.* Upon review, we agree release of some of the information at issue would directly or indirectly identify individuals as participants in a compliance program investigation. *See id.* § 51.971(c). Accordingly, we find the university must withhold the information we have marked in Attachment B under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 51.971(c). However, none of the remaining information in Attachment B identifies an individual as a participant in the investigation at issue. Accordingly, the university may not withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 51.971.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which 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. This office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Additionally, this office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally private. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (employee's designation of retirement beneficiary, choice of insurance carrier, election of optional coverages, direct deposit authorization, forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 455 at 9 (1987) (employment applicant's salary information not private), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). Furthermore, 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 (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 (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).

Upon review, we conclude some of the remaining information meets the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the university must withhold Attachment D and the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find no portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern, and the university may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate 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 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.* 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. *See 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 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 Attachment E consists of communications between university attorneys and employees that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the university. You state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find Attachment E consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Therefore, the university may withhold Attachment E under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the university must withhold the information we have marked in Attachment B under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 51.971(c). The university must withhold Attachment D and the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The university may withhold Attachment E under section 552.107(1) 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 <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,

Meredith L. Coffman  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MLC/rm

Ref: ID# 857042

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 9 Requestors  
(w/o enclosures)