



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 25, 2022

Mr. Ruben Gandia
Associate General Counsel
The University of North Texas System
1155 Union Circle #310907
Denton, Texas 76203

OR2022-08785

Dear Mr. Gandia:

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# 937891 (PIR No. 8802).

The University of North Texas (the "university") received a request for the requestor's personnel file and communications involving named individuals that include specified keywords during a defined period of time.¹ You state the university has released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

¹ You state the university sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

² We assume 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 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.” Gov’t Code § 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.

...

(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.

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

(1) in a compliance program investigation and releasing the information would interfere with an ongoing compliance investigation[.]

Educ. Code § 51.971(a), (c)-(e)(1). 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 at issue relates to a compliance investigation conducted by the university's Equal Opportunity office. You state the investigation was conducted in response to allegations involving standards of conduct of university employees and was initiated 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).

You seek to withhold the information you indicated under section 51.971(e)(1). This section requires there be an ongoing compliance program investigation. *Id.* § 51.971(e)(1). However, the information at issue pertains to a completed compliance investigation. Therefore, we conclude the university may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 51.971(e)(1) of the Education Code.

You also claim the information at issue is 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).

The information at issue relates to a completed compliance investigation, which concluded in a determination that the allegations were unsubstantiated. Upon review, find the information at issue identifies the complainant and individuals alleged to have committed the activity that is the subject of the unsubstantiated complaint. We note the requestor is the complainant at issue. Thus, pursuant to section 51.971(d), the university may not withhold the requestor's information from him under section 51.971(c). However, we understand the remaining individuals at issue have not consented to release of their information. Accordingly, the university must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 51.971(c) of the Education Code. However, upon review, we find the remaining information at issue does not identify any individual as a participant in the investigation at issue or an individual

alleged to have committed the activity that is the subject of an unsubstantiated complaint. Accordingly, the university may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 51.971(c) of the Education 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 that are 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).

This office has also concluded a preliminary draft of a document that is intended for public release in its final form necessarily represents the drafter’s advice, opinion, and recommendation with regard to the form and content of the final document, so as to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 559 at 2 (1990) (applying statutory predecessor). Section 552.111 protects factual information in the draft that also will be included in the final version of the document. *See id.* at 2-3. Thus, section 552.111 encompasses the entire contents, including comments, underlining, deletions, and proofreading marks, of a preliminary draft of a policymaking document that will be released to the public in its final form. *See id.* at 2.

You state the information you indicated consists of a draft of an Academic Program Review for the Media Arts department and comments related to the draft. You inform us the draft document will be made available to the public in its final form. Based on these representations and our review of the information at issue, we find the university may withhold the information at issue, which we marked, under section 552.111 of the Government Code.³

In summary, the university must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 51.971(c) of the Education Code. The university may withhold the information we marked 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 <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,

Michelle Garza
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MRG/be

Ref: ID# 937891

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.