



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

May 8, 2007

Mr. W. Montgomery Meitler  
Assistant Counsel  
Office of Legal Services  
Texas Education Agency  
1701 North Congress Avenue  
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

OR2007-05446

Dear Mr. Meitler:

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# 278596.

The Texas Education Agency (the "agency") received a request for certain emails written and received by the former assessment director. You state that the agency is withholding information that is protected under the federal Family Education Rights and Privacy Act. You also state that most of the requested information will be released to the requestor but claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.111, 552.116 and 552.122 of the Government Code. You believe that the release of some of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of a third party, Pearson Educational Management ("Pearson"). Accordingly, you inform us that you notified Pearson of the request and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why its information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d) (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure in certain circumstances). We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you inform us that some of the requested information was the subject of a previous request for information, in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter

No. 2007-04935 (2007). With regard to information in the current request that is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, we conclude that, as we have no indication that the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have changed, the agency must continue to rely on this ruling as a previous determination and release this information in accordance with this ruling. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure).

We note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days from the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) of the Government Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, this office has not received comments from Pearson explaining how the release of the company's submitted information will affect its proprietary interests. Thus, we have no basis to conclude that the release of any portion of the submitted information would implicate the proprietary interests of Pearson. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (stating that business enterprise that claims exception for commercial or financial information under section 552.110(b) must show by specific factual evidence that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret). Accordingly, we conclude that the agency may not withhold any of the information at issue on this basis.

Next, we consider the agency's claim under section 552.116 of the Government Code. Section 552.116 provides as follows:

(a) An audit working paper of an audit of the state auditor or the auditor of a state agency, an institution of higher education as defined by Section 61.003, Education Code, a county, a municipality, or a joint board operating under Section 22.074, Transportation Code, is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021. If information in an audit working paper is also maintained in another record, that other record is not excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 by this section.

(b) In this section:

(1) "Audit" means an audit authorized or required by a statute of this state or the United States, the charter or an ordinance of a municipality, an order of the commissioners court of a county, or a resolution or other action of a joint board described by Subsection (a) and includes an investigation.

(2) “Audit working paper” includes all information, documentary or otherwise, prepared or maintained in conducting an audit or preparing an audit report, including:

(A) intra-agency and interagency communications; and

(B) drafts of the audit report or portions of those drafts.

Gov’t Code § 552.116. You state that the submitted information includes “audit working papers prepared and maintained by [the agency]’s Student Assessment Division and Task Force on Test Security and [the agency’s Office of Inspector General] in conducting investigations of testing irregularities in the administration of statewide assessment instruments.” You explain that these investigations are authorized by section 39.075(a)(8) of the Education Code. *See* Educ. Code § 39.075 (listing circumstances in which the commissioner shall authorize investigations). Based on your arguments and our review, we agree that the information you have marked constitutes audit working papers. Accordingly, the agency may withhold this information under section 552.116.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency.” 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, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993), 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 that 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* Open Records Decision No. 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 can encompass communications between a governmental body and a third party consultant. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 631 at 2 (section 552.111 encompasses information created for governmental body by outside consultant acting at governmental body’s request and performing task that is within governmental body’s

authority), 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process), 462 at 14 (1987) (section 552.111 applies to memoranda prepared by governmental body's consultants). For section 552.111 to apply in such instances, the governmental body must identify the third party and explain the nature of its relationship with the governmental body. Section 552.111 is not applicable to a communication between the governmental body and a third party unless the governmental body establishes it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the third party. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 9.

In addition, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *See* Open Records Decision No. 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 that 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 inform us that the a portion of the submitted information, which you have marked, reflects the agency's deliberations about policy issues surrounding test development, scoring, and testing irregularities. You also state that the final versions of documents marked "draft" are or will be made available to the public. Based upon your arguments and our review, we agree that the information you have marked, except as we have marked otherwise, may be withheld pursuant to section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Finally, you claim that some of the remaining submitted information is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.122 of the Government Code. Section 552.122(b) excepts from disclosure test items developed by a licensing agency or governmental body. In Open Records Decision No. 626 (1994), this office determined that the term "test item" in section 552.122 includes any standard means by which an individual's or group's knowledge or ability in a particular area is evaluated, but does not encompass evaluations of an employee's overall job performance or suitability. Whether information falls within the section 552.122 exception must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *Id.* Traditionally, this office has applied section 552.122 where release of "test items" might compromise the effectiveness of future examinations. *Id.* at 4-5; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 118 (1976). Section 552.122 also protects the answers to test questions when the answers might reveal

the questions themselves. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-640 at 3 (1987); Open Records Decision No. 626 at 8 (1994).

You claim that the information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.122. After reviewing the information, we agree that the submitted questions test an individual's knowledge in a particular area and thus constitute "test items" as contemplated by section 552.122(b). We also find that the answers to these questions may reveal the questions themselves. Accordingly, the agency may withhold the submitted questions and their respective answers pursuant to section 552.122(b) of the Government Code.

In summary, the agency may withhold the information you have marked under (1) section 552.116 of the Government Code; (2) section 552.111 of the Government Code, except as we have marked otherwise, and (3) section 552.122 of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Paige Savoie  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

PS/sdk

Ref: ID# 278596

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Josh Benton  
The Dallas Morning News  
P.O. Box 655237  
Dallas, Texas 75265  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael R. Cooper  
Vice President, State Assessments - Texas  
Pearson Educational Measurement  
2510 North Dodge Street  
Iowa City, Iowa 52245-9555  
(w/o enclosures)