ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 18, 2008

Ms. Paige Kyle
Walsh, Anderson, Brown, Schulze, & Aldridge, P.C.
P.O. Box 460606
San Antonio, Texas 78246

OR2008-12888

Dear Ms. Kyle:

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# 322148.

The Northside Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for various information pertaining to a specified investigation, including information pertaining to a student or teacher being disciplined for bringing fake weapons to school, statements from a named student regarding a specific incident, disciplinary records of the named student, and the district's grievance policy.[1] You have only submitted one document to this office for review. We presume that to the extent that other responsive information existed at the time of the request, it has been released. If not, the district must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.006, .301, .302; Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (concluding that section 552.221(a) requires that information not excepted from disclosure must be promptly released). You claim that the submitted document is 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 document.[2]

---

[1]The requestor seeks student statements and disciplinary records which may be subject to the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States. The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") has informed this office that FERPA does not permit unredacted student records to be submitted to this office for review. The DOE has determined that FERPA determinations must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. We have posted a copy of the letter from the DOE to this office on the Attorney General's website: http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf.

[2]You state that Exhibit B is an example. We assume that the example document 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.

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. Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by other statutes. Section 21.355 of the Education Code provides that "a document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential." Educ. Code § 21.355. This office has interpreted this section to apply to any document that evaluates, as that term is commonly understood, the performance of a teacher or administrator. Open Records Decision No. 643 (1996). In Open Records Decision No. 643, we determined that a "teacher" for purposes of section 21.355 means a person who (1) is required to and does in fact hold a teaching certificate under subchapter B of chapter 21 of the Education Code or a school district teaching permit under section 21.055 and (2) is engaged in the process of teaching, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. *See id.* at 4. In addition, the court has concluded a written reprimand constitutes an evaluation for purposes of section 21.355 because "it reflects the principal's judgment regarding [a teacher's] actions, gives corrective direction, and provides for further review." *North East Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Abbott*, 212 S.W.3d 364 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.).

Upon review, we agree that the submitted document is an evaluation. However, you do not state or provide documentation that the employee who is the subject of the evaluation held a teacher's certificate or permit under subchapter B of chapter 21 of the Education Code and was performing the functions of a teacher at the time of the evaluation. If the employee held a teacher's certificate or permit and was performing the functions of a teacher at the time of the evaluation, the submitted document is confidential under section 21.355, and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code. If the employee did not hold the requisite certification or was not performing the necessary functions, the evaluation is not confidential under section 21.355. Accordingly, we will address your arguments under section 552.107 if section 21.355 is not applicable.

Section 552.107 of the Government Code protects information that comes 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 "for the purpose of facilitating 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 Texas 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). Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. *See* 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, meaning it was "not intended to be

disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of 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, no writ). 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).

The submitted document is a written reprimand of an employee by a principal. You have not explained how the reprimand is a communication between privileged parties in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services. Therefore, we find that you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.107 to the document.

In summary, if the employee held a teacher's certificate or permit and was performing the functions of a teacher at the time of the evaluation, the submitted document is confidential under section 21.355 of the Education Code, and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code. If section 21.355 does not apply, the document must be released to the requestor.

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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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 challenge 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,

Olivia A. Maceo
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

OM/mcf

Ref: ID# 322148

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Michael Latimer
Attorney at Law
The Travis Building
405 North St. Mary's, Suite 242
San Antonio, Texas 78205-1722
(w/o enclosures)