



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 10, 2014

Mr. Randall J. Cook
Counsel for Canton Independent School District
Hardy, Cook & Hardy, P.C.
2080 Three Lakes Parkway
Tyler, Texas 75703

OR2014-09961

Dear Mr. Cook:

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# 525396.

The Canton Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for (1) the internet history for specified computers, (2) any available surveillance video during a specified time period, (3) all e-mails and instant messages from the specified computers related to specified policies, and (4) any e-mails or memos about a specified incident or between four specified individuals.¹ You state you have released some of the requested information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses other statutes, such as section 21.355 of the Education Code, which provides that "[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential." Educ. Code § 21.355(a). This office has interpreted section 21.355 to apply

¹You state the district sought and received clarification of the request 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).

to any document that evaluates, as that term is commonly understood, the performance of a teacher or an administrator. *See* Open Records Decision No. 643 (1996). Additionally, a court has concluded that a written reprimand constitutes an evaluation for purposes of section 21.355, as it “reflects the principal’s judgment regarding [a teacher’s] actions, gives corrective direction, and provides for further review.” *Abbott v. North East Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 212 S.W.3d 364 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.). In Open Records Decision No. 643, we concluded that a “teacher” for purposes of section 21.355 means a person who (1) is required to and does in fact hold a certificate or permit required under chapter 21 of the Education Code and (2) is teaching at the time of his or her evaluation. *See* ORD 643.

You assert the document marked as Item 3 consists of a written evaluation that is confidential under section 21.355. You inform us the teacher at issue held the appropriate certification at the time of the evaluation. Based on your representations and our review, we agree the document marked as Item 3 constitutes an evaluation as contemplated by section 21.355. Accordingly, the district must withhold this document under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code.²

Section 552.107(1) 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. *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 “for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. *See* 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. *See 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, lawyer representatives, and a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein. *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, *id.*, 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

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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. *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 the documents marked as Item 1 and Item 2 consist of communications between district employees and the district’s attorney made in regard to legal counsel provided to the district by the district’s attorney. You also state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the documents marked as Item 1 and Item 2 consist of privileged attorney-client communications the district may withhold under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the district must withhold the document marked as Item 3 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code. The district may withhold the documents marked as Item 1 and Item 2 under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

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 http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, or call the Office of the Attorney General’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Meredith L. Coffman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MLC/dls

Ref: ID# 525396

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)