



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 4, 2016

Ms. Leticia D. McGowan
School Attorney
Dallas Independent School District
3700 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75204-5491

OR2016-00127

Dear Ms. McGowan:

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# 592760 (ORR# 14621).

The Dallas Independent School District (the "district") received a request for all Trustee Tracker requests and responses and all posted Board Library documents from a specified period of time. The district states it has released some information. The district claims portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.107, 552.111, 552.116, and 552.122 of the Government Code and privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.¹ We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

We note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

...

¹Although the district also raises Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, it has not submitted arguments explaining how this privilege applies to the submitted information. Therefore, we presume the district does not assert this privilege. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body [and]

...

(16) information that is in a bill for attorney's fees and that is not privileged under the attorney client privilege[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3), (16). We note portions of the submitted information consist of invoices and contracts that are subject to subsection 552.022(a)(3) and attorney fee bills that are subject to subsection 552.022(a)(16). This information must be released unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a). You seek to withhold this information under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, section 552.107 is a discretionary exception and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11*(attorney-client privilege under Gov't Code § 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the information we have marked may not be withheld under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, the Texas Supreme Court has ruled the Texas Rules of Evidence are "other law" that make information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53S.W.3d 328 (Tex. 2001). Accordingly, we will address your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 for the submitted information. Further, because section 552.136 of the Government Code makes information confidential under the Act, we will also consider the applicability of this exception for the information at issue.²

Rule 503(b)(1) of the Texas Rules of Evidence provides:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

(A) between the client or the client's representative and the client's lawyer or the lawyer's representative;

(B) between the client's lawyer and the lawyer's representative;

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).*

(C) by the client, the client's representative, the client's lawyer, or the lawyer's representative to a lawyer representing another party in a pending action or that lawyer's representative, if the communications concern a matter of common interest in the pending action;

(D) between the client's representatives or between the client and the client's representative; or

(E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

Tex. R. Evid. 503(b)(1). A communication is "confidential" if not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client or reasonably necessary to transmit the communication. *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under Rule 503, a governmental body must 1) show that the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; 2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and 3) show that the communication is confidential by explaining that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 (2002). Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the entire communication is confidential under Rule 503 provided the client has not waived the privilege or the communication does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in Rule 503(d). *Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein); *In re Valero Energy Corp.*, 973 S.W.2d 453, 457 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1998, orig. proceeding) (privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

You state the information subject to section 552.022 includes communications between district employees or representatives and the district's legal counsel. You state the communications at issue were made in furtherance of the rendition of legal services to the district, and have not been and were not intended to be disclosed to third parties. Based on your representations and our review, we find the district has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to some of the information at issue. Accordingly, the district may withhold the information we have marked under rule 503. However, the remaining information at issue either does not consist of communications for purposes of rule 503 or documents communications with individuals you have not identified as privileged. Accordingly, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the remaining information subject to section 552.022, and the district may not withhold it under rule 503.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Upon review, we find the district must withhold the insurance policy numbers in the submitted information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Next, we turn to the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See id.* § 552.107(1). The elements of the privilege under section 552.107(1) are the same as those for rule 503. 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. ORD 676 at 6-7. 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 district states portions of the submitted information consist of or documents communications involving attorneys for the district and district employees and officials. The district states the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the district and these communications have remained confidential. Upon review, we find the district has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information we have marked. Thus, the district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, some of the communications at issue are with individuals the district has not demonstrated are privileged parties. Further, some of the information at issue does not document a communication. Thus, we find the district has not demonstrated the remaining information constitutes privileged attorney-client communications for the purposes of section 552.107(1). Therefore, the district may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.107(1).

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 section 21.355 of the Education Code, which provides, “[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential.” *See Educ. Code* § 21.355(a). This office has interpreted section 21.355 to apply 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). We have determined for purposes of section 21.355, the term “teacher” means a person who is required to and does in fact hold a teaching certificate or permit under subchapter B of

chapter 21 of the Education Code and who is engaged in the process of teaching, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. *See id.* at 4. We have determined that the word “administrator” in section 21.355 means a person who is required to and does in fact hold an administrator's certificate under chapter 21 of the Education Code and is performing the functions of an administrator, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. *Id.* The Third Court of Appeals 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.” *See Abbott v. North East Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 212 S.W.3d 364 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006. no pet.).

The district argues portions of the submitted information consist of evaluations of district employees in their performances as teachers or administrators. However, upon review, we find you have not established any of the information at issue consists of “[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator” as contemplated by section 21.355. *See* Educ. Code § 21.355(a). Accordingly, we conclude you have not established any of the information at issue is confidential under section 21.355, and the district may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

Section 552.101 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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Upon review, we find the district has failed to demonstrate the submitted information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the district may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). We understand you to assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101 of the Government Code, which is discussed above. *See Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref’d n.r.e.), the court of appeals ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court has expressly disagreed with *Hubert’s* interpretation of section 552.102(a) and held the privacy standard under section 552.102(a) differs from the *Industrial*

Foundation test under section 552.101. *See Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). The supreme court also considered the applicability of section 552.102(a) and held it exempts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *See id.* at 348. Upon review, we find no portion of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.116 of the Government Code provides the following:

(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, a school district, a hospital district, or a joint board operating under Section 22.074, Transportation Code, including any audit relating to the criminal history background check of a public school employee, 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, the bylaws adopted by or other action of the governing board of a hospital district, a resolution or other action of a board of trustees of a school district, including an audit by the district relating to the criminal history background check of a public school employee, 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. For the purposes of section 552.116, a school district must establish that an audit is authorized by a resolution or other action of a board of trustees of a school district. *Id.* § 552.116(b)(1). You inform us the information you have indicated under section 552.116 pertains to an internal audit being conducted by the district's Internal Audit

department. Although you state “the audit was authorized,” you provided no arguments demonstrating under what authority the audit was authorized. Thus, we conclude you have failed to establish section 552.116 is applicable to any portion of the information at issue, and none of the submitted information may be withheld on this basis.

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[.]” *Id.* § 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, 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, 364 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body’s policymaking functions 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 severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152, 157 (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, section 552.111 protects the factual information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

This office has also concluded section 552.111 exempts from disclosure a preliminary draft of a document intended for public release in its final form because the draft necessarily represents the drafter’s advice, opinion, and recommendation with regard to the form and content of the final document. *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 of a preliminary draft of a policymaking document, including comments, underlining, deletions, and proofreading marks, that will be released to the public in its final form. *See id.* at 2.

You state portions of the submitted information consist of draft documents that have been or will be released to the public in final form. You further state the information in the draft documents consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations relating to the district's policymaking. Based on your representations and our review, we find the district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we find the remaining information is general administrative and purely factual information or does not pertain to policymaking. Therefore, we find the you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information at issue consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations regarding policymaking matters. Consequently, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee or official who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee or official who did not timely request under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. Therefore, to the extent the employee whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, to the extent the employee whose information is at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the district may not withhold the information under section 552.117(a)(1).

Section 552.122 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "a test item developed by a . . . governmental body[.]" Gov't Code § 552.122(b). In Open Records Decision No. 626 (1994), this office determined 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." ORD 626 at 6. The question of whether specific information falls within the scope of section 552.122(a) must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *Id.* at 7. Traditionally, this office has applied section 552.122 where release of "test items" might compromise the effectiveness of future examinations. *See* Open Records Decision No. 118 (1976); *see generally* ORD 626 at 4-5. 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).

You seek to withhold the submitted questions and the answers to the submitted questions under section 552.122 of the Government Code. You state these questions test the knowledge of the students that are taking the exams. You further state it is the district's policy to reuse these questions, and the release of the information at issue would compromise the effectiveness of future examinations. Based on your representations and our review, we agree the submitted exam questions are "test items" under section 552.122(b) of the Government Code. Furthermore, we find release of the answers to these questions would reveal the questions themselves. Therefore, the district may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.122(b) of the Government Code.

In summary, in the information we have marked under section 552.022 of the Government Code, the district may withhold the information we have marked under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and must withhold the insurance policy numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. To the extent the employee whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The district may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.122(b) of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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,



Katelyn Blackburn-Rader
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KB-R/akg

Ref: ID# 592760

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)