



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 14, 2016

Mr. Mike Leasor
Counsel for Eagle Mountain-Saginaw Independent School District
Leasor Crass, P.C.
302 West Broad Street
Mansfield, Texas 76063

OR2016-23173

Dear Mr. Leasor:

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# 630370.

The Eagle Mountain-Saginaw Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a named district employee and a specified incident.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.107 of the Government Code and privileged under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.² We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office has informed this office the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code, does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental or an adult student's consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for

¹You state the district 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).

²Although you also raise sections 552.102 and 552.114 of the Government Code, you have not provided any arguments to support these exceptions. Therefore, we assume you have withdrawn your claim these sections apply to the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act.³ Consequently, state and local educational authorities that receive a request for education records from a member of the public under the Act must not submit education records to this office in unredacted form, that is, in a form in which “personally identifiable information” is disclosed. *See* 34 C.F.R. § 99.3 (defining “personally identifiable information”). You have submitted redacted and unredacted education records for our review. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing these education records to determine whether appropriate redactions under FERPA have been made, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to any of the submitted records, other than to note parents and their legal representatives have a right of access to their child’s education records and their right of access prevails over claims under sections 552.101 and 552.103 of the Government Code. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(1)(A); 34 C.F.R. § 99.3; Open Records Decision No. 431 (1985) (information subject to right of access under FERPA may not be withheld pursuant to statutory predecessor to Gov’t Code § 552.103); *see also Equal Employment Opportunity Comm’n v. City of Orange, Tex.*, 905 F. Supp. 381, 382 (E.D. Tex. 1995) (holding FERPA prevails over inconsistent provision of state law). Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. The DOE also has informed our office, however, a parent’s right of access under FERPA to information about the parent’s child does not prevail over an educational institution’s right to assert the attorney-client privilege. Therefore, we will address your assertion of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. We will also consider the district’s claimed exceptions to the extent the student’s parent does not have a right of access to the submitted information under FERPA.

Next, we note 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:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information consists of a completed investigation that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The district must release the completed investigation pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* You seek to withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code. However, sections 552.103

³A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General’s website at <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/og/20060725usdoe.pdf>

and 552.107 are discretionary in nature and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive Gov't Code § 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (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 submitted information may not be withheld under section 552.103 or section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, you also seek to withhold a portion of the submitted information under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are “other law” within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Accordingly, we will address your claim of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence for the information at issue. Further, as sections 552.101 and 552.117 of the Government Code make information confidential, we will consider the applicability of these sections to the submitted information.⁴

Texas Rule of Evidence 503(b)(1) provides as follows:

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;

(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 it is not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the

⁴The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication. *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Thus, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must (1) show 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 the communication is confidential by explaining it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the information is privileged and confidential under rule 503, provided the client has not waived the privilege or the document does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, orig. proceeding).

You assert some of the submitted information consists of privileged attorney-client communications between the district's attorneys and district employees in their capacities as clients. You state the communications at issue were made for the purpose of the rendition of legal services to the district. You indicate the communications at issue have not been, and were not intended to be, disclosed to third parties. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find the district has established the information we marked constitutes attorney-client communications under rule 503. Thus, the district may withhold the information we marked pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts 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. Section 21.355 of the Education Code provides, in relevant part, "[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential." Educ. Code § 21.355(a). 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." *Abbott v. North East Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 212 S.W.3d 364 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.). 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 administrator. *See* Open Records Decision No. 643 (1996). In Open Records Decision No. 643, we determined for purposes of section 21.355, the word "teacher" means a person who is required to and does in fact hold a teaching certificate under subchapter B of chapter 21 of the Education Code and who is in the process of teaching, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. *See id.* at 4. Further, in Open Records Decision No. 643, we determined an "administrator" for purposes of section 21.355 means a person who is required to, and does in fact, hold an administrator's certificate under subchapter B of chapter 21 of the Education Code, and is performing the functions as an administrator, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. *Id.* We note section 21.355 does not apply to evaluations relating to an individual's duties as a coach. *See* Educ. Code § 21.353 (teachers shall be appraised only

on basis of classroom teaching performance and not in connection with extracurricular activities).

The district contends some of the remaining information consists of confidential evaluations of teachers and administrators by the district. We understand the administrator at issue was performing the functions of an administrator at the time of the evaluations. However, the district does not inform us the administrator was certified as an administrator under chapter 21 of the Education Code at the time of the evaluations. *See* ORD 643 at 4. Accordingly, we must rule conditionally. To the extent the administrator at issue was certified under chapter 21 of the Education Code, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code. To the extent the administrator was not certified under chapter 21 of the Education Code, the information we have marked is not confidential under section 21.355 of the Education Code and may not be withheld on that basis under section 552.101 of the Government Code. However, the remaining information at issue consists of evaluations of individuals in their capacities as coaches. Accordingly, the district may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education 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, except as provided by section 552.024(a-1). *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.117(a)(1), .024. Section 552.024(a-1) of the Government Code provides, “[a] school district may not require an employee or former employee of the district to choose whether to allow public access to the employee's or former employee's social security number.” *Id.* § 552.024(a-1). Thus, the district may only withhold under section 552.117 the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of the district who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024. We note section 552.117 is also applicable to personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). 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 individuals 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; however, the marked cellular

telephone number may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. Conversely, to the extent the individuals at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the district may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1).

In summary, the district may withhold the information we marked pursuant to rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. To the extent the district determines the remaining information does not constitute student records to which the student's parent has a right of access under FERPA, the district must withhold (1) the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code if the administrator at issue was certified under chapter 21 of the Education Code, and (2) the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code if the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code; however, the marked cellular telephone number may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. 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,



Meagan J. Conway
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MJC/akg

Ref: ID# 630370

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)