



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 14, 2005

Mr. Bill Aleshire
Riggs & Aleshire P.C.
700 Lavaca, Suite 920
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2005-05231

Dear Mr. Aleshire:

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# 226206.

The Carroll Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received requests for information pertaining to the resignation of a teacher, including the teacher's personnel file. You state that some of the requested information was released, but claim that some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.107, 552.114, 552.117, 552.135, and 552.137 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 ("FERPA") provides that no federal funds will be made available under any applicable program to an educational agency or institution that releases personally identifiable information, other than directory information, contained in a student's education records to anyone but certain enumerated federal, state, and local officials and institutions, unless otherwise authorized by the student's parent. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(b)(1).

¹Although you assert in your brief that some of the submitted information is excepted under section 552.108 as privileged attorney-client communications, we assume you intended to assert section 552.107 for this information instead.

“Education records” means those records that contain information directly related to a student and are maintained by an educational agency or institution or by a person acting for such agency or institution. *Id.* § 1232g(a)(4)(A). This office generally applies the same analysis under section 552.114 and FERPA. Open Records Decision No. 539 (1990).

Section 552.114 excepts from disclosure student records at an educational institution funded completely or in part by state revenue. Section 552.026 provides as follows:

This chapter does not require the release of information contained in education records of an educational agency or institution, except in conformity with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, Sec. 513, Pub. L. No. 93-380, 20 U.S.C. Sec. 1232g.

Gov’t Code § 552.206. In Open Records Decision No. 634 (1995), this office concluded that (1) an educational agency or institution may withhold from public disclosure information that is protected by FERPA and excepted from required public disclosure by sections 552.026 and 552.101 without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision as to those exceptions, and (2) an educational agency or institution that is state-funded may withhold from public disclosure information that is excepted from required public disclosure by section 552.114 as a “student record,” insofar as the “student record” is protected by FERPA, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision as to that exception. In this instance, however, the district has submitted some of the requested information to this office for consideration. Therefore, we will consider whether the information is protected by FERPA.

Information must be withheld from required public disclosure under FERPA only to the extent “reasonable and necessary to avoid personally identifying a particular student.” *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 332 (1982), 206 (1978). We have marked the information that identifies students, and that the district must withhold under section 552.101 in conjunction with FERPA.² But the remaining submitted information does not identify students for purposes of FERPA, and the department may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

Section 552.101 also encompasses section 21.355 of the Education Code, which provides that “[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential.” 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 643 (1996). In Open Records Decision No. 643, we determined that the word “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

²As we are able to resolve this under FERPA, we do not address your other arguments regarding exception of this information.

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. We agree that a portion of the submitted information consists of evaluations. Thus, provided the employee at issue was required to hold and did hold the appropriate certificate and was teaching at the time of the submitted teaching evaluations, the information we have marked under section 21.355 is confidential, and the district must withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 also encompasses section 411.097 of the Government Code. Criminal history record information ("CHRI") generated by the National Crime Information Center or by the Texas Crime Information Center is confidential. Part 20 of title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI that states obtain from the federal government or other states. Open Records Decision No. 565 (1990). The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual law with respect to CHRI it generates. *Id.* Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI that the Department of Public Safety ("DPS") maintains, except that the DPS may disseminate this information as provided in chapter 411, subchapter F of the Government Code. *See Gov't Code* § 411.083.

A school district may obtain from CHRI from the DPS if authorized by section 411.097 and subchapter C, chapter 22 of the Education Code; however, a school district may not release CHRI except as provided by section 411.097(d). *See id.* § 411.097(d); Educ. Code § 22.083(c)(1) (authorizing school district to obtain from any law enforcement or criminal justice agency all CHRI relating to school district employee); *see also* Gov't Code § 411.087. Section 411.087 authorizes a school district to obtain CHRI from the Federal Bureau of Investigation or any other criminal justice agency in this state. Thus, any CHRI in the submitted information that the district obtained from the DPS or any other criminal justice agency in this state must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.097(d) of the Government Code. *See* Educ. Code § 22.083(c)(1).

Section 552.101 also encompasses information protected by the informer's privilege, which has long been recognized by Texas courts. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969); *Hawthorne v. State*, 10 S.W.2d 724, 725 (Tex. Crim. App. 1928). The informer's privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority, provided that the subject of the information does not already know the informer's identity. Open Records Decision Nos. 515 at 3 (1988), 208 at 1-2 (1978). The informer's privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to "administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres." Open Records Decision No. 279 at 2 (1981); *see* Wigmore, Evidence, § 2374, at 767 (McNaughton rev. ed. 1961). The report must be of

a violation of a criminal or civil statute. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4-5 (1988).

You assert that the individual you have identified as “P” reported to the district possible criminal violations by the employee at issue, and the individual’s identifying information is thus confidential pursuant to the informer’s privilege. You do not inform us, however, that this individual reported the violations to the police or similar law-enforcement agency; therefore, the identifying information of “P” is not confidential under the informer’s privilege, and the district may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

You claim that portions of the employee’s transcripts are excepted under section 552.102(b).³ Section 552.102(b) excepts from disclosure all information from transcripts of professional public school employees other than the employee’s name, the courses taken, and the degree obtained. Gov’t Code § 552.102; Open Records Decision No. 526 (1989). Thus, with the exception of the employee’s name, courses taken, and degree obtained, the district must withhold the information in the submitted transcripts we have marked pursuant to section 552.102(b) of the Government Code.

You assert that pages 34, 67, 79, and 127 of the submitted information are excepted under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming 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). 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, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). Thus, a governmental body

³We note that the district failed to timely assert section 552.102 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(b)(1), (4). However, because section 552.102 is a mandatory exception under the Act, we will address your argument under it. *See id.* § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302).

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.* 503(b)(1), 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).

Having considered your representations and reviewed the information at issue, we find you have established that pages 34, 67, 79, and 127 of the submitted information constitute privileged attorney-client communications. The district may thus withhold these pages under section 552.107.

You contend that some of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.117 of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024. Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989)*. You state, and provide supporting documentation showing, that the employee at issue elected to keep these types of information confidential before the district received the requests for information; therefore, the district must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.117.

You contend that the identifying information of an employee you have identified as “B” is excepted under section 552.135 of the Government Code, which provides the following:

(a) “Informer” means a student or former student or an employee or former employee of a school district who has furnished a report of another person’s or persons’ possible violation of criminal, civil, or regulatory law to the school district or the proper regulatory enforcement authority.

(b) An informer’s name or information that would substantially reveal the identity of an informer is excepted from [required public disclosure].

(c) Subsection (b) does not apply:

(1) if the informer is a student or former student, and the student or former student, or the legal guardian, or spouse of the student or former student consents to disclosure of the student's or former student's name; or

(2) if the informer is an employee or former employee who consents to disclosure of the employee's or former employee's name; or

(3) if the informer planned, initiated, or participated in the possible violation.

(d) Information excepted under Subsection (b) may be made available to a law enforcement agency or prosecutor for official purposes of the agency or prosecutor upon proper request made in compliance with applicable law and procedure.

(e) This section does not infringe on or impair the confidentiality of information considered to be confidential by law, whether it be constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision, including information excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021.

Gov't Code § 552.135. Because the legislature limited the protection of section 552.135 to the identity of a person who reports a possible violation of "law," a school district that seeks to withhold information under that exception must clearly identify to this office the specific civil, criminal, or regulatory law that is alleged to have been violated. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A). After review of your arguments, we agree that you may withhold the identifying information of the employee "B," which you have marked, under section 552.135.

Finally, the district asserts that some of the remaining information is excepted under section 552.137 of the Government Code. Section 552.137 excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body" unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 does not apply to a government employee's work e-mail address because such an address is not that of the employee as a "member of the public," but is instead the address of the individual as a government employee. The remaining e-mail addresses at issue do not appear to be of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). You do not inform us that a member of the public has affirmatively consented to the release of any e-mail address contained in the submitted materials.

Therefore, the district must withhold the remaining e-mail addresses you have marked, as well as those we have marked, under section 552.137.

To conclude, pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code, the district must withhold the information we have marked that is confidential under FERPA and section 21.355 of the Education Code. Any CHRI the district obtained from the DPS or any other criminal justice agency in this state must be also withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 411.097(d) of the Government Code. With the exception of the employee's name, courses taken, and degree obtained, the district must withhold the information in the marked transcripts under section 552.102(b) of the Government Code. The district may withhold pages 34, 67, 79, and 127 under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The district must withhold the information marked under section 552.117 of the Government Code and the remaining marked e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code. It must release the remaining information.

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); *Tex. 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 Texas Building and Procurement Commission 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. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. 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,



James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/seg

Ref: ID# 226206

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Robert A. Brunig
Brunig & Associates
918 Stratford Drive
Southlake, Texas 76092-7110
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Kathryn Yegge
The Dallas Morning News
P.O. Box 655237
Dallas, Texas 75265
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Terry Webster
Mr. Kelly Melhart
Star-Telegram Staff Writer
P.O. Box 915007
Fort Worth, Texas 76115
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Lance Conrad
WFAA
606 Young Street
Dallas, Texas 75202
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Scott Price
The Courier
5100 Thompson Terrace, Suite B
Colleyville, Texas 76034
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Lorian Hernandez
KXAS
3100 McKinnon Street
Dallas, Texas 75201
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Natalie Hankins
Southlake Times
624 Krona Drive, Suite 170
Plano, Texas 75074
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Dee Doleman
Assignment Desk Editor
CBS 11 TV
P.O. Box 2495
Fort Worth, Texas 76113
(w/o enclosures)