



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 6, 2015

Mr. W. Lee Auvenshine  
Deputy Superintendent  
Human Resources & Legal Services  
Waxahachie Independent School District  
411 North Gibson Street  
Waxahachie, Texas 75165

OR2015-06504

Dear Mr. Auvenshine:

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# 558804.

The Waxahachie Independent School District (the "district") received a request for e-mails sent to or from a named employee during a specified time period. You state the district will release some information to the requestor. You state the district will redact some information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code.<sup>1</sup> You claim some of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. You further claim the remaining submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.107, 552.111, 552.117, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

---

<sup>1</sup>The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") has informed this office FERPA does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act. The DOE has determined 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>

Initially, we note some of the submitted e-mails are not responsive to the request for information because they were not sent to or from the named employee. This ruling does not address the public availability of non-responsive information, and the district is not required to release non-responsive information in response to this request.

Next, we address your argument the password and identification number you have marked are not subject to disclosure under the Act. The Act is applicable only to "public information." See Gov't Code §§ 552.002, .021. Section 552.002(a) defines "public information" as the following:

[I]nformation that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

- (1) by a governmental body;
- (2) for a governmental body and the governmental body:
  - (A) owns the information;
  - (B) has a right of access to the information; or
  - (C) spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or
- (3) by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

*Id.* § 552.002(a). Thus, virtually all information that is in a governmental body's physical possession constitutes public information that is subject to the Act. *Id.* § 552.002(a)(1); see also Open Records Decision Nos. 549 at 4 (1990), 514 at 1-2 (1988). In Open Records Decision No. 581 (1990), this office determined that certain computer information, such as source codes, documentation information, and other computer programming, that has no significance other than its use as a tool for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public property is not the kind of information that is made public under section 552.021. See ORD 581 at 6 (construing predecessor statute). You contend the information at issue is not public information, as defined by section 552.002. Based on your representation and our review, we agree the information you have marked is not public information for the purposes of section 552.002, and, thus, is not subject to disclosure under the Act. See Gov't Code § 552.021. Therefore, the information you have marked need not be released in response to this request for information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” *Id.* § 552.101. Section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the Medical Practice Act (“MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records. *See* Occ. Code §§ 151.001-168.202. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in relevant part:

(a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient, is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient’s behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

*Id.* § 159.002(a)-(c). Information subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See id.* §§ 159.002, .004. This office has concluded the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 487 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982). Upon review, we find the information we marked constitutes medical records. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.<sup>2</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 21.355 of the Education Code, which provides, “[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 to any document that evaluates, as that term is commonly understood, the performance of a teacher or administrator. *See* Open Records Decision No. 643 at 3 (1996). We have determined a “teacher” for purposes of section 21.355 means a person who is required to, and does in fact, hold a certificate or permit under chapter 21 of the Education Code and is teaching at the time of the evaluation. *See* ORD 643 at 4. Additionally, the Third Court of Appeals has concluded a written reprimand constitutes an

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

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.” *Abbot v. North East Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 212 S.W.3d 364 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.). Upon review, we find none of the submitted information constitutes an evaluation of a teacher for purposes of section 21.355. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrines of common-law and constitutional privacy. Common-law privacy 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 or 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 portions of the submitted information satisfy the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.<sup>3</sup> However, you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual’s interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. ORD 455 at 4. The first type protects an individual’s autonomy within “zones of privacy” which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual’s privacy interests and the public’s need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the “most intimate aspects of human affairs.” *Id.* at 5 (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate how any portion of the remaining information falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual’s privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the district may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of constitutional privacy.

---

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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, as discussed above. 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 then considered the applicability of section 552.102(a) and held it excepts 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 the district must withhold the employees’ dates of birth in the remaining information under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup> However, none of the remaining information is confidential under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code and none of it may be withheld on that basis.

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 “to facilitate 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 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 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 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: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of

---

<sup>4</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit 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, orig. proceeding). 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).

You claim the information you marked consists of communications between the district and its attorneys that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the district. You state these communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to some of the information at issue. Thus, the district may generally withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. We note, however, some of the privileged e-mail strings you have marked include e-mails received from or sent to individuals you have not demonstrated are privileged parties. If these e-mails are removed from the privileged e-mail strings and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if the non-privileged e-mails we have marked are maintained by the district separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the district may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

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[.]” Gov’t Code § 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 (1993)*, this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined that 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 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body's policymaking functions do 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). Additionally, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure purely factual information that is severable from the opinion portions of internal memoranda. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); ORD 615 at 4-5. But if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

You state the information you marked consists of intraagency communications between district employees pertaining to a salary survey for paraprofessionals. You further state the information at issue pertains to the district's effort to better regulate salaries and wages. However, we find the information at issue consists of information that is purely factual in nature. Thus, we find the district has failed to demonstrate how the information at issue is excepted under section 552.111. Accordingly, the district may not withhold the information you marked 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). 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 confidentiality under section 552.024. 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 marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the district may only withhold the cellular telephone number we have marked 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) of the Government Code. However, we find

none of the remaining information is subject to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code, and none of it may be withheld on that basis.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code 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). Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The marked e-mail addresses are not of a type excluded by subsection (c). Accordingly, the district must withhold the e-mail addresses you marked and we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their release.

As you acknowledge, portions of the remaining information may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; see Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the identification number and password you have marked need not be released in response to this request for information. The district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The district must withhold the employees’ dates of birth under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The district may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; however, the district must release the non-privileged e-mails we have marked if the district maintains them separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear. 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 marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the district may only withhold the cellular telephone number we have marked if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. The district must withhold the e-mail addresses you marked and we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their release. The district must release the remaining information; however, any information that is subject to copyright may be released only in accordance with copyright law.

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](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,



Lauren Dahlstein  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

LMD/som

Ref: ID# 558804

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)