



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 17, 2015

Mr. Peter K. Rusek  
Counsel for the Waco Independent School District  
Sheehy, Lovelace & Mayfield, P.C.  
510 North Valley Mills Drive, Suite 500  
Waco, Texas 76710

OR2015-10971A

Dear Mr. Rusek:

This office issued Open Records Letter No. 2015-10971 (2015) on June 4, 2015. We have examined this ruling and determined that we will correct the previously issued ruling. *See generally* Gov't Code § 552.011 (providing that Office of Attorney General may issue decision to maintain uniformity in application, operation, and interpretation of Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code). Consequently, this decision serves as the correct ruling and is a substitute for the decision issued on June 4, 2015. Your request was assigned ID# 575794.

The Waco Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a named former district employee. You state the district has released some of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.107, and 552.114 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> Additionally, you state you have notified the former employee of his right to submit comments to this office why the submitted information should not be released.<sup>2</sup> *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why

---

<sup>1</sup>Although you also raise section 552.135 of the Government Code, you have not provided any arguments to support this exception. Therefore, we assume you have withdrawn your claim this section applies to the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

<sup>2</sup>As of the date of this letter, this office has not received comments from any third party explaining why any of the submitted information should not be released.

information should or should not be released). We have considered the exceptions you claim 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 the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act.<sup>3</sup> 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”); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 224 (1979) (student’s handwritten comments protected under FERPA because they would make identity of student easily traceable through handwriting, style of expression, or particular incidents related in the comments). You assert FERPA applies to portions of the submitted documents. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing these 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. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(1)(A). Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the district. Likewise, we do not address your claim under section 552.114 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code §§ 552.026 (incorporating FERPA into the Act), 552.114 (excepting from disclosure “student records”); Open Records Decision No. 539 (1990) (determining the same analysis applies under section 552.114 of the Government Code and FERPA). However, we will consider your remaining arguments against disclosure of the submitted 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.” 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. *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

---

<sup>3</sup>A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General’s website at <http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

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.

You contend some of the submitted information consists of confidential evaluations of the named former district employee. You inform us the named employee was certified as a teacher by the State Board of Educator Certification at the time the evaluations were prepared. You further inform us the employee was acting as a teacher at the time some of the information was created. Upon review, we find 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. However, the remaining information at issue consists of self-evaluations or does not otherwise consist of a teacher evaluation for purposes of section 21.355. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate how any of the remaining information at issue consists of documents evaluating the performance of a teacher for purposes of section 21.355 of the Education Code. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.102(b) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure “a transcript from an institution of higher education maintained in the personnel file of a professional public school employee[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.102(b). This exception further provides, however, that “the degree obtained or the curriculum on a transcript in the personnel file of the employee” are not excepted from disclosure. *Id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 526 (1989). Thus, with the exception of the employee’s name, courses taken, and degrees obtained, the district must withhold the submitted college transcripts, which we have marked, pursuant to section 552.102(b) of the Government Code.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.107(1). 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 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 state the information submitted as Exhibit 10 consists of privileged attorney-client communications. You indicate the information at issue consists of communications involving attorneys for the district and district employees and officials in their capacities as clients. You indicate these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the district. You indicate these communications were intended to be confidential and you do not indicate the district has waived the confidentiality of the information at issue. Based on your representation and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the district may withhold Exhibit 10 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Some of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup> Section 552.117(a)(1) 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. 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,

---

<sup>4</sup>The 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)*.

information may only be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee 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. Therefore, to the extent the individual 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 individual at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the district may not withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1).

In summary, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code. With the exception of the employee's name, courses taken, and degrees obtained, the district must withhold the marked college transcripts pursuant to section 552.102(b) of the Government Code. The district may withhold Exhibit 10 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. To the extent the individual 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. The district must release the remaining information.

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,



Claire V. Morris Sloan  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CVMS/som

Ref: ID# 575794

c: Requestor