



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 6, 2015

Ms. Veronica L. Garcia
Counsel for the Vidor Independent School District
Walsh, Anderson, Gallegos, Green and Treviño, P.C.
10375 Richmond Avenue, Suite 750
Houston, Texas 77042-4196

OR2015-08786

Dear Ms. Garcia:

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# 562658.

The Vidor Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for several categories of information related to a named district student and all "write-ups, memos[,] and reprimands of employees directly responsible for the provision of services" to the named student during a specified time period. You state the district will release some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information is not responsive to the instant request for information because it was created after the district received the request for information. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the district is not required to release such information in response to this request.

Next, you state you have redacted student-identifying information from the submitted documents pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code. The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office has informed this office FERPA 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.¹ 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 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, except to note parents have a right of access under FERPA to their children’s education records, and that right prevails over a claim under section 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) (FERPA prevails over inconsistent provision of state law). The DOE has informed us, however, that 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 the district’s assertion of this privilege under section 552.107 of the Government Code. We will also consider the district’s claimed exceptions to the extent the requestor does not have a right of access to the submitted information under FERPA.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information that comes 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

¹A 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>.

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 you have marked Exhibit 2 consists of communications involving attorneys for the district and district employees in their capacities as clients. You further state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the district. You state these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on your representations 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 the responsive information in Exhibit 2 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.²

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 section 21.355 of the Education Code, which provides that “[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 an administrator. *See Open Records Decision No. 643* (1996). Additionally, a court has concluded that a written reprimand constitutes an 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.” *Abbott v. North East Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 212 S.W.3d 364 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.). In *Open Records Decision No. 643*, we concluded that a “teacher” for purposes of section 21.355 means a person who (1) is required to and does in fact hold a certificate or permit required under chapter 21 of the Education Code and (2) is teaching at the time of his or her evaluation. *See ORD 643*.

You assert the information you have marked Exhibit 3 is confidential under section 21.355. You state, and provide documentation demonstrating, the teachers at issue held the

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.


appropriate certifications under chapter 21 of the Education Code at the time the information in Exhibit 3 was created. Based on your representations and our review, we agree that Exhibit 3 consists of evaluations as contemplated by section 21.355. Accordingly, the district must withhold Exhibit 3 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code.

In summary, the district may withhold the responsive information in Exhibit 2 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The district must withhold Exhibit 3 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code.

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,



Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/bhf

Ref: ID# 562658

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)