



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 18, 2020

Ms. Katheryne Ellison
Assistant General Counsel
Houston Independent School District
4400 West 18th Street
Houston, Texas 77092-8501

OR2020-23689

Dear Ms. Ellison:

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# 844164 (Ref. No. HC030420).

The Houston Independent School District (the "district") received a request for three categories of information pertaining to three named employees during a specified time period. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code and privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Initially, you acknowledge some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides, in part:

(a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, the 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[.]

¹ We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). You state some of the submitted information is part of a completed investigation subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The district must release the information at issue pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. The Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are "other law" that make information expressly confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Therefore, we will consider your argument under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503(b)(1) provides the following:

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 not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client or reasonably necessary to transmit the communication. *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must 1) show that 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 that the communication is confidential by explaining that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. *See* ORD 676. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the entire communication is confidential under rule 503 provided the client has not waived the privilege or the communication does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege

enumerated in rule 503(d). *Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein); *In re Valero Energy Corp.*, 973 S.W.2d 453, 457 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1998, orig. proceeding) (privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

You state Exhibit 2 consists of a communication between district employees and outside counsel for the district related to an investigation conducted by the outside counsel for the district. You also state the communication and investigation were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the district. You assert the communication and investigation were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Upon review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to this information. *See Harlandale Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Cornyn*, 25 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. App.—Austin 2000, pet. denied) (attorney’s entire investigative report protected by attorney-client privilege where attorney was retained to conduct investigation in her capacity as attorney for purpose of providing legal services and advice). Thus, the district may withhold Exhibit 2 under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.²

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses other statutes, such as 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 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. *See ORD 643*.

You assert the remaining information consists of written evaluations that are confidential under section 21.355. You inform us, and have submitted documentation reflecting, the administrators at issue held the appropriate certifications at the time of the evaluations. Based on your representations and our review, we agree the remaining information constitutes evaluations as contemplated by section 21.355. Accordingly, the district must withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code.

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

In summary, the district may withhold Exhibit 2 under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. The district must withhold the remaining information 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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Meredith L. Coffman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MLC/rm

Ref: ID# 844164

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor