



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 25, 2022

Mr. Jacob Woolston
Staff Attorney
Round Rock Independent School District
1 Chisholm Trail, Suite 400
Round Rock, TX 78681

OR2022-08708

Dear Mr. Woolston:

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# 937676 (TPIA#s 2022-275 & 2022-284).

The Round Rock Independent School District (the "district") received two requests from the same requestor for specified communications. The district will release some information to the requestor. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.111, 552.114, and 552.137 of the Government Code.¹ Additionally, you state release of some of the submitted information may implicate the interests of the Texas Education Agency (the "TEA"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, the district notified the TEA of the request for information and of the right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have received comments from the TEA. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") has informed this office that the federal 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

¹ Although you do not raise section 552.137 of the Government Code, we understand you to raise this exception based on your markings.

consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act.² 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 assert FERPA applies to portions of the information at issue. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing education records to determine the applicability of FERPA, we will not address FERPA with respect to those records. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(1)(A); 34 C.F.R. § 99.3. Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in the possession of the education record. Likewise, we do not address your argument under section 552.114 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code §§ 552.026 (incorporating FERPA into the Act), .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).

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. Section 552.101 encompasses section 39.004 of the Education Code which provides, in part:

(e) Unless otherwise provided by law, all evidence collected by the agency in connection with a special investigation, including witness statements and videos of agency interviews, are confidential and not subject to disclosure under Chapter 552, Government Code, except that evidence described by this section may be disclosed:

- (1) to a person with a legitimate interest in the investigation; or
- (2) in connection with an administrative or other legal proceeding brought under this title.

Educ. Code § 39.004(e). The TEA states some of the submitted information was collected by its Division of Investigations in conjunction with a pending special investigation of the district. The TEA also states the special investigation was authorized by section 39.003(a)(17) of the Education Code. *See id.* § 39.003 (listing circumstances in which the commissioner shall authorize investigations). Based on these representations and our review, we agree the information at issue constitutes evidence collected by the TEA in connection with a special investigation. Further, the TEA states sections 39.004(e)(1)-(2) are not applicable in this instance. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information

² A copy of this letter may be found on the attorney general's website at <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/sites/default/files/files/divisions/open-government/20060725-USDOE-FERPA.pdf>

we indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 39.004 of the Education Code on behalf of the TEA.³

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

You contend the some of the submitted information is related to pending litigation to which the district is a party. You inform us, and have provided documentation demonstrating, litigation styled *Clark v. Round Rock Ind. Sch. Dist.*, Cause No. 21-1187-C425, was pending in the 425th Judicial District of Williamson County, Texas on the date the district received the request at issue. Based on your representations, the submitted documentation, and our review of the information at issue, we find litigation was pending when the district received the relevant request for information, and we find the information you marked is related to the pending litigation for purposes of section 552.103. Therefore, the district may withhold the information you marked under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

We note, however, the purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties seeking information relating to that litigation to obtain it through discovery procedures. *See* ORD 551 at 4-5. Thus, if the opposing party has seen or had access to information relating to the

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure of the information at issue.

pending litigation through discovery or otherwise, there is no interest in withholding such information from public disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). We also note the applicability of section 552.103 ends once the litigation concludes. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate 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 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). 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.*, 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. *See 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 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 marked consists of or documents communications between attorneys for the district and district officials and employees that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the district. You further state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based upon your representations and our review, we find most of the information you marked consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Accordingly, except for the information we marked for release, the district may withhold the information you marked under section

552.107(1) of the Government Code.⁴ However, we find the information we marked for release was sent to an individual whom you have not demonstrated the district shares a privileged relationship. Thus, the information we marked is not privileged, and the district may not withhold it 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, 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 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; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 364 (Tex. 2000); *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.). 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). However, 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. ORD 615 at 5-6; *see also Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d at 364 (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking).

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *See Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 37 S.W.3d at 157; ORD 615 at 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 have marked consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of district employees and officials regarding policymaking matters. Based upon this representation and our review, we find some of the information at issue consists of advice, opinion, or recommendations on policymaking matters of the district. Accordingly, except for the information we marked for release, the district may withhold

⁴ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure of the information at issue.

the information you marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.⁵ However, we find the remaining information at issue has been shared with a monitor assigned to the district by the TEA. Although you assert the district shares a privity of interest with the TEA monitor regarding the communications at issue, it appears the TEA is acting in a regulatory capacity over the district. Thus, the information we marked was sent to an individual with whom the district has not demonstrated it shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process, and we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue constitutes internal communications containing advice, recommendations, or opinions reflecting the policymaking processes of the district. Therefore, the district may not withhold any portion of the remaining information, which we marked for release, under section 552.111 of the Government Code on the basis of the deliberative process privilege.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses 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). 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 or administrator. *See* Open Records Decision No. 643 (1996). 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. *Id.*

You assert the some of the remaining communications are evaluative documents that are confidential under section 21.355. However, upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the information at issue constitutes documents evaluating the performance of an administrator for the purposes of section 21.355 of the Education Code. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code.

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). *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 instead the address of the individual as a government employee. The e-mail addresses at issue do not appear to be of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the district must withhold the personal e-mail address you indicated and the additional e-mail address

⁵ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure of the information at issue.

we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure.

In summary, the district must withhold the information we indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 39.004 of the Education Code on behalf of the TEA. The district may withhold the information you marked under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Except for the information we marked for release, the district may withhold the information you marked under sections 552.107(a) and 552.111 of the Government Code. The district must withhold the personal e-mail address you indicated and the additional e-mail address we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. 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 <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,

Amy Shipp
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ALS/jm

Ref: ID# 937676

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party
(w/o enclosures)