



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 1, 2022

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

OR2022-22564

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# 961012 (File No. Heiner H040422).

The Houston Independent School District (the "district") received a request for information pertaining to seven types of expenditures during a specified time period; specified contracts; information pertaining to assignments of a named employee during a specified time period; and e-mails between the named employee, a second named employee, and a named former employee during a specified time period.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

¹ We note the district received clarification regarding this request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (governmental body may communicate with requestor for purpose of clarifying or narrowing request for information); *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed). The district states it sent the requestor a cost estimate of charges pursuant to section 552.2615 of the Government Code, and the requestor accepted the cost estimate. *See* Gov't Code § 552.2615. The estimate of charges required the requestor to provide a deposit for payment of anticipated costs under section 552.263 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.263(a). The district also informs us it received the required payment on May 12, 2022. *See id.* § 552.263(e) (if governmental body requires deposit or bond for anticipated costs pursuant to section 552.263, request for information is considered to have been received on date governmental body receives bond or deposit).

Initially, we note you have not submitted any information responsive to the request for information pertaining to seven types of expenditures during a specified time period or the specified contracts. Thus, although you state the district has submitted a representative sample of the requested information, we find the submitted information is not representative of all the information to which the requestor seeks access. Please be advised this open records letter ruling applies only to the type of information you have submitted for our review. This ruling does not authorize the district to withhold any type of information that is substantially different from the types of information you submitted to this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302 (where request for attorney general decision does not comply with requirements of section 552.301, information at issue is presumed to be public). Therefore, we presume the district has released the information responsive to the remaining portions of the request, to the extent such information existed when the district received this request for information. If not, then the district must release any such information immediately. *See id.* §§ 552.221, .301, .302; Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public 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 21.355 of the Education Code, which provides, in relevant part, “[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential and not subject to disclosure under [the Act].” Educ. Code § 21.355(a). Additionally, the Third Court of Appeals has concluded 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.). 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 for purposes of section 21.355, the word “teacher” means a person who is required to and does in fact hold a teaching 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. We also determined for purposes of section 21.355, an “administrator” 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 information submitted as Exhibit 3 consists of evaluations of teachers or administrators that are confidential under section 21.355. You inform us, and have submitted documentation reflecting, the individuals at issue were certified as teachers or administrators by the State Board of Educator Certification and were acting as teachers or administrators at the time the evaluations were prepared. Based on your representations and our review, we agree some of the information at issue constitutes evaluations as contemplated by section 21.355. Accordingly, 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, we find the district has failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue consists of documents evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator for 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 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the Medical Practice Act (the “MPA”), which governs access to medical records. Occ. Code §§ 151.001-168.202. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides:

(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 that is subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See id.* §§ 159.002, .004. The information we have marked consists of medical records subject to the MPA. The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 159.002 of the Occupations Code.² However, none of the remaining information at issue constitutes a record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that was created or is maintained by a physician. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with the MPA.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which 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 and 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). We note, however, the public generally has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public employees. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 542 (1990); 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job

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

qualifications and performance of public employees); 444 at 5 6 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation or public employees); 432 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). Additionally, information pertaining to leave of public employees is generally a matter of legitimate public interest. *See* Open Records Decision No. 336 at 2 (1982) (names of employees taking sick leave and dates of sick leave taken not private). We note that the fact that a public employee is sick is public information, but specific information about illnesses is excepted from disclosure. *See* ORD 470 at 4.

Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies 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. However, the remaining information is either not highly intimate and embarrassing or is of legitimate public interest, or pertains to individuals who have been de-identified and whose privacy interests are, thus, protected. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information subject to 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). 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. *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 marked documents a communication between attorneys for the district and district employees that was made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the district. You also state the communication was intended to be confidential and has remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the district may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, 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. The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 159.002 of the Occupations Code. 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 may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(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 <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,

Jennifer Copeland
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JC/mo

Ref: ID# 961012

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)