



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 24, 2022

Mr. Neil Bonavita
FWISD Attorney
Fort Worth Independent School District
100 North University Drive, Suite 172
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2022-25528

Dear Mr. Bonavita:

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# 967814 (Internal Ref. No. W005287).

The Fort Worth Independent School District (the "district") received a request for the personnel file of a named former teacher. You state you will release some of the requested information. 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.

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. 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 submitted as Exhibit C consists of communications between district attorneys and district employees in their capacities as clients. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the district. You state these communications were confidential and have not been disclosure to third parties. 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 Exhibit C under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

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). 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. 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.).

You contend Exhibit D consists of confidential evaluations of the named teacher. You inform us the named teacher was certified as a teacher by the State Board of Educator Certification and was acting as a teacher at the time the evaluations were prepared.

Accordingly, the district must generally 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, section 21.355(c) of the Education Code provides, “At the request of a school district, open-enrollment charter school, or private school at which a teacher or administrator has applied for employment, a school district or an open-enrollment charter school shall give the requesting district or school a document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator employed by the school.” Educ. Code § 21.355(c). The requestor in this instance is a representative of the Arlington Independent School District (“Arlington ISD”). Thus, if the teacher at issue has applied for employment with Arlington ISD, then the district may not withhold the information we marked from this requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code. Further, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of 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. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

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 highly intimate or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. The court of appeals has concluded public citizens’ dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Upon review, we find the information we marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.102 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[.]”¹ 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 employees’ names, courses taken, and degrees obtained, the district must withhold the submitted college transcripts pursuant to section 552.102(b) of the Government Code.

¹ 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).

In summary, the district may withhold Exhibit C under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The district must generally 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, if the teacher at issue has applied for employment with Arlington ISD, then the district may not withhold the information we marked from this requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code but must release it. The district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. With the exception of the employees' names, courses taken, and degrees obtained, which must be released, the district must withhold the submitted college transcripts pursuant to section 552.102(b) 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,

Nick Ybarra
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

NY/jm

Ref: ID# 967814

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)