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Board members are elected to serve as trustees for their school districts. As such, they have the opportunity and responsibility to participate in matters of school business. An independent school district is governed by a board of trustees who, as a body corporate, shall oversee the management of the district. Tex. Educ. Code § 11.051(a).

Trustees, however, must operate as “a body corporate,” which means no single board member may act alone. Tex. Educ. Code § 11.051. So how do the roles and responsibilities of each individual trustee intersect with the role of the board as an entity?

The Limits of Free Speech

Although board members and other public officials do not lose their free speech rights when they enter public office, the U.S. Supreme Court has acknowledged that restrictions on speech based upon the necessities of governmental functions do not violate the First Amendment. See Asgeirsson v. Abbott, 773 F. Supp. 2d 684 (W.D. Tex. 2011) (concluding that the Texas Open Meetings Act (OMA) requirement that open meetings take place in public was necessary to provide the governmental function of transparency and therefore did not violate the First Amendment). In other words, school board members have free speech rights, but when they are acting in their official capacity, those rights may be limited to serve the legitimate needs of the public.

On the one hand, the government may not limit public officials’ capacity to discuss their views of local or national policy. The Supreme Court has observed that the interest of the public in hearing all sides of a matter of public concern would not be advanced by extending more free speech protection to citizen-critics than to public officials. Instead, the public benefits by knowing what governmental officials think so the public can judge whether the elected officials are truly the best people to represent them. Bond v. Floyd, 385 U.S. 116 (1966).

On the other hand, a board member’s personal right to free speech does not extend to using the advantage of public office to promote personal views. For example, when a judge who had been censured for holding a press conference in his courtroom to address allegations made by a litigant appealed the censure, the Fifth Circuit struck down the censure order “[t]o the extent that [t]he extent that [i]t censured [the Judge] for the content of his speech, shutting down all communication between the Judge and his constituents;” however, the Fifth Circuit held that the portion of the order that was directed at the judge’s “use of the trappings of judicial office to boost his
message, his decision to hold a press conference in his courtroom, and particularly stepping out from behind the bench, while wearing his judicial robe, to address the cameras’ survived strict scrutiny. *Jenevein v. Willing*, 493 F.3d 551, 560 (5th Cir. 2007). In other words, the judge had a right to speak out about the allegations, but not to use the courtroom as a platform.

In the same way, board members’ right to speak out and advocate regarding school business is not unlimited. Sometimes the limits come from legal requirements like the OMA or prohibitions on the use of public funds for political advertising. Tex. Gov’t Code ch. 551; Tex. Elec. Code ch. 255. Other times these limits are self-imposed by a school board in the form of a local policy or board operating procedure adopted in the interest of best school district practices. See TASB Policy BE(LOCAL).

**Board Meeting Attendance and Participation**

A school board member holds the rights and obligations of the office until replaced by a duly-qualified successor. Tex. Const. art. XVI, § 17. The office changes hands only when another person has been elected (or, in the case of a board member’s resignation, appointed) to the office and has taken the oath of office. In Texas, school board members are not subject to recall by the voters, nor may they be removed by an action of the rest of the school board. Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code §§ 66.001-.002 (providing for quo warranto action in district court); Tex. Loc. Gov’t Code § 87.015 (providing for removal by petition and trial).

Consequently, a qualified board member is entitled to participate in deliberation and voting, unless there is a conflict of interest that prevents the board member’s participation.

**Voting**

All board members may vote on all matters, absent a conflict of interest. (See Legal Conflicts of Interest, below.) To vote, a trustee must attend the board meeting in person (unless the meeting is being held by videoconference in accordance with the OMA) and cast a vote in public. Proxy votes, secret ballots, and straw polls are not permissible; nor is voting of any kind in a closed meeting. Tex. Gov’t Code § 551.102; Tex. Att’y. Gen. Op. No. JH-1163 (1978). The board president has the same opportunity to vote and deliberate as any other board member. See TASB Policy BE(LEGAL). See TASB Legal Services’ FAQ on Voting.

A trustee is not obligated to deliberate or cast a vote, even if state law would not prohibit participation. At times, a trustee may feel too involved with a certain situation or with a particular vendor to make an unbiased decision and may abstain. The trustee may also choose to abstain from participation to avoid the appearance of impropriety. Through local policy, most school districts have adopted a local board member code of ethics that can assist trustees in evaluating their circumstances and determining when to abstain. See TASB Policy BBF(LOCAL).
Public officials have argued that restricting their ability to vote based on conflicts of interest would be an unconstitutional restraint on the officials’ exercise of free speech. However, these arguments have failed. In *Nevada Comm’n on Ethics v. Carrigan*, the U.S. Supreme Court considered this question when a city council member challenged his censure by the Nevada Commission on Ethics for failing to disclose a business relationship with a vendor and recuse himself from voting on a construction project. The Court agreed to hear the case and directly addressed the question of whether restrictions upon an official’s vote are restrictions upon the official’s protected speech. The Court opined that a public official casts a vote in trust for the official’s constituents, not as an act of personal power. According to the Court, the act of voting is not, in and of itself, symbolic speech. Rather, even though a vote may reflect an official’s deeply held personal belief, and even if the official would like the vote to convey that belief, the official’s belief does not transform the action of voting into First Amendment speech. *Nevada Comm’n on Ethics v. Carrigan*, 564 U.S. 117 (2011).

**Legal Conflicts of Interest**

In certain circumstances, a board member may be legally prohibited from participating in deliberation and voting on a matter when there is a conflict of interest. Examples include the following:

- **Nepotism:** When an employee related to a board member is employed pursuant to the “continuous employment” exception, the board member may not participate in any deliberation or voting on the appointment, reappointment, confirmation of the appointment or reappointment, employment, reemployment, change in status, compensation, or dismissal of the employee if that action applies only to the individual and is not taken regarding a bona fide class or category of employees. Tex. Gov’t Code § 573.062(b). See TASB Policy DBE(LEGAL).

- **Substantial interest:** A trustee with a substantial interest in a business or real property must abstain from further participation in the official decision-making process if the board’s action on the matter will have a special economic effect on the business entity or real property that is distinguishable from the effect on the public. Tex. Loc. Gov’t Code § 171.004(a). However, abstention is *not* required if a majority of board members are required to file, and do file, affidavits of substantial interest in a particular business entity. Tex. Loc. Gov’t Code § 171.004(c). See TASB Policy BBFA(LEGAL).

- **Budget items:** The school board must take a separate vote on any budget item specifically dedicated to a contract with a business entity in which a board member has a substantial interest. The member may, however, vote on the budget as a whole if the member has filed the necessary affidavit, abstained from voting on the specific item, and the specific budget item has been otherwise resolved. Tex. Loc. Gov’t Code § 171.005. See TASB Policy BBFA(LEGAL).
Duty to another entity: In many cases, state law permits an individual to hold two positions, such as serving simultaneously as a school board member and as a director for a private corporation. Separate laws governing the actions of the individual while serving in the second capacity may affect the individual’s ability to participate in school board decision making. Assume, for instance, that a school board member is also on the board of a nonprofit corporation. If the trustee ignores a potential conflict of interest between the school district and the nonprofit, the trustee could be sued for breach of the trustee’s fiduciary duty to the nonprofit. Tex. Att’y Gen. Op. No. DM-0256 (1993) (citing Blocker v. State, 718 S.W.2d 409 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1986, writ ref’d n.r.e.)). A trustee should consider the trustee’s obligations to both the school district and the other entity before participating in school board matters.

Exclusion from a Meeting

The circumstances under which a board member can be excluded from a board meeting are exceptionally rare.

Open meetings: Like all members of the public, board members are permitted to attend open meetings. Even board members with a conflict of interest on a matter before the board may (but do not have to) attend the portion of an open meeting related to that item, even if they are not participating in the deliberation and vote. If there is a disruption during a meeting involving board members, the presiding officer typically calls a recess until all are able to resume.

Closed meetings: A board member who is prohibited from participation (meaning deliberating and voting) due to a legal conflict of interest may still be able to attend (sitting silently) a closed meeting regarding the matter; however, the attorney general has strongly suggested that a public official choose to refrain from attending the portion of a closed meeting that addresses such a matter in order to avoid the appearance of impropriety. Tex. Att’y Gen. Op. No. GA-0334 (2005). In addition, a school board may exclude a particular trustee from a closed meeting if the trustee has taken a legal position adverse to the district on the subject of the closed meeting and disclosure of the deliberation would compromise the district’s position as to that matter. In one case, the attorney general ruled it was proper for a school board to exclude from closed session a trustee who had sued the school district. The board could prevent the trustee from hearing the board’s consultation with its attorney regarding defense strategy or settlement of the claim. Tex. Att’y Gen. Op. No. JM-1004 (1984). A board should always consult with an attorney before excluding a trustee from any portion of a meeting.

Placing an Item on a Future Agenda

For districts using TASB Policy BE(LOCAL), local policy permits a single board member to request that an item go on the agenda for an upcoming meeting. In planning an agenda, the superintendent and board president must ensure that all trustee requests appear on the present agenda or are scheduled for a future agenda. No item may be removed from an agenda.
without the permission of the requesting trustee. The attorney general has noted that a board cannot adopt a procedure that has the net effect of precluding individual board members from placing an item on the agenda. Tex. Att’y Gen. Op. No. DM-0228 (1993).

A board president or superintendent who chooses to delay or deny a board member’s request should consult with the board member about the request. If a board member believes that a requested item is being improperly kept off the board’s agenda, the board member may raise the issue during a board meeting. Because the item does not appear on that board meeting’s agenda, the board is not permitted to discuss the merits of the matter. The board is permitted to vote, however, on whether to place the item on a future agenda. Tex. Gov’t Code § 551.042.

**Speaking at a Board Meeting about an Item Not on the Agenda**

Because board members have the opportunity to request specific agenda items, speaking during public comment on an item that is not on the agenda may violate the OMA. For example, the Hays County Commissioners Court posted a meeting notice that included an item listed as “Presentation by Commissioner Molenaar” under the heading “Proclamations & Presentations.” When Molenaar spoke, his comments went into some detail about a proposed county transportation plan. A taxpayer organization sued the county for OMA violations. The court of appeals concluded that “presentation” was too vague a description to give the public notice of the subject matter. *Hays County Water Planning P’ship v. Hays County*, 41 S.W.3d 174 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, pet. denied).

Similarly, after the chair of the Board of Directors of the Brazos Valley Groundwater Conservation District (BVGCD) refused a board member’s request to add an item to a board agenda out of concern that it related to pending litigation, the board member attempted to sign in and make a public comment at the board meeting. When he was not allowed to address the board, he joined the pending lawsuit against the BVGCD, alleging a violation of his First Amendment right to free speech. The district court ruled in favor of the board, and the Fifth Circuit affirmed. The court concluded that, given the board member’s status as a public official, he was governed by the OMA and did not have the same rights as a member of the public when attending a BVGCD meeting. *Stratta v. Roe*, 961 F.3d 340 (5th Cir. 2020).

If a board member or a member of the public asks about a subject that is not on the agenda during a meeting, the board may only:

- **Give factual information:** Make a statement of specific factual information, e.g., “The deadline for submitting bids on that proposal is December 29, 2021.”
- **Give a policy reference:** Recite existing policy in response to the inquiry, e.g., “Complaints by a parent against a district employee should be submitted under the district’s local policy FNG (LOCAL).”
Place on a future agenda: Deliberate about or decide whether to place the subject on the agenda for a later meeting. Tex. Gov’t Code § 551.042.

Making Personal Recordings

The OMA permits any person to record all or any part of an open meeting by audio recorder, video camera, or other means of aural or visual reproduction. The board may adopt reasonable rules to maintain order relating to any such recording, such as the location of the recording equipment and the manner in which the recording is conducted. Tex. Gov’t Code § 551.023. The same is not true in closed meetings, however. Neither board members nor other individuals may audio record a closed meeting absent authorization by the board. Zamora v. Edgewood Indep. Sch. Dist., 592 S.W.2d 649 (Tex. Civ. App.—Beaumont 1979, writ ref’d. n.r.e.).

Activities Outside of Board Meetings

Persuading Fellow Board Members

Board members are permitted to speak to each other and to the district administration (in person and through electronic communications) about public business outside of board meetings. They may “lobby” each other on relevant matters. Board members must take care, however, not to violate the OMA with these discussions. The Fifth Circuit has concluded that government officials do not have a First Amendment right to discuss public policy and public business among a quorum of their governing body in private, concluding that the OMA is not unconstitutional in its regulation of public business. See Asgeirsson v. Abbott, 773 F. Supp. 2d 684 (W.D. Tex.2011), aff’d, 696 F.3d 454 (5th Cir. 2012) (finding the OMA was not vague or overbroad with respect to indictment of city council members for emails about public business).

A meeting under the OMA happens whenever a quorum deliberates school business. Tex. Gov’t Code § 551.001(4). Deliberation means a verbal exchange during a meeting between a quorum of a board, or between a quorum of a board and another person, concerning an issue within the jurisdiction of the board or any other public business. Tex. Gov’t Code § 551.001(2). According to the Texas Supreme Court, “When a majority of a public decisionmaking [sic] body is considering a pending issue, there can be no ‘informal’ discussion. There is either formal consideration of a matter in compliance with the Open Meetings Act or an illegal meeting.” Acker v. Tex. Water Comm’n, 790 S.W.2d 299, 300 (Tex. 1990). An illegal meeting can occur if a quorum deliberates school business outside of a posted meeting, even if the quorum does not meet at one time or place. Hitt v. Mabry, 687 S.W.2d 791 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1985, no writ); Tex. Att’y Gen. LO-95-055 (1995).

A walking quorum occurs when members of a governmental body deliberately hold serial meetings of less than a quorum outside of a public meeting and then ratify the decisions made in private at a subsequent public meeting in an attempt to circumvent the OMA. Esperanza Peace & Justice Ctr. v. City of San Antonio, 316 F. Supp. 2d 433 (W.D. Tex. 2001). A board member
commits an offense if the member knowingly engages in communications in violation of the OMA, and if the member knew that the communication involved or would involve a quorum and would constitute a deliberation. Tex. Gov’t Code § 551.143(a). This offense is a misdemeanor punishable by fine, confinement, or both. Tex. Gov’t Code § 551.143(b). See also Tex. Att’y Gen. Op. No. GA-0098 (2003) (warning against holding serial, closed, quorumless meetings).

Preserving School District Records

Under the Texas Public Information Act (PIA), a school board member is a temporary custodian of school district records to the extent, in the transaction of official business, the board member creates or receives public information that the member has not provided to the district’s public information officer (i.e., the superintendent). Tex. Gov’t Code § 552.003(7). Public information is defined broadly to include any district information created or maintained in connection with the transaction of official business and located on any device. Tex. Gov’t Code § 552.002(a)-(a-2). As a temporary custodian, a board member may either forward the public information to the district or preserve information as required by the PIA and other laws governing the preservation and retention of local government records, including Texas Government Code chapter 441 and Texas Local Government Code Title 6. Tex. Gov’t Code § 552.004(b)-(c). For this reason, board members are well-advised to limit electronic exchanges related to school business to software applications (like district email) that are accessible to and retained by the school district. For more information, see TASB Legal Services’ memo Board Member Responsibilities as Temporary Custodians.

Reviewing School District Records


Requesting records: A board member, acting in an official capacity, may request information and records from the district without the need for a public information request. Information not subject to disclosure as public information may be redacted or withheld, and the district is required to track and periodically report certain information about board member requests for records. Tex. Educ. Code § 11.1512(c)-(f). Of course, trustees should observe good governance practices, requesting only the documents needed to perform their appropriate functions and following established procedures for making document requests. On the other hand, most boards have a local policy that requires a majority vote before the board will commission the creation of a new report. See TASB Policy BBE(LOCAL). See also TASB Legal Services’ memo on Board Member Access to School District Records.

Access to closed meeting records: Either a certified agenda or an official audio recording must be kept of the proceedings of each closed meeting, except for a governmental body’s private consultation with its attorney. Tex. Gov’t Code § 551.103(a). A certified agenda or recording of
a closed meeting is available for public inspection and copying only under a court order. Tex. Gov’t Code § 551.104(c). However, current trustees who attended a closed meeting may review the certified agenda or audio recording of that meeting. Tex. Att’y Gen. Op. No. DM-0227 (1993). Current board members may also review the recording or certified agenda of a closed meeting they did not attend. Tex. Att’y Gen. Op. No. JC-0120 (1999). Although a board may adopt reasonable procedures for review of closed meeting records, the board may not absolutely prohibit a board member from reviewing the recording or certified agenda. While a board member may review the record, this does not include the authority to obtain a copy of the record. Former board members may not review a recording or certified agenda after they have left office. Tex. Att’y Gen. Op. No. JC-0120 (1999).

**Talking to the Public or the Press**

Like all citizens, individual board members may voice their opinions to the public or the press. Nevertheless, important practical considerations should guide board members speaking publicly about school business. First, because the board acts only as “a body corporate,” many school boards have a board operating procedure that appoints the board president as a spokesperson; other board members are free to speak to the press or the public but should clarify that their statements reflect their own views, not necessarily the official position of the board. Moreover, board members should not use the press as a vehicle for communicating with each other; such communications undermine good working relationships and the purpose of open meetings.

Public statements may also telegraph bias on contested matters. Generally, a board member is presumed to be impartial absent specific evidence of actual bias. *Nardone v. El Paso Indep. Sch. Dist.*, Tex. Comm’r of Educ. Decision No. 151-R1-798 (Aug. 25, 1998). In some cases, however, board members act in the role of a judge or tribunal by hearing appeals of contested cases. Examples include grievances, employee contract appeals, and other contested matters, many of which require due process of law. The concept of due process calls for the board to serve as an impartial decision maker, which means board members should come to the hearing with an open mind.

Public statements by a board member expressing an opinion on pending matters may be considered evidence of bias or prejudgment on the issue. This evidence of bias may be used to call into question the validity of board action. See, e.g., *Valley v. Rapides Par. Sch. Bd.*, 118 F.3d 1047 (5th Cir. 1997) (overturning a superintendent’s termination when the record showed that four members of a nine-member school board had made public statements indicating bias against the superintendent).

Finally, disagreement among the board is to be expected from time to time, but most boards encourage individual members to express their views during the debate of a matter and to refrain from criticizing decisions after the fact. For example, many boards commit in their code of ethics to air their disagreements during board deliberations, but to avoid undermining final majority decisions afterwards. See TASB Policy BBF(LOCAL) (“I will respect the majority decision as the
decision of the Board.”). That said, board members have a constitutionally protected right to express dissent. See City of Corpus Christi v. Bayfront Assoc., Ltd., 814 S.W.2d 98 (Tex. App.—Corpus Christi–Edinburg 1991, writ denied) (observing that a city council member who disagreed publicly with a decision of the council could not be “sanctioned” for voicing her disagreement).

For more information, see TASB Legal Services’ Social Media Guidelines Use by Board Members.

**Interacting with Staff**

A district’s employment policy must provide each employee with the right to present grievances to the board, and the policy may not restrict the ability of an employee to communicate directly with a member of the board regarding a matter relating to the operation of a district, with the exception of communications about a pending appeal under Texas Education Code chapter 21 regarding employment contracts or another appeal or hearing in which ex parte communication (i.e., communication with only one party in a pending matter) would be inappropriate pending a final decision by the board. Tex. Educ. Code § 11.1513(i)-(j). See TASB Policy DGBA(LEGAL) and (LOCAL).

That said, local school boards routinely establish guidelines for school board members that emphasize that individual members are not authorized to respond to complaints from individual employees or other citizens. Instead, complaints or concerns should be redirected through the chain of command to an appropriate administrator. Boards set this expectation in board policies, board operating procedures, and often their superintendent contracts.

Board members should avoid asking school employees, other than the superintendent, to perform any tasks or favors for the board member. Not only do such requests disrupt the chain of command, but they also risk the board member being accused of micromanagement or abuse of official capacity.

**Visiting Campuses**

Each school board is required to establish a policy regarding board members’ visits to district campuses or facilities. Tex. Educ. Code § 11.1512(g). See TASB Policy BBE(LOCAL).

**Liability Issues**

**Preserving Confidential Information**

The audio recording or written record of a closed meeting, called a certified agenda, is confidential by law. A person who knowingly discloses a certified agenda or a recording of a closed meeting to a member of the public, without lawful authority, commits a Class B misdemeanor. Tex. Gov’t Code § 551.146. The penalty is a fine not to exceed $2,000, jail confinement not to exceed 180 days, or both. Tex. Penal Code § 12.22.
Although the unauthorized release of an audio recording or certified agenda from a closed meeting is a criminal offense, there is no comparable statutory prohibition in the OMA specifically preventing other disclosure of the subject or content of closed meeting discussions. The attorney general has stated that the restrictions on the disclosure of the certified agenda or recording do not prohibit board members or other persons who attend a closed meeting from making public statements about the subject matter of a closed meeting. The attorney general’s conclusion was based on the fact that (1) school board members and others present during a closed meeting possess constitutional rights to freedom of speech; and (2) in enacting the certified agenda or recording requirement, the legislature apparently intended only to ensure the preservation of the record of closed meeting discussions. Tex. Att’y Gen. Op. No. JM-1071 (1989).

Despite this ruling, there are several compelling reasons for a trustee not to reveal the content of closed meeting deliberations. First, as a trustee to the district, a board member owes a fiduciary obligation to the district to put its interests ahead of the board member’s own. Disclosure of information discussed in a closed meeting, such as the negotiating position of the district, could harm the district’s interests. Consequently, the trustee could be subject to a civil lawsuit for breach of fiduciary duty.

Second, disclosing information discussed in a closed meeting is inconsistent with the board’s local policies. Most school districts have adopted a local policy stating that a trustee will not “disclose information that is confidential by law or that will needlessly harm the District if disclosed.” Trustees also commit to “consistently uphold all applicable laws, rules, policies, and governance procedures.” See TASB Policy BBF(LOCAL). While these ethical standards may not create a separate legal cause of action, they define the policy duties of the trustee.

Third, an individual board member may be sued for defamation. Defamation occurs when an individual, acting with actual malice if the target is a public figure or with mere negligence if the target is a private individual, publishes or prints a statement that “tends to impeach [a] person’s honesty, integrity, or virtue.” Marshall v. Mahaffey, 974 S.W.2d 942, 949 (Tex. App.—Beaumont 1998, pet. denied). A school board member can claim official immunity in such suits if the statement was made by the member while performing a discretionary duty in good faith and within the scope of the member’s authority. The defense of official immunity will fail, however, if the board member’s statements were not made in good faith and within the scope of the board member’s authorized duties. A successful plaintiff could recover monetary damages caused by the statement plus exemplary damages. Kinsey v. Ryan, No. Civ. A. 398CV-1000-BC, 1998 WL 920329 (N.D. Tex. Dec. 31, 1998) (mem. op.).

Fourth, depending on how confidential information is used, a board member may be subject to criminal liability for misuse of official information. The Texas Penal Code specifically prohibits a public official from misusing information that has not been made public and to which the official has access by virtue of the public office. Official information is information to which the public generally does not have access and which is prohibited from disclosure under the PIA. Depending on the circumstances, information discussed in a closed meeting may fall in this category.
category. A trustee may run afoul of this provision by relying on official information to acquire (or help someone else to acquire) a financial interest in property, a transaction, or an enterprise affected by the information or discloses or uses official information for a non-governmental purpose with intent to benefit from or harm or defraud another. Violation of this provision is a third-felony. Tex. Penal Code § 39.06.

Finally, a board member’s disclosure of closed meeting discussions undermines the purpose and integrity of the closed meeting. The closed meeting exceptions represent the legislature’s determination of the subject areas that warrant discussion outside the public’s view. Disclosing discussions or information about these subjects may inhibit open discussion of issues in future closed meetings. For all these reasons, it is highly inadvisable for board members to disclose information regarding deliberations in closed meetings.

**Defamation against Board Members**

While the First Amendment may sometimes be called upon to protect speech by public officials, it is more often called upon to protect speech about and against public officials. School board members must have thicker skin than ordinary citizens when it comes to personal attacks. See, e.g., *Greer v. Abraham*, 489 S.W.3d 440 (Tex. 2016) (concluding that a school board member is a public figure justifying a heightened standard requiring proof of “actual malice” to support a defamation claim). Accordingly, public officials must tolerate more significant actions taken in response to their exercise of free speech than an average citizen would before the actions are considered adverse. *Mattox v. City of Forest Park*, 183 F.3d 515 (6th Cir.1999). In Texas, even candidates for school board are considered public officials, subject to the heightened standard of actual malice to support a defamation claim. *Schofield v. Gerda*, No. 02-15-00326-CV, 2017 WL 2180708, at *1 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth May 18, 2017, no pet.)

Not only is it harder for a school board member to claim defamation, but any such claim could be struck down as a “SLAPP,” which stands for a Strategic Lawsuit Against Public Participation. A SLAPP is considered a meritless lawsuit aimed at stopping citizens from talking about issues of public concern. In response to a growing number of defamation claims related to online speech, the Texas Legislature passed the Texas Citizens Participation Act (TCPA), more generally known as an anti-SLAPP law, in 2011 to “protect people’s right of free speech, petition, or association.” Bill Analysis, Tex. H.B. 2973, 82d Leg., R.S. (2011). In 2019, the Texas Legislature went back to the TCPA and substantially amended the law to clarify what parties were subject to the law. Importantly, a government entity, agency, or an official or employee acting in an official capacity cannot file a TCPA motion to dismiss. This includes school districts, school boards, and school board members acting in their official capacity. Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 27.003(a).

**Censure**

Nothing in the U.S. Supreme Court’s precedent “suggests the Court intended for the First Amendment to guard against every form of political backlash that might arise out of the everyday squabbles of hardball politics,” and “the First Amendment may well prohibit retaliation against
elected officials for speech pursuant to their official duties only when the retaliation interferes with their ability to adequately perform their elected duties.” *Willson v. Yerke*, 604 F. App’x 149, 151 (3rd Cir. 2015) (affirming summary judgment in favor of township and board of supervisors on allegations by former member that chairman and other members insulted and threatened him, directed obscene gestures at him, and changed locks on township garage).

Under most circumstances, conflicts and miscommunications among board members can be addressed by ensuring that board members receive regular continuing education and that local boards collaborate to develop and review sound board operating procedures.

In the event a board member’s actions deliberately violate local policy or board operating procedures, the rest of the board may consider addressing the concerns by taking the following steps:

- A private conversation between the offending member and the board president or other appropriate individual.
- A confidential conversation between the offending member and the board and the district’s school attorney.
- Discussion in closed session between the offending member and the full board.
- If private conversations have not been effective, the board could seek the assistance of the school district’s attorney to express in writing concerns about specific policy violations.
- If all possible private interventions have not been effective, board members may make public statements to distance themselves from the acts or statements of another board member.

While board members each have a protected First Amendment right to express their views on matters of public concern—including views about the acts or statements of a fellow board member—a board that is considering a formal reprimand, censure, or sanction against an individual member of the board should consult its school attorney to carefully consider the costs and benefits of such actions. Public censure of a fellow board member often leads to protracted and expensive litigation with claims and counterclaims of unconstitutional restrictions on protected speech. In *Houston Community College System v. Wilson*, the U.S. Supreme Court reviewed the claim by a community college trustee that the board’s vote to publicly censure the trustee for actions not consistent with the best interests of the college and board violated the First Amendment. The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals had determined that the trustee’s allegation of censure in retaliation for speaking out on a matter of public concern was sufficient to establish an actionable harm for lower court review of the claimed damages. In reversing the Fifth Circuit’s ruling, the Supreme Court noted that “elected bodies in this country have long exercised the power to censure their members” and that members should expect “a degree of criticism about their public service from their constituents and their peers.” As to the
trustee’s claim that the censure constituted an unconstitutional adverse action in response to speech, the Court reasoned that the First Amendment “cannot be used as a weapon to silence other representatives” from seeking to exercise their same rights to speak on matters public policy. The Court cautioned that its holding was limited to a verbal censure of a member of an elected body by other members, not to more extreme forms of punishment like expulsion or exclusion. *Houston Cnty. Coll. Sys. v. Wilson*, 142 S. Ct. 1253, 1259-61 (2022).

**Personal Legal Liability**

School board service is a voluntary role and should not typically subject board members to personal liability. That said, when board members stray from acting in good faith within the scope of their appropriate role on the board, risks may ensue. Board members can be subjected to two types of liability: civil and criminal. Board members almost always have immunity from liability for civil claims. Civil claims are lawsuits by individuals seeking either monetary damages or injunctive relief from the school district. Board members are immune from liability for discretionary acts done in good faith within the course and scope of their role on the board. *City of Lancaster v. Chambers*, 883 S.W.2d 650 (Tex. 1994); Tex. Educ. Code § 22.0511.

Plaintiffs in state lawsuits must choose to sue either the school district as an entity or an individual person (employee or board member) who allegedly caused the harm. Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 101.106. Generally speaking, unless a plaintiff is claiming that a board member acted separate and apart from the rest of the board—for example, the plaintiff claims the board member made a defamatory statement—suit will be brought against the district, not an individual board member.

If a civil suit, like a defamation claim, is brought against a board member in the member’s individual capacity, the board member may be able to rely on the district’s director and officer (D&O) insurance to mount a defense, as long as the board member was acting in good faith in the course and scope of the board member role. Tex. Att’y Gen. Op. No. JH-0070 (1973). If, however, the board member was not acting in good faith, the board member’s actions may not be covered by the district’s insurance. In these rare circumstances, a board member may have a conflict of interest with the school district that would require the individual to rely on personal resources, such as homeowner’s insurance or personal assets, to defend the claim. Tex. Att’y Gen. Op. No. GA-0878 (2011). Whether public funds may be spent on a board member’s defense must be decided on a case-by-case basis. Tex. Att’y Gen. Op. No. GA-0115 (2003). A school district may not expend public funds to represent the purely personal interests of an individual trustee. Tex. Att’y Gen. Op. Nos. DM-0488 (1998), JM-0968 (1988), JH-0070 (1973).

Board members are also immune from federal claims unless their conduct violates clearly established rights of which reasonable person would have known. *Harlow v. Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S. 800 (1982). As supervisory officials, board members may be considered liable for the acts or omissions of subordinates only if: (1) the board members learned of facts or a pattern of behavior by a subordinate pointing plainly toward the conclusion that the subordinate was
depriving someone of federal rights; (2) the board member demonstrated deliberate
difference toward the individual’s rights by failing to take action that was obviously necessary
to prevent or stop the deprivation; and (3) such failure caused injury to the individual. Doe v.
Taylor Indep. Sch. Dist., 15 F.3d 443 (5th Cir. 1994) (en banc). If board members do not have
actual knowledge of a violation of rights, or if the board responds in a way calculated to end or
prevent civil rights abuses, board members will not be liable under federal law.

Board members must be cautious to avoid the violation of a variety of state laws that carry
criminal penalties. Examples include:

- Open Meetings Act
- Public Information Act
- Nepotism prohibition
- Conflict of interest disclosure laws
- Purchasing laws
- Prohibitions on gifts and bribes

If a board member is accused of a criminal act, the board member must pay the cost of criminal
defense. If the board member is found not guilty, the rest of the board may vote to reimburse the
board member for the cost of the defense. If, however, the board member is found guilty, the
school district also has the authority to pay attorney’s fees for a board member who sought legal
representation for a criminal investigation that did not result in any criminal charges filed, provided
that the board determines, subject to judicial review, that the payment will serve a public interest
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