



OFFICE of the ATTORNEY GENERAL
GREG ABBOTT

March 28, 2003

Ms. Dianna D. Wojcik
Bracewell & Patterson, L.L.P.
500 N. Akard Street, Suite 4000
Dallas, Texas 75201-3387

OR2003-2116

Dear Ms. Wojcik:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 178535.

The Hurst-Eules-Bedford Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for five categories of information related to a named teacher at a district school. You advise that you have released some of the requested information. You further advise that the district does not possess information responsive to one of the requested categories of information.¹ You claim that the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.026, 552.101, 552.102, 552.114, and 552.135 of the Government Code, and under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 ("FERPA"). We have considered the exceptions you claim and have reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered written comments submitted by the individual who is the subject of the request for information. See Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that member of public may submit written comments stating why information at issue in request for attorney general decision should or should not be released).

We first note that you have redacted some information within the submitted documents pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 ("FERPA"). FERPA provides that no federal funds will be made available under any applicable program to an educational agency or institution that releases personally identifiable information (other than directory information) contained in a student's education records to anyone but certain enumerated federal, state, and local officials and institutions, unless otherwise authorized by

¹ The Public Information Act does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist at the time the request was received. *Economic Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.--San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision No. 452 at 3 (1986).

the student's parent. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(b)(1). "Education records" means those records that contain information directly related to a student and are maintained by an educational agency or institution or by a person acting for such agency or institution. *Id.* § 1232g(a)(4)(A). This office generally applies the same analysis under section 552.114 and FERPA. Open Records Decision No. 539 (1990).

Section 552.114 excepts from disclosure student records at an educational institution funded completely or in part by state revenue. Section 552.026 provides as follows:

This chapter does not require the release of information contained in education records of an educational agency or institution, except in conformity with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, Sec. 513, Pub. L. No. 93-380, 20 U.S.C. Sec. 1232g.

In Open Records Decision No. 634 (1995), this office concluded that (1) an educational agency or institution may withhold from public disclosure information that is protected by FERPA and excepted from required public disclosure by sections 552.026 and 552.101 without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision as to those exceptions, and (2) an educational agency or institution that is state-funded may withhold from public disclosure information that is excepted from required public disclosure by section 552.114 as a "student record," insofar as the "student record" is protected by FERPA, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision as to that exception. Information must be withheld from required public disclosure under FERPA only to the extent "reasonable and necessary to avoid personally identifying a particular student." *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 332 (1982), 206 (1978). This includes information that directly identifies a student, as well as information that, if released, would allow the student's identity to be easily traced. *See* Open Records Decision No. 224 (1979) (finding student's handwritten comments making identity of student easily traceable through handwriting, style of expression, or particular incidents related in comments protected under FERPA).

Thus, we agree that, to the extent the information you have redacted identifies particular students, it must not be disclosed unless the district has authority to release the information under the federal law. Such identifying information contained in the submitted audiotapes must likewise be redacted. Further, the district must withhold the handwritten statements of students in their entirety, as well as some additional information, in order to avoid identifying particular students. We have marked the types of information that must be withheld under FERPA. As all of the information identifying students is subject to FERPA and section 552.114 of the Government Code, we need not address your claim for this information section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege, or under section 552.135.

You claim that responsive information is excepted under sections 552.101 and 552.102. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law,

either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” This section encompasses information protected by common-law privacy and excepts from disclosure private facts about an individual. *See id.* Section 552.102 excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.--Austin 1983, writ ref’d n.r.e.), the court ruled that the test to be applied to information claimed to be protected under section 552.102 is the same as the test formulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common-law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101 of the Government Code. Accordingly, we address your section 552.101 and section 552.102 claims together.

Information must be withheld from the public under common-law privacy when (1) it is highly intimate and embarrassing such that its release would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities, and (2) there is no legitimate public interest in its disclosure. *See Industrial Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 611 at 1 (1992). In *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App. – El Paso 1992, writ denied), the court applied the common-law right to privacy addressed in *Industrial Foundation* to an investigation of alleged sexual harassment. The investigation files at issue in *Ellen* contained third-party witness statements, an affidavit in which the individual accused of the misconduct responded to the allegations, and the conclusions of the board of inquiry that conducted the investigation. *See* 840 S.W.2d at 525. The court upheld the release of the affidavit of the person under investigation and the conclusions of the board of inquiry, stating that the disclosure of such documents sufficiently served the public’s interest in the matter. *Id.* The court further held, however, that “the public does not possess a legitimate interest in the identities of the individual witnesses, nor the details of their personal statements beyond what is contained in the documents that have been ordered released.” *Id.*

Thus, if there is an adequate summary of an investigation of alleged sexual harassment, the summary must be released under *Ellen*, but the identities of the victims and witnesses must be redacted, and their detailed statements must be withheld from disclosure. *See also* Open Records Decision Nos. 393 (1983), 339 (1982). If no adequate summary of the investigation exists, all of the information relating to the investigation ordinarily must be released, with the exception of information that would tend to identify the victims and witnesses. In either case, the identity of the individual accused of sexual harassment is not protected from disclosure. Common-law privacy does not protect information about a public employee’s alleged misconduct on the job or complaints made about a public employee’s job performance. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 438 (1986), 405 (1983), 230 (1979), 219 (1978).

You indicate that the submitted information relates to an investigation that was prompted in part by allegations of sexual harassment. However, we find that there is no adequate summary of the investigation. Thus, with the exception of the student identifying

information that must be withheld under FERPA, the district may not withhold the statements regarding the allegations of sexual harassment pursuant to the holding in *Ellen*. Because all of the information identifying alleged victims and witnesses is subject to FERPA and may not be released, there is no additional information that may be withheld under *Ellen*. See *Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525 (identifying information of victims and witnesses to alleged sexual harassment is protected by doctrine of common-law privacy).

However, there is some information not pertaining to alleged victims or witnesses that is protected as private. The types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. This office has also found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy: some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses; see Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps), and personal financial information pertaining to voluntary financial decisions and financial transactions that do not involve public funds, see Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990).

Further, constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy" which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common-law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5 (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)).

On the other hand, a public employee's job performance does not generally constitute his or her private affairs. Open Records Decision No. 470 (1987); see Open Records Decision Nos. 329 at 2 (1982) (information relating to complaints against public employees and discipline resulting therefrom is not protected under former section 552.101 or 552.102), 208 at 2 (1978) (information relating to complaint against public employee and disposition of complaint is not protected under either constitutional or common-law right of privacy). See also Open Records Decision No. 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has genuine interest in information concerning public employee's job performance and reasons for dismissal, demotion or promotion). We have marked the information that must be withheld under sections 552.101 and 552.102 in conjunction with privacy rights.

You also contend that one of the submitted documents is confidential under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code. Section 552.101 also encompasses information protected by other statutes. Section 21.355 of the Education Code provides, "A document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential." This office interpreted this section to apply to any document that evaluates, as that term is commonly understood, the performance of a teacher or administrator. Open Records Decision No. 643 (1996). In that opinion, this office also concluded that an administrator is someone who is required to hold and does hold a certificate required under chapter 21 of the Education Code and is administering at the time of his or her evaluation. *Id.* After reviewing the information at issue, we find that it does not constitute a teacher evaluation for the purpose of section 21.355 of the Education Code. Therefore, the district may not withhold this information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code.

However, portions of the submitted information may be excepted from disclosure under section 552.117. Section 552.117(1) excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024. Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117 must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, if the district employee whose personal information is at issue elected under section 552.024, prior to the district's receipt of the request, to keep this information confidential, you must withhold it under section 552.117(1) of the Government Code. You may not withhold this information under section 552.117 if the employee did not make a timely election under section 552.024. We have marked the information that you must withhold if section 552.117 applies.

In summary, all information identifying students must be withheld under FERPA and section 552.114 of the Government Code. We have marked information that must be withheld under sections 552.101 and 552.102 in conjunction with privacy rights. We have marked the information that must be withheld under section 552.117 if the district employee made a timely election under section 552.024. The remaining information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days.

Id. § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Kristen Bates
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KAB/lmt

Ref: ID# 178535

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Paula Caballero
Education Reporter
Star-Telegram, Northeast
3201 Airport Freeway, Ste. 108
Bedford, Texas 76022
(w/o enclosures)