



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 20, 2014

Mr. Robert Viña
Counsel for Rio Hondo Independent School District
Walsh, Anderson, Gallegos, Green and Treviño, P.C.
105 East 3rd Street
Weslaco, Texas 78596

OR2014-21132

Dear Mr. Viña:

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# 544808.

The Rio Hondo Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, 552.108, 552.111, and 552.152 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim 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 Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), 20 U.S.C. § 1232g, does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act.¹ 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").

¹A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website: <http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

We note the submitted incident report was obtained or created by the district's police department (the "department") and is maintained by the department for a law enforcement purpose. FERPA is not applicable to records that were created by a law enforcement unit of an educational agency or institution for a law enforcement purpose and that are maintained by the law enforcement unit. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(4)(B)(i); 34 C.F.R. §§ 99.3, .8. Thus, this information is not encompassed by FERPA. You do not indicate, however, whether the remaining information is maintained exclusively by the department. Therefore, to the extent the remaining information is maintained by a component of the district other than the department, such records are subject to FERPA. We note this information is unredacted.² Because our office is prohibited from reviewing education records to determine whether appropriate redactions under FERPA have been made, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to the information at issue. Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of such records. However, we will consider your arguments against disclosure of the submitted information.

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 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. A compilation of an individual's criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. U.S. Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (finding significant privacy interest in compilation of individual's criminal history by recognizing distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of criminal history information). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. We note, however, the public generally has a legitimate interest in information relating to public employment and public employees. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (1990) (personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs, but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern), 470 (1987) (public employee's job performance does not generally constitute employee's private affairs), 444 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employee), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow).

²In the future, if the district does not obtain parental consent to submit unredacted education records and the district seeks a ruling from this office on the proper redaction of those education records in compliance with FERPA, we will rule accordingly.

Upon review, we find the present request does not seek a compilation of an individual's criminal history; rather, the request is for information pertaining to a specified incident. Such a request does not implicate an individual's common-law right to privacy. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information as criminal history compilation under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 261.201 of the Family Code. Section 261.201 provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

(1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and

(2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

...

(k) Notwithstanding Subsection (a), an investigating agency, other than the [Texas Department of Family and Protective Services] or the Texas Youth Commission, on request, shall provide to the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child who is the subject of reported abuse or neglect, or to the child if the child is at least 18 years of age, information concerning the reported abuse or neglect that would otherwise be confidential under this section. The investigating agency shall withhold information under this subsection if the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of the child requesting the information is alleged to have committed the abuse or neglect.

(l) Before a child or a parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child may inspect or copy a record or file concerning the child under Subsection (k), the custodian of the record or file must redact:

...

(2) any information that is excepted from required disclosure under [the Act], or other law.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a), (k), (l)(2). Upon review, we find the submitted information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse under chapter 261 of the Family Code by the department. *See id.* §§ 261.001 (defining “abuse” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code), 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of this section as person under 18 years of age who is not and has not been married or who has not had the disabilities of minority removed for general purposes). Thus, the submitted information is generally confidential under section 261.201(a) of the Family Code. We note, however, the requestor may be a parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of the child victim. Furthermore, the requestor is not alleged to have committed the alleged or suspected abuse. Accordingly, we must rule conditionally. If the requestor is not a parent, managing conservator, or legal representative of the child victim, then the district must withhold the submitted information in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code. If the requestor is a parent, managing conservator, or legal representative of the child victim, then the district may not withhold the submitted information from the requestor under section 261.201(a). *Id.* § 261.201(k). In that event, section 261.201(l)(2) states any information that is excepted from required disclosure under the Act or other law may still be withheld from disclosure. *Id.* § 261.201(l)(2). Thus, we will address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state, and provide an affidavit demonstrating, the submitted information pertains to an open criminal investigation by the department. Based on your representation, we conclude the release of the submitted information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Therefore, we agree that section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the submitted information.

However, we note section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about a crime. Gov’t Code § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. 531 S.W.2d at 186–87. Thus, with the exception of basic

information, the district may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.³

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 21.355 of the Education Code. Section 21.355 provides, in relevant part, as follows:

(a) 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.

You contend the basic information evaluates the performance of a certified educator and is, therefore, exempt from disclosure. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate how any of the basic information constitutes an evaluation for the purposes of section 21.355 of the Education Code. Therefore, the district may not withhold the basic information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code.

You argue the basic information is confidential under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-part test discussed above. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Upon review, we find none of the basic information is highly intimate or embarrassing information of no legitimate public interest, and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy. 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.

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information, except to note basic information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle* is generally not excepted from public disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Open Records Decision No. 597 (1991).

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)). After review of the basic information, we find you have failed to demonstrate how any portion of the basic information falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the basic information under section 552.101 on the basis of constitutional privacy.

Next, we address your argument under section 552.102 of the Government Code. Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code 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). We understand you to assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101 of the Government Code. As previously mentioned, common-law privacy protects information if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court of appeals ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court has expressly disagreed with *Hubert's* interpretation of section 552.102(a) and held the privacy standard under section 552.102(a) differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. *See Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). The supreme court also considered the applicability of section 552.102(a) and held it excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *See id.* at 348. Upon review, we find none of the basic information is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the district may not withhold any of the basic information on that basis.

You assert section 552.111 of the Government Code for the basic information. Section 552.111 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 that

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. 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. *Id.*; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). 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). Additionally, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure purely factual information that is severable from the opinion portions of internal memoranda. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); ORD 615 at 4-5. 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 at issue consists of “communications of [d]istrict employees regarding confidential matters not intended for release to the general public.” As previously stated, the deliberative process privilege only excepts communications pertaining to administrative and personnel matters of a broad scope that affect a governmental body's policy mission. *See* ORD 631 at 3. Upon review, we find the information at issue does not constitute advice, opinions, recommendations, or other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the district, and the basic information is purely factual in nature. Therefore, you have failed to demonstrate how the deliberative process privilege applies to the basic information. Accordingly, you may not withhold the basic information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.152 of the Government Code provides:

Information in the custody of a governmental body that relates to an employee or officer of the governmental body is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if, under the specific circumstances pertaining to the employee or officer, disclosure of the information would subject the employee or officer to a substantial threat of physical harm.

Gov't Code § 552.152. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate release of any of the basic information would subject any individual to a substantial threat of physical harm. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the basic information under section 552.152 of the Government Code.

In summary, if the requestor is not a parent, managing conservator, or legal representative of the child victim, then the district must withhold the submitted information in its entirety

under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code. If the requestor is a parent, managing conservator, or legal representative of the child victim, then, with the exception of basic information, the district may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

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 http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Paige Thompson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PT/dls

Ref: ID# 544808

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)