



February 18, 2015

Ms. Leticia D. McGowan
School Attorney
Dallas Independent School District
3700 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75204

OR2015-03191

Dear Ms. McGowan:

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# 554555 (ORR# 13618).

The Dallas Independent School District (the "district") received a request for the report that led to the recommendation of the requestor's termination. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, and 552.135 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 has informed this office the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code, does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental or an adult student's 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

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

disclosed. *See* 34 C.F.R. § 99.3 (defining “personally identifiable information”); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 224 (1979) (student’s handwritten comments protected under FERPA because they would make identity of student easily traceable through handwriting, style of expression, or particular incidents related in the comments). You have submitted unredacted education records for our review. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing these education records to determine whether appropriate redactions under FERPA have been made, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to any of the submitted records. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(1)(A). Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. However, we will consider your arguments against disclosure of the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts 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 section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in 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 [chapter 261 of the Family Code] 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 [chapter 261 of the Family Code] or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a); *see also id.* §§ 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), 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of Family Code ch. 261). You argue the submitted information is confidential under section 261.201. We note the district is not an agency authorized to conduct an investigation under chapter 261 of the Family Code. *See id.* § 261.103 (listing agencies that may conduct child abuse investigations). You state the information was obtained from the Dallas Police Department, the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (“DFPS”), or the district’s police department (the “department”). You also state the district has on staff an employee who is shared with DFPS to receive and investigate child abuse claims. Upon review, we find portions of the submitted information consist of reports of alleged or suspected child abuse made to DFPS and contain the identity of an individual making such a report. Further, we find some of the

remaining information consists of files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, or working papers used or developed by DFPS under chapter 261 of the Family Code. Therefore, the information at issue, which we have marked, is confidential under section 261.201(a) of the Family Code, and the district must withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code. The remaining information, however, was not obtained from the Dallas Police Department, DFPS, or the department, but instead relates to an administrative investigation by the district. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse, consists of a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect under chapter 261 of the Family Code, or reveals the identity of an individual who made a report of alleged or suspected child abuse to DFPS. Therefore, none of the remaining information is confidential under section 261.201 of the Family Code, and none of it may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 261.101(d) of the Family Code, which provides the identity of an individual making a report under chapter 261 is confidential. *See id.* § 261.101(d). As noted above, the district is not an agency authorized to conduct a chapter 261 investigation. *See id.* § 261.103 (listing agencies that may conduct child abuse investigations). Upon review, we find none of the remaining information contains the identifying information of an individual who made a report under chapter 261 of the Family Code. Thus, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 261.101(d).

You also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied). 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. 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 established. *Id.* at 681-82. In *Ellen*, the court addressed the applicability of the common-law privacy doctrine to files of an investigation of allegations of sexual harassment. We note, however, the ruling in *Ellen* was applicable to investigations involving workplace harassment. The information at issue relates to allegations of sexual harassment of district students. Upon review, we find this information does not constitute a sexual harassment investigation in the employment context of the district for purposes of *Ellen*. Accordingly, we conclude the ruling in *Ellen* is not applicable in this situation, and the district may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Some of the remaining information is protected 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. We find the identity of a victim of child abuse or neglect is private. *Cf.* Fam. Code § 261.201. Upon review, we find the identifying information of the children who are the subjects of the administrative investigation satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the district must withhold such information, consisting of the children's names, initials, home addresses and telephone numbers, school identification numbers, and parents' names, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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, which is discussed above. *See 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 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. The remaining information includes the requestor's date of birth. Because section 552.102 protects personal privacy, the requestor has a right of access to his own date of birth information under section 552.023 of the Government Code and it may not be withheld from him under section 552.102(a). *See id.* § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person's agent on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Accordingly, the district may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

Some of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code.² Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code, except as provided by section 552.024(a-1). *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.117(a)(1), .024. Section 552.024(a-1) of the Government Code provides, "A school district may not require

²The 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).

an employee or former employee of the district to choose whether to allow public access to the employee's or former employee's social security number." *Id.* § 552.024(a-1). Thus, the district may only withhold under section 552.117 the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of the district who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024. We note section 552.117 is also applicable to personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may only be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. The remaining information contains the cellular telephone number of a district employee. Therefore, if the employee whose cellular telephone number is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service, the district must withhold the information at issue under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, if the employee at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024 or a governmental body pays for the cellular telephone service, the district may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.117(a)(1).

Section 552.135 of the Government Code provides in relevant part the following:

(a) "Informer" means a student or a former student or an employee or former employee of a school district who has furnished a report of another person's or persons' possible violation of criminal, civil, or regulatory law to the school district or the proper regulatory enforcement authority.

(b) An informer's name or information that would substantially reveal the identity of an informer is excepted from [required public disclosure].

(c) Subsection (b) does not apply:

(1) if the informer is a student or former student, and the student or former student, or the legal guardian, or spouse of the student or former student consents to disclosure of the student's or former student's name; or

(2) if the informer is an employee or former employee who consents to disclosure of the employee's or former employee's name; or

(3) if the informer planned, initiated, or participated in the possible violation.

Gov't Code § 552.135(a)-(c). Because the legislature limited the protection of section 552.135 to the identity of a person who reports a possible violation of "law," a school district that seeks to withhold information under that exception must clearly identify to this office the specific civil, criminal, or regulatory law that is alleged to have been violated. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A). Additionally, witnesses and other individuals who provide information in the course of an investigation are not informants for purposes of section 552.135 of the Government Code. You state the remaining information identifies students and employees who reported an alleged violation of criminal and civil laws. Upon review, we find the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.135 of the Government Code. However, the district has failed to demonstrate how any of the remaining information at issue reveals the identity of an informer for the purposes of section 552.135 of the Government Code. Therefore, the district may not withhold the remaining information on that ground.

In summary, the district must withhold (1) the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code; (2) the identifying information of the children who are the subjects of the administrative investigation, consisting of the children's names, initials, home addresses and telephone numbers, school identification numbers, and parents' names, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; (3) the cellular telephone number of a district employee under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code, if the employee whose cellular telephone number is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service; and (4) the information we marked under section 552.135 of the Government Code. The district must release the remaining information.³

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/>

³We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4. Thus, if the district receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the district must again seek a decision from this office.

[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,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Claire Morris Sloan". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal line extending to the right from the end of the name.

Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/som

Ref: ID# 554555

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)