



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 13, 2015

Mr. John A. Kazen
Counsel for the Laredo Independent School District
Kazen, Meurer, & Perez, L.L.P.
211 Calle Del Norte, Suite 100
Laredo, Texas 78041

OR2015-07048

Dear Mr. Kazen:

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# 559788.

The Laredo Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for all documents and e-mails in a specified district employee's personnel file pertaining to his proposed termination. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.114, and 552.135 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the privacy interests of a third party. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified an interested party of the request for information and of his right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit written comments regarding why information should or should not be released). We have received comments from the interested party's attorney. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office 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”). In this instance, you have submitted redacted and unredacted education records for our review and assert FERPA applies to portions of the submitted information. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing these records to determine the applicability of FERPA, we will not address its applicability to any of the information at issue. Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the district. Likewise, we do not address your argument under section 552.114 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code §§ 552.026 (incorporating FERPA into Act), .114 (excepting from disclosure “student records”); Open Records Decision No. 539 (1990) (determining same analysis applies under section 552.114 of Government Code and FERPA). However, we will address your remaining arguments against disclosure of the responsive 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 information protected by other statutes, such as 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). We note the district is not an agency authorized to conduct an investigation under chapter 261 of the Family

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>.

Code. *See id.* § 261.103 (listing agencies that may conduct child abuse investigations). However, upon review, we find the information we have marked consists of information used or developed in investigations of alleged child abuse by the district's police department and the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services. Accordingly, the information we have marked is within the scope of section 261.201(a)(1) of the Family Code. Therefore, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a)(1) of the Family Code.²

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. We note this office has found the public has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employees and their conduct in the workplace. *See, e.g.*, 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 at 4 (1987) (job performance does not generally constitute public employee's private affairs), 444 at 3 (1986) (public has obvious interest in information concerning qualifications and performance of government employees), 405 at 2 (1983) (manner in which public employee's job was performed cannot be said to be of minimal public interest). Additionally, this office has found that common-law privacy generally protects the identifying information of juvenile victims of abuse or neglect. *See* Open Records Decision No. 394 (1983); *cf.* Fam. Code § 261.201. Upon review, we find some of the remaining information identifies juvenile victims of abuse or neglect. Accordingly, the district must withhold the identifying information of the juvenile victims of abuse or neglect, including the victims' names, initials, telephone numbers, and names of the parents of the juvenile victims in the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, upon review, we find no portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 on the basis of common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 21.355 of the Education Code, which provides, "[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential." Educ. Code § 21.355. This office has interpreted this section to apply to any document that evaluates, as that term is commonly understood, the

²As our ruling on this information is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against its disclosure.

performance of a teacher or administrator. Open Records Decision No. 643 (1996). In that opinion, this office also concluded a teacher is someone who is required to hold and does hold a certificate required under chapter 21 of the Education Code and is teaching at the time of his or her evaluation. *Id.* In addition, the court has concluded a written reprimand constitutes an evaluation for purposes of section 21.355 because “it reflects the principal’s judgment regarding [a teacher’s] actions, gives corrective direction, and provides for further review.” *See Abbott v. North East Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 212 S.W.3d 364 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.).

Upon review, we find the information we have marked consists of “document[s] evaluating the performance of a teacher” as contemplated by section 21.355. *See* Educ. Code § 21.355(a). Therefore, provided the teacher was required to hold and did hold the appropriate certificate and was teaching at the time of the evaluations at issue, the information we have marked is confidential under section 21.355 and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code. However, if the teacher did not hold the appropriate certificate or was not teaching at the time of the evaluations at issue, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 on the basis of section 21.355.

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 argue the submitted information identifies district employees who reported an alleged violation of criminal and civil laws, as well as district policy. Based on your representation and our review, we conclude the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.135 of the Government Code. However, we find the district has failed to demonstrate how any of the remaining submitted information at issue reveals the identity of an informer who reported a possible violation of civil, criminal, or regulatory law for the purposes of section 552.135 of the Government Code. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the remaining submitted information on that ground.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the common-law informer's privilege, which Texas courts have long recognized. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). The informer's privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority. *See* Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2 (1978). The informer's privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to "administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres." Open Records Decision No. 279 at 1-2 (1981) (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (J. McNaughton Rev. Ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4 (1988). However, individuals who provide information in the course of an investigation but do not make the initial report of the violation are not informants for the purposes of claiming the informer's privilege. The privilege excepts the informer's statement only to the extent necessary to protect that informer's identity. Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990). We note the privilege is not intended to protect the identities of public officials and employees who have a duty to report violations of the law. Because a public employee acts within the scope of his employment when filing a complaint, the informer's privilege does not protect the public employee's identity. *Cf. United States v. St. Regis Paper Co.*, 328 F. Supp. 660,665 (W.D. Wis. 1971) (concluding public officer may not claim informer's reward for service it is his or her official duty to perform).

You contend portions of the remaining submitted information identify complainants who reported possible violations of law to the district. Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated how any of the remaining submitted information identifies any individual who

made a report of a violation of law for purposes of the informer's privilege. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the remaining submitted information under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the 1990 amendments to the federal Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I), which make confidential social security numbers and related records that are obtained and maintained by a state agency or political subdivision of the state pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990. *See* Open Records Decision No. 622 (1994). We note, however, the remaining information does not contain any social security numbers. Consequently, you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 405 of title 42 of the United States Code to the remaining submitted information, and the district may not withhold any of it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

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 Texas 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 the district must withhold the dates of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. However, we find no portion of the remaining information is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information on that basis.

We note some of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, 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 of the Government Code, except as provided by section 552.024(a-1).³ *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.117(a)(1), .024.

³The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Section 552.024(a-1) of the Government Code provides, "A school district may not require 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. 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 be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee or official 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. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee or official who did not timely request under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. Therefore, to the extent the employees at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, to the extent the employees at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the district may not withhold the information under section 552.117(a)(1).

In summary, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. The district must withhold the name, home address and telephone number, student identification number, and names of the parents of the juvenile victim in the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code to the extent the individual at issue held the appropriate certificate under chapter 21 at the time the information at issue was created. The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.135 of the Government Code. The district must withhold the dates of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code to the extent the employees at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code. The district must release the remaining information.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at 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,



Abigail T. Adams
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ATA/akg

Ref: ID# 559788

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Julissa Herrera
Help Center Attorney
Texas State Teachers Association
316 West Twelfth Street
Austin, Texas 78701-1815
(w/o enclosures)