



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 14, 2015

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

OR2015-07220

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# 559858 (ORR# 13724).

The Dallas Independent School District (the "district") received a request for the employment records of a named employee of the district and information relating to a specified incident involving the named employee. The district states it will release some of the requested information. The district claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.135 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions the district claims 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

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>.

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”); *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). The district has 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 the district’s 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 of the Government Code encompasses section 21.355 of the Education Code, which provides, in relevant part, “[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). The Third Court of Appeals 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.” *Abbott v. North East Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 212 S.W.3d 364 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.). 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* ORD 643 at 4.

We note the information we have marked consists of evaluations of a teacher by the district. The district states the teacher at issue held a teaching certificate under chapter 21 of the Education Code and was engaged in the process of teaching at the time of the evaluations. Accordingly, 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.

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

- (a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act], 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.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a); *see id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of chapter 261), 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). The district claims the information it has indicated 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). The district states the information at issue was obtained from the Dallas Police Department (“DPD”), the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (“DFPS”), or the district’s police department (the “department”). The district also states the district has on staff an employee who is shared with DFPS to receive and investigate child abuse claims. We are unable to determine, however, whether the submitted reporting form was produced to DPD, DFPS, or the department. Accordingly, we rule in the alternative. To the extent the reporting form was produced to DPD, DFPS, or the department, we find this information consists of information used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse under chapter 261 and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a)(2) of the Family Code.

To the extent the reporting form was not produced to DPD, DFPS, or the department, then this information does not consist of information used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse under chapter 261 of the Family Code and may not be withheld on the basis of section 261.201(a)(2). In this instance, however, we find portions of the reporting form, which we have marked, consist of the identifying information of persons who reported alleged or suspected abuse or neglect to Child Protective Services. We find the information we have marked in the reporting form is within the scope of section 261.201(a)(1) of the Family Code. Therefore, the district must withhold the information we have marked in the reporting form under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a)(1) of the Family Code.² However, 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.

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the [GB]’s remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 261.101 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 consists of the identifying information of an individual who made a report under chapter 261 of the Family Code. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.101 of the Family Code.

Section 552.135 of the Government Code provides the following:

- (a) “Informer” means a student or former student or an employee or former employee of a school district who has furnished a report of another person’s 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].

Gov’t Code § 552.135. 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 the 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, individuals who provide information in the course of the investigation, but do not report a violation of law are not informants for purposes of section 552.135 of the Government Code.

The district claims the remaining information reveals the identity of an informer who reported possible violations of criminal and civil laws. Upon review, we find the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.135 of the Government Code. However, we find the district has not demonstrated the remaining information identifies an informer for the purposes of section 552.135. Therefore, we find the district may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.135 of the Government Code.

In summary, 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 reporting form was produced to DPD, DFPS, or the department, the district must withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a)(2) of the Family Code. To the extent the reporting form was not produced to DPD, DFPS, or the department, the district must withhold the information we have marked in the reporting form under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a)(1) of the Family Code. The district must

withhold the information we have marked under section 552.135 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,



David L. Wheelus
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DLW/bhf

Ref: ID# 559858

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)