



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 16, 2015

Ms. Lauren M. Wood
Counsel for the Plano Independent School District
Abernathy, Roeder, Boyd & Joplin, P.C.
P.O.Box 1210
McKinney, Texas 75070-1210

OR2015-11850

Dear Ms. Wood:

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# 567535.

The Plano Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received two requests for the personnel files of named individuals.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, and 552.117 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the requestor has agreed to exclude e-mail addresses, "witness identifying information, confidential student and personnel information, and attorney/client communications" from the scope of her requests. Accordingly, these types of information are not responsive to the present requests. This ruling does not address the public availability

¹You state, and provide documentation showing, the district asked for and received clarification of the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b)(providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify the request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

of non-responsive information, and the district need not release it in response to these requests.

Next, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information includes completed evaluations that are subject to subsection 552.022(a)(1). The district must release the completed evaluations pursuant to subsection 552.022(a)(1) unless they are excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or are made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* You seek to withhold the information subject to subsection 552.022(a)(1) under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, section 552.103 is a discretionary exception and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.–Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive Gov't Code § 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the evaluations may not be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code. As section 552.101 makes information confidential under the Act, we will consider your arguments under this exception for the information at issue. We will also consider your argument under section 552.103 for the information that is not subject to section 552.022.

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 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 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 Open Records Decision No. 643, we determined an “administrator” for purposes of section 21.355 means a person who is required to, and does in fact, hold an administrator's certificate under subchapter B of chapter 21 of the Education Code, and is performing the functions as an administrator, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation.

See ORD 643. 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 submitted information includes evaluations of teachers and an administrator. You have submitted documentation reflecting the teachers and administrator at issue held the appropriate certifications at the time of the evaluations. Based on our review, we find the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 21.355 in conjunction with section 552.101 of the Government Code. However, upon review, we find the remaining information at issue does not constitute an evaluation for purposes of section 21.355. Thus, we conclude the remaining information at issue is not confidential under section 21.355 of the Education Code. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part, as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person’s office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov’t Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show section 552.103(a) is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, *writ ref’d n.r.e.*); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551.

To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Concrete evidence to support a claim litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body’s receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. *See* Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, or when an individual threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 346 (1982), 288 (1981). On the other hand, this office has determined if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

The district claims the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The district asserts it reasonably anticipated litigation regarding this matter because the district received a letter from an attorney stating he represents an individual involved in a specified incident. Further, the district states, and provides supporting documentation demonstrating, the letter directs the district to preserve evidence related to the incident at issue. However, we note the district received the letter after the date it received the first request for information. Accordingly, we find the district has failed to demonstrate it reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the first request for information. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the remaining responsive information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 21.048 of the Education Code, which addresses teacher certification examinations. Section 21.048(c-1) provides the following:

The results of an examination administered under this section are confidential and are not subject to disclosure under Chapter 552, Government Code, unless:

- (1) the disclosure is regarding notification to a parent of the assignment of an uncertified teacher to a classroom as required by Section 21.057; or
- (2) the educator has failed the examination more than five times.

Educ. Code § 21.048(c-1). Upon review, we find the information we marked consists of or reveals teacher certification examination results. We note subsections 21.048(c-1)(1) and (2) are not applicable in this instance. Therefore, the district must withhold the information we marked pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.048(c-1) of the Education Code.

Section 552.101 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. This office has stated in numerous opinions the work behavior of a public employee and the conditions for the employee's continued employment are generally matters of legitimate public interest not protected by the common-law right of privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 438 (1986), 405 at 2-3 (1983) (public has interest in manner in which public employee performs his job). 329 at 2 (1982) (information relating to complaints against public employees and discipline resulting therefrom is not protected under former section 552.101). 208 at 2 (1978) (information relating to complaint against public employee and disposition of the complaint is not protected under either the constitutional or common-law right of privacy).

Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 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 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 marked dates of birth

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.

Section 552.102(b) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “a transcript from an institution of higher education maintained in the personnel file of a professional public school employee[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.102(b). This exception further provides, however, “the degree obtained or the curriculum on a transcript in the personnel file of the employee” are not excepted from disclosure. *Id.* Upon review, we find the district must withhold the educational transcripts we have marked under section 552.102(b) of the Government Code, except for the information that reveals the employee’s name, the degree obtained, and the courses taken. *See* Open Records Decision No. 526 (1989) (addressing statutory predecessor).

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code 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 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 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). 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). 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 piece of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, a governmental body must withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee only if the individual made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for the information was made. Accordingly, to the extent the employees whose information is at issue timely elected to keep their information confidential pursuant to section 552.024, the district must withhold the information at issue, a representative sample of which we have marked, under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. However, the district may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers if a governmental body did not pay for the service. To the extent the individuals at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the district may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or a personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release.² Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Upon review, we find the district must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.147(a-1) of the Government Code provides, "The social security number of an employee of a school district in the custody of the district is confidential." *Id.* § 552.147(a-1). Thus, section 552.147(a-1) makes the social security numbers of school district employees confidential, without such employees being required to first make a confidentiality election under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *Id.* § 552.024(a-1) (school district may not require employee or former employee of district to choose whether to allow public access to employee's or former employee's social security number). Reading sections 552.024(a-1) and 552.147(a-1) together, we conclude section 552.147(a-1) makes confidential the social security numbers of both current and former school district employees. Accordingly, the district must withhold the social security numbers of district employees contained in the remaining responsive information under section 552.147(a-1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 21.355 of the Education Code in conjunction with section 552.101 of the Government Code. The district must withhold the information we marked pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.048(c-1) of the Education Code. The district must withhold the dates of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code and the educational transcripts we have marked under section 552.102(b) of the Government Code, except for the information that reveals the employee's name, the degree obtained, and the courses taken. To the extent the individuals 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. However, the district may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers if a governmental body did not pay for the service. The district must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The district must withhold the social security numbers of district employees contained in the remaining responsive information under section 552.147(a-1) of the Government Code. The remaining responsive information must be released.

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).

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 Lay
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PL/bhf

Ref: ID# 567535

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)