



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 1, 2015

Mr. James R. Raup  
Counsel for Round Rock Independent School District  
McGinnis Lochridge  
600 Congress Avenue, Suite 2100  
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2015-13122

Dear Mr. Raup:

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# 569465.

The Round Rock Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for four categories of information pertaining to a named district employee. You state the district released some information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.117, and 552.137 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have also received and considered comments from a representative of the named district employee. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should or should not be released). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note you have redacted some of the submitted information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the

---

<sup>1</sup>We note the district failed to comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting a ruling; however, sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.117, and 552.137 of the Government Code are mandatory exceptions that constitute compelling reasons to withhold information sufficient to overcome the presumption of openness caused by a failure to comply with section 552.301. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.007, .301, .302, .352. Accordingly, we will consider the district's arguments under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.117, and 552.137.

United States Code. We note, however, the submitted information also contains unredacted education records. We note the United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office has informed this office FERPA 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.<sup>2</sup> 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"). 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 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 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 a teacher. Therefore, provided the teacher was required to hold and did hold the appropriate certificate and was teaching at the time of the evaluations, the evaluations we marked must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code. However, we find none of the remaining information at issue constitutes an evaluation for the purposes of section 21.355 of the Education Code. Therefore, the district may not withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code.

---

<sup>2</sup>A 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>.

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. Upon review, we find none of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing information and 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 552.102(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 remaining information is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the district may not withhold any of the remaining information on that basis.

You state the district redacted information subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code pursuant to section 552.024(c) of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> 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 current or former

---

<sup>3</sup>Section 552.024(c)(2) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact information protected by section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting a decision under the Act if the current or former employee or official to whom the information pertains timely chooses not to allow public access to the information. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.024(c)(2). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with subsections 552.024(c-1) and (c-2). *See id.* § 552.024(c-1)-(c-2).

employees or officials of a governmental body who request this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). 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, a school 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 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. We understand the individual at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Therefore, the district must withhold the information you redacted, and the additional information we marked, under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

You state pursuant to the previous determination in Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), the district redacted personal e-mail addresses subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup> Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body" unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the district must withhold the personal e-mail addresses you redacted, and the additional e-mail address we marked, under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure.

In summary, provided the teacher was required to hold and did hold the appropriate certificate and was teaching at the time of the evaluations, the evaluations we marked must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code. The district must withhold the information you redacted, and the additional information we marked, under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the personal e-mail addresses you redacted, and the additional e-mail address we marked, under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. The district must release the remaining information.

---

<sup>4</sup>Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

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](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# 569465

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Elaine F. Edwards  
Deats, Durst & Owen, P.L.L.C.  
1204 San Antonio Street, Suite 203  
Austin, Texas 78701  
(w/o enclosures)