



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 10, 2015

Mr. Joseph L. Parks
Executive Director
Safety and Security Services
Plano Independent School District
2700 West 15th Street
Plano, Texas 75075

OR2015-23671

Dear Mr. Parks:

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# 586904.

The Plano Independent School District (the "district") received a request for four categories of information pertaining to the district's baseball program. The district states it will release some information. The district states it has redacted some information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), 20 U.S.C. § 1232g.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government

¹The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") 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. The DOE has determined FERPA determinations must be made by the educational authority in possession of the educational records. We have posted a copy of the letter from the DOE on the Attorney General's website at <http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

Code.² We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed 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 that “[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential.” Educ. Code § 21.355. 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.” *Abbott v. North East Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 212 S.W.3d 364 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.). 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, we concluded that a teacher is someone who is required to hold and does hold a certificate or permit required under chapter 21 of the Education Code and is teaching at the time of his or her evaluation. *Id.* We also have determined that for purposes of section 21.355, “administrator” 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 of an administrator, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. *Id.*

You claim the submitted information constitutes an evaluation of a teacher that is confidential under section 21.355 of the Education Code. You state the individual at issue held the appropriate certificate at the time of the evaluation. However, upon review, we find the submitted information pertains to the employee at issue in his capacity as a coach. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the information at issue constitutes an evaluation of the performance of a teacher or an administrator for the purposes of section 21.355 of the Education Code. *See* Educ. Code § 21.353 (teachers shall be appraised only on basis of classroom teaching performance and not in connection with extracurricular activities). Therefore, the district may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code. As the district does not raise another exception to disclosure, the district must release the submitted 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.

²You acknowledge, and we agree, the district did not comply with the requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(b), (e). Nevertheless, section 552.101 of the Government Code is a mandatory exception that can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness caused by a failure to comply with section 552.301. *See id.* §§ 552.007, .302. Thus, we will consider the district’s claim under section 552.101.

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,



Lee Seidlits
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CLS/som

Ref: ID# 586904

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)