



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 14, 2016

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

OR2016-08388

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# 605892.

The Frisco Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for any student/parent grievances filed against a named employee and any documents related to the investigation into that employee. The district claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception the district claims and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

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

---

<sup>1</sup>We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. See Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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”); *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 redacted and 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.

Next, we note some of the requested information may have been the subject of a previous request for information, in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2016-06615 (2016). In Open Records Letter No. 2016-06615, we determined: (1) to the extent the submitted information is identical to the information previously submitted and ruled on by this office, the district must withhold or release the information in accordance with Open Records Letter Nos. 2016-03905 (2016) and 2016-04022 (2016); (2) the district must withhold the marked information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; (3) if the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality pursuant to section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body, the district must withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; and (4) the district must release the remaining information. We have no indication the law, facts, or circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have changed. Accordingly, to the extent the requested information is identical to the information previously ruled on by this office, we conclude the district must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2016-06615 as a previous determination and withhold or release the information in accordance with that ruling. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 at 6-7 (2001) (discussing criteria for first type of previous determination). To the extent the requested information is not subject to that ruling, we will address the arguments against release 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

---

<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>.

Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as 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. 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.*

You claim the information at issue 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. Based on your representations and our review, we find the information we have marked constitutes evaluations of a teacher as contemplated by section 21.355. 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.<sup>3</sup> However, we find the remaining information evaluates the individual at issue in his capacity as a coach. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information constitutes an evaluation of the performance of a teacher 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 remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 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. However, information pertaining to the work conduct and job performance of public employees is subject to a legitimate public interest and therefore generally not protected from disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has interest in public employee’s qualifications and performance and the circumstances of public employee’s resignation or termination), 423 at 2 (1984).

In *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied), the court addressed the applicability of common-law privacy to information relating to an investigation

---

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

of alleged sexual harassment. The investigation files in *Ellen* contained individual witness statements, an affidavit by the individual accused of the misconduct responding to the allegations, and conclusions of the board of inquiry that conducted the investigation. *See* 840 S.W.2d at 525. The court ordered the release of the affidavit of the person under investigation and the conclusions of the board of inquiry, stating the public's interest was sufficiently served by the disclosure of such documents. *Id.* The *Ellen* court held "the public did not possess a legitimate interest in the identities of the individual witnesses, nor the details of their personal statements beyond what is contained in the documents that have been ordered released." *Id.*

In this instance, the district has not demonstrated, nor does our review of the submitted information indicate, the information at issue relates to a sexual harassment investigation. Thus, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*. Further, upon review, we find the district has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Therefore, the district may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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 that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code, except as provided by section 552.024(a-1).<sup>4</sup> *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). 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. Section 552.117(a)(1) also applies to the personal cellular telephone number of a current or former official or employee of a governmental body, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988). 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). Accordingly, 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

---

<sup>4</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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, if the employee whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body, the district must withhold the cellular telephone number we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, if the employee at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024 or the cellular telephone service is paid for by a governmental body, the district may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.117(a)(1).

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). Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c) of the Government Code. Accordingly, the district must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner of the e-mail address affirmatively consents to its disclosure.

In summary, to the extent the requested information is identical to the information previously submitted and ruled on by this office, the district must withhold or release the information in accordance with Open Records Letter No. 2016-06615. 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. The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. If the employee whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body, the district must withhold the cellular telephone number we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner of the e-mail address affirmatively consents to its disclosure. 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](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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Meredith L. Coffman', with a long, sweeping flourish extending to the right.

Merédith L. Coffman  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MLC/bw

Ref: ID# 605892

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)