



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 31, 2016

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

OR2016-12239

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# 615454 (ORR# 15107).

The Dallas Independent School District (the "district") received a request for information pertaining to a named teacher. You state the district will release some responsive information to the requestor. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.135 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim 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 unredacted form, that is, in a form in which "personally identifiable information"

¹A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website at <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/og/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

is disclosed. *See* 34 C.F.R. § 99.3 (defining “personally identifiable information”). 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 exempts 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 information protected by other statutes, such as section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in part:

(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). You claim some of the submitted information 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). You state 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”). You also state the district has on staff an employee who is shared with DFPS to receive and investigate child abuse claims. Upon review, we find the information we have marked was 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. Some of the remaining information was not obtained from DPD, DFPS, or the department, but instead relates to an administrative investigation by the district. We are unable to determine, however, whether the submitted Suspected Child Abuse Reporting Form (the “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 in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a)(2) of the Family Code.

In the event 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 this information is within the scope of section 261.201(a)(1) of the Family Code. Therefore, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a)(1) of the Family Code. However, the remaining information is not confidential under section 261.201 of the Family Code and the district may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

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 552.101 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 also found that common-law privacy generally protects the identifying information of juvenile victims of abuse or neglect. *See* Open Records Decision No. 394 (1983); *cf.* Fam. Code § 261.201. In considering whether a public citizen's date of birth is private, the Third Court of Appeals looked to the supreme court's rationale in *Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts v. Attorney General of Texas*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). The supreme court concluded public employees' dates of birth are private under section 552.102 of the Government Code because the

employees' privacy interest substantially outweighed the negligible public interest in disclosure.² *Tex. Comptroller*, 354 S.W.3d at 347-48. Based on *Texas Comptroller*, the court of appeals concluded the privacy rights of public employees apply equally to public citizens, and thus, public citizens' dates of birth are also protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *City of Dallas*, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3. Upon review, we find some of the remaining information identifies a juvenile victim of abuse or neglect. Accordingly, the district must withhold the identifying information of the juvenile victim of abuse or neglect, including the child's name, student identification number, address, and parent's name under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The district must also withhold the date of birth we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.135 of the Government Code provides in relevant part the following:

(a) "Informer" means a student or a 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].

(c) Subsection (b) does not apply:

(1) if the informer is a student or former student, and the student or former student, or the legal guardian, or spouse of the student or former student consents to disclosure of the student's or former student's name; or

(2) if the informer is an employee or former employee who consents to disclosure of the employee's or former employee's name; or

(3) if the informer planned, initiated, or participated in the possible violation.

Gov't Code § 552.135(a)-(c). 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 that 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

²Section 552.102(a) 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).

of an investigation, but do not report a possible violation of law are not informants for purposes of section 552.135. The district claims the remaining information contains personally identifiable information of informers who reported possible violations of criminal and civil law. However, we find the district has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information reveals the identity of an informer for the purposes of section 552.135 of the Government Code. Therefore, the district may not withhold the remaining information on that ground.

In summary, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a)(2) of the Government Code. If the reporting form was produced to DPD, DFPS, or the department, then the district must withhold the reporting form in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a)(2) of the Family Code. If the reporting form was not produced to DPD, DFPS, or the department, then the district must withhold the information we have marked 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 identifying information of the juvenile victim of abuse or neglect under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The district must also withhold the date of birth we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The remaining information must be released.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'B. Berger', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Brian E. Berger
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BB/akg

Ref: ID# 615454

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)