



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 26, 2004

Mr. Juan J. Cruz
Escamilla & Poneck, Inc.
Attorneys and Counselors
5219 McPherson, Suite 306
Laredo, Texas 78041

OR2004-7321

Dear Mr. Cruz:

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# 207835.

The United Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request from the State Board for Educator Certification ("SBEC") for specified categories of employment information concerning a named former district employee, including (1) reports, notes, statements, or memoranda that reflect a chronology of the conduct reported or the district's investigation of the incident; (2) the employee's application for employment and any documents submitted in support of the application; (3) any information that evidences administrative reprimands or other disciplinary measures; (4) any documentation relating to the employee's employment; (5) the employee's teacher service record; and (6) any other document that may be relevant to SBEC's investigation of the employee. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.026, 552.101, 552.102, 552.107, 552.108, 552.111, 552.114, 552.117 and 552.1325 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and have reviewed the information you submitted.

We will first consider your claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.026 and 552.114 of the Government Code. Section 552.114 excepts from disclosure student records at an educational institution funded completely or in part by state revenue. This office generally applies the same analysis under

section 552.114 and the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 ("FERPA"), which is encompassed by section 552.101 of the Government Code.¹ Open Records Decision No. 539 (1990). FERPA provides that no federal funds will be made available under any applicable program to an educational agency or institution that releases personally identifiable information (other than directory information) contained in a student's education records to anyone but certain enumerated federal, state, and local officials and institutions, unless otherwise authorized by the student's parent. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(b)(1); *see also* 34 C.F.R. § 99.3 (defining personally identifiable information). "Education records" means those records that contain information directly related to a student and are maintained by an educational agency or institution or by a person acting for such agency or institution. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(4)(A). Section 552.026 of the Government Code provides that "information contained in education records of an educational agency or institution" may only be released under the Act in accordance with FERPA. Information must be withheld from required public disclosure under FERPA only to the extent "reasonable and necessary to avoid personally identifying a particular student." *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 332 (1982), 206 (1978). Such information includes information that directly identifies a student as well as information that, if released, would allow the student's identity to be easily traced. *See* Open Records Decision No. 224 (1979) (finding student's handwritten comments protected under FERPA because they make identity of student easily traceable through handwriting, style of expression, or particular incidents related).

In Open Records Decision No. 634 (1995), this office concluded that (1) an educational agency or institution may withhold from public disclosure information that is protected by FERPA and excepted from required public disclosure by sections 552.026 and 552.101 without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision as to those exceptions, and (2) an educational agency or institution that is state-funded may withhold from public disclosure information that is excepted from required public disclosure by section 552.114 as a "student record," insofar as the "student record" is protected by FERPA, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision as to that exception. However, because you have submitted documents to this office that you state contain information related to students, we will address whether any portion of this submitted information is confidential under section 552.114 and FERPA. Based on your arguments and our review of the submitted information, we agree that portions of it personally identify a particular student and, thus, are made confidential under section 552.114 and FERPA. We have marked this information for your review.

You also raise section 552.101 in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code. Section 21.355 provides that "[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential." Educ. Code § 21.355. This office has interpreted

¹Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." This section encompasses information made confidential by other statutes.

section 21.355 to apply to any document that evaluates, as that term is commonly understood, the performance of a teacher or an administrator. *See* Open Records Decision No. 643 (1996). In that decision, we determined that the word “teacher,” for purposes of section 21.355, is a person who is required to and does in fact hold a teaching certificate under subchapter B of chapter 21 of the Education Code or a school district teaching permit under section 21.055 and who is engaged in the process of teaching, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. *See id* at 4. We also concluded that the word “administrator” in 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 of an administrator, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. *Id.*

You state that a portion of the submitted information consists of teacher evaluations. Assuming that the individual who is the subject of this information held a teaching certificate under subchapter B of chapter 21 of the Education Code or a school district teaching permit under section 21.055 and was engaged in teaching at the time of the evaluation, we conclude that the information we have marked is confidential in its entirety under section 21.355 of the Education Code and must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Further, portions of the submitted information are subject to section 261.201 of the Family Code. Section 261.201 provides in part:

(a) The following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, 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). Because portions of the remaining submitted information, which we have marked, pertain to an investigation of alleged child abuse, they are generally confidential under section 261.201 of the Family Code. However, section 261.201(a) also provides that information encompassed by subsection (a) may be disclosed “for purposes consistent with [the Family Code] and applicable federal or state law.” *Id.*

We note that section 22.082 of the Education Code and chapter 411 of the Government Code constitute “applicable state law” in this instance. Section 22.082 provides that the SBEC “shall obtain from any law enforcement or criminal justice agency all criminal history record information that relates to an applicant for or holder of a certificate.” Additionally, section 411.090 of the Government Code specifically grants a right of access for SBEC to obtain criminal history record information (“CHRI”) from the Department of Public Safety (“DPS”). Section 411.090 of the Government Code provides:

(a) The State Board for Educator Certification is entitled to obtain from [DPS] any criminal history record information maintained by the department about a person who has applied to the board for a certificate under Subchapter B, Chapter 21, Education Code.

Gov’t Code § 411.090(a). Furthermore, pursuant to section 411.087 of the Government Code, an agency that is entitled to obtain CHRI from DPS is also authorized to “obtain from any other criminal justice agency in this state criminal history record information maintained by that [agency].” Gov’t Code § 411.087(a)(2). CHRI consists of “information collected about a person by a criminal justice agency that consists of identifiable descriptions and notations of arrests, detentions, indictments, informations, and other formal criminal charges and their dispositions.” Gov’t Code § 411.082(2).

In this instance, the requestor is a staff investigator with SBEC and states that SBEC is conducting an investigation of an individual who has applied for or currently holds educator credentials. We conclude that when read together, section 22.082 of the Education Code and sections 411.087 and 411.090 of the Government Code give SBEC a statutory right of access to a portion of the requested information. *See also* Gov’t Code § 411.082(2); *cf. Brookshire v. Houston Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 508 S.W.2d 675, 678-79 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1974, no writ) (when legislature defines term in one statute and uses same term in relation to same subject matter in latter statute, later use of term is same as previously defined). Consequently, if the district determines that SBEC intends to use the criminal history record information for purposes consistent with the Family Code, the district must release information from the marked documents that shows the type of allegation made and whether there was an arrest, information, indictment, detention, conviction, or other formal charges and their dispositions.² *See* Open Records Decision No. 451 (1986) (specific statutory right of access provisions overcome general exceptions to disclosure under statutory predecessor to Act). In that instance, the district must withhold the remainder of these particular marked documents pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.

² We note that because the requestor has a special right of access to this information in this instance, the district must again seek a decision from this office if it receives another request for the same information from another requestor.

If, however, the district determines that SBEC does not seek this information for purposes consistent with the Family Code, the district must withhold this marked information in its entirety pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code. *See* Attorney General Opinions DM-353 at 4 n. 6 (1995) (finding interagency transfer of information prohibited where confidentiality statute enumerates specific entities to which release of information is authorized and where potential receiving governmental body is not among statute's enumerated entities), JM-590 at 4-5 (1986); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 655 (1997), 650 (1996) (transfer of confidential information to federal agency impermissible unless federal law requires its disclosure), 440 at 2 (1986) (construing predecessor statute); Fam. Code § 261.201(b)-(g) (listing entities authorized to receive 261.201 information).

Next, we address the district's privacy arguments for information contained in Exhibits C, D, E, and F. Section 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). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court ruled that the test to be applied to information claimed to be protected under section 552.102(a) is the same as the test formulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common-law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 683-85 (Tex. 1976). Accordingly, we will consider your section 552.101 and section 552.102(a) claims together.

For information to be protected from public disclosure by the common law right of privacy under section 552.101, the information must meet the criteria set out in *Industrial Foundation*. In *Industrial Foundation*, the Texas Supreme Court stated that information is excepted from disclosure if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the release of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Id.* at 685. The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683.

Prior decisions of this office have determined that some kinds of medical information and personal financial information not related to a transaction between an individual and a governmental body are protected by common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (personal financial information not related to transaction with governmental body generally not subject to legitimate public interest), 470 (1987) (information pertaining to illness from severe emotional and job-related stress protected by privacy), 455 (1987) (information pertaining to prescription drugs, specific illnesses, procedures, and physical disabilities protected by privacy). However, this office has also determined that the essential

facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body generally are subject to a legitimate public interest. *See* Open Decision Nos. 545 (1990) (financial information pertaining to receipt of funds from governmental body or debts owed to governmental body not protected by common-law privacy), 523 (1989). Based on your representations and our review of the submitted information, we conclude that none of the remaining submitted information is protected from disclosure under the common law right to privacy and that no portion of it may be withheld on that basis. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees), 405 at 2-3 (1983) (public has interest in manner in which public employee performs his job); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow).

Section 552.102(b) 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 section further provides, however, that “the degree obtained or the curriculum on a transcript in the personnel file of the employee” are not excepted from disclosure. Thus, except for the information that reveals the degree obtained and the courses taken, you must withhold the transcripts that we have marked under section 552.102(b).

Next, we address your claim that section 552.107 is applicable to a document you have marked in Exhibit F. Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a *confidential* communication, *id.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission

of the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the *intent* of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no writ). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

Based on your representations and our review of the document you have marked in Exhibit F, we agree that this information consists of a confidential communication exchanged between privileged parties in furtherance of the rendition of legal services to a client. Accordingly, we conclude that the district may withhold this document pursuant to section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Next, we address your claim that section 552.111 is applicable to another document you have marked in Exhibit F. Section 552.111 excepts from disclosure “an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency.” In Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993), this office reexamined the predecessor to the section 552.111 exception in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ), and held that section 552.111 excepts only those internal communications consisting of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the deliberative or policymaking processes of the governmental body. Open Records Decision No. 615 at 5-6 (1993). An agency’s policymaking functions, however, do not encompass internal administrative or personnel matters; disclosure of information relating to such matters will not inhibit free discussion among agency personnel as to policy issues. Open Records Decision No. 615 at 5-6 (1993). The information at issue relates to a personnel matter. Thus, we find that the information at issue is not related to the policymaking processes of the district. Accordingly, the submitted document may not be withheld pursuant to section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Next we address the applicability of section 552.117 to portions of the remaining submitted information. Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who timely elect to keep this information confidential pursuant to section 552.024. Whether information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for information is received by the governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, the district may only withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of current or former officials or employees who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was received by the district.

We note that Exhibit C contains a document that reflects that the named former district employee elected to allow her home address and telephone number to be made available to the general public prior to the date that the district received this request. Consequently, the district cannot withhold the home addresses and telephone numbers reflected in the remaining submitted documents that relate to the named former district employee under section 552.117(a)(1). However, if the former employee at issue timely elected to keep her social security number and family member information confidential, the district must withhold this information from the remaining documents under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. If the former employee did not timely elect to keep this information confidential, the district may not withhold the information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. We have marked information that may be confidential under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

We note, however, that if the former employee did not timely elect to keep her social security number confidential pursuant to section 552.024, the social security number may be confidential under section 552.101 in conjunction with the 1990 amendments to the federal Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I). *See* Open Records Decision No. 622 (1994). These amendments make confidential social security numbers and related records that are obtained or maintained by a state agency or political subdivision of the state pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990. *See id.* We have no basis for concluding that the social security number in the submitted documents is confidential under section 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I), and therefore excepted from public disclosure under section 552.101 on the basis of that federal provision. We caution, however, that section 552.352 of the Act imposes criminal penalties for the release of confidential information. Prior to releasing the former employee's social security number, the district should ensure that the social security number was not obtained and is not maintained by the district pursuant to any provision of law, enacted on or after October 1, 1990.

Next, we note that the submitted information also contains Texas driver's license information. Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides in relevant part:

(a) Information is excepted from the requirement of Section 552.021 if the information relates to:

(1) a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state; [or]

(2) a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state[.]

We have marked driver's license information that the district must withhold pursuant to section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Next, we note that the submitted information contains e-mail addresses obtained from a member of the public. Section 552.137 makes certain e-mail addresses confidential. Section 552.137 provides:

(a) Except as otherwise provided by this section, an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under this chapter.

(b) Confidential information described by this section that relates to a member of the public may be disclosed if the member of the public affirmatively consents to its release.

(c) Subsection (a) does not apply to an e-mail address:

(1) provided to a governmental body by a person who has a contractual relationship with the governmental body or by the contractor's agent;

(2) provided to a governmental body by a vendor who seeks to contract with the governmental body or by the vendor's agent;

(3) contained in a response to a request for bids or proposals, contained in a response to similar invitations soliciting offers or information relating to a potential contract, or provided to a governmental body in the course of negotiating the terms of a contract or potential contract; or

(4) provided to a governmental body on a letterhead, coversheet, printed document, or other document made available to the public.

(d) Subsection (a) does not prevent a governmental body from disclosing an e-mail address for any reason to another governmental body or to a federal agency.

Gov't Code § 552.137. Under section 552.137, a governmental body must withhold the e-mail address of a member of the general public, unless the individual to whom the e-mail address belongs has affirmatively consented to its public disclosure. *See id.* § 552.137(b). We have marked e-mail addresses that the district must withhold under section 552.137 unless the owner has affirmatively consented to their release. *See Gov't Code* § 552.137(b).

Finally, we note that some of the submitted documents may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish

copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, the district must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.114 and FERPA. Assuming that the individual who is the subject of this information held a teaching certificate under subchapter B of chapter 21 of the Education Code or a school district teaching permit under section 21.055 and was engaged in teaching at the time of the evaluation, the information we have marked is confidential in its entirety under section 21.355 of the Education Code and must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. If the district determines that SBEC intends to use criminal history record information for purposes consistent with the Family Code, the district must release to this requestor information from the marked documents that shows the type of allegation made and whether there was an arrest, information, indictment, detention, conviction, or other formal charges and their dispositions and must withhold the remaining submitted information pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. If the district determines that SBEC does not seek this information for purposes consistent with the Family Code, the district must withhold the marked documents in their entirety pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. Except for the information that reveals the degree obtained and the courses taken, the district must withhold the transcripts that we have marked under section 552.102(b). The district may withhold the document marked in Exhibit F pursuant to section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. If the former employee at issue timely elected to keep her social security number and family member information confidential, the district must withhold this information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Nevertheless, her social security number may be confidential under federal law. The district must withhold the section 552.130 information we have marked. The district must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137, unless the owner has affirmatively consented to their release. All remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor; however, in doing so, the district must comply with the applicable copyright law for the portions of this information that are copyrighted. As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by

filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Cary Grace
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ECG/jev

Ref: ID# 207835

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Scott Byram
Staff Investigator
State Board of Educator Certification
P. O. Box 12728
Austin, Texas 78711-2728
(w/o enclosures)