



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

February 20, 2007

Ms. Laura C. Rodriguez  
Walsh, Anderson, Brown, Schulze & Aldridge, P.C.  
P.O. Box 460606  
San Antonio, Texas 78246-0606

OR2007-02038

Dear Ms. Rodriguez:

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# 271629.

The Southside Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for correspondence between a named individual and members of the Board of Trustees during a specified time period, and for grievances filed during the same time period which name the same individual "as one of the accused." You claim that some of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.117, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions 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. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 21.355 of the Education Code. Section 21.355 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). This office has determined 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 the evaluation. Open Records Decision No. 643. We also determined 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 contend that a portion of the submitted information is confidential under section 21.355. You do not indicate, however, whether the individual held a teacher’s or administrator’s certificate or permit under chapter 21 of the Education Code and was performing the functions of a teacher or administrator at the time of the evaluation. Nevertheless, to the extent the individual in question did hold a teacher’s or administrator’s certificate or permit and was functioning as a teacher or administrator at the time of the evaluation, then the district must withhold pages AG-0011 through AG-0013 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code. To the extent the individual in question did not hold a teacher’s or administrator’s certificate or permit or was not functioning as a teacher or administrator at the time of the evaluation, then the information at issue is not confidential under section 21.355 of the Education Code and may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that (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. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The types 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. In addition, in *Morales v. Ellen*, 40 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.–El Paso 1992, writ denied), the court addressed the applicability of the common-law privacy doctrine to files of an investigation of allegations of 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. *Ellen*, 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 that the public’s interest was sufficiently served by the disclosure of such documents. *Id.* In concluding, the *Ellen* court held that “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 accordance with *Ellen*, a governmental body must withhold information that would tend to identify a witness or victim of sexual harassment. We note, however, that *Ellen* provides

no protection to individuals who are accused of sexual harassment. *See id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 405 at 2-3 (1983) (public has interest in manner in which public employee performs his job), 329 at 2 (1982) (information relating to complaints against public employees and discipline resulting therefrom is not protected under former sections 552.101 or 552.102 of Government Code), 208 at 2 (1978) (information relating to complaint against public employee and disposition of complaint is not protected under either constitutional or common-law right of privacy). You assert that some of the submitted information is identifying information of witnesses and victims in sexual harassment complaints; therefore, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and in accordance with *Ellen*.

You claim that section 552.117 of the Government Code may be applicable to some of the remaining information. Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, 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. Whether information is protected by section 52.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Pursuant to section 552.117(a)(1), the district must withhold personal information that pertains to a current or former employee of the district who elected, prior to the district's receipt of the request for information, to keep such information confidential. Such information may not be withheld for individuals who did not make a timely election. The district must withhold the information you have marked if section 552.117 applies.

You assert that some of the remaining information is excepted under section 52.137 of the Government Code. Section 552.137 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). Section 552.137 does not apply to a government employee's work e-mail address because such an address is not that of the employee as a "member of the public," but is instead the address of the individual as a government employee. The e-mail addresses at issue do not appear to be of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). You do not inform us that a member of the public has affirmatively consented to the release of any e-mail address contained in the submitted materials. Therefore, the district must withhold the e-mail addresses you have marked under section 552.137.

Accordingly, to the extent the individual in question did hold a teacher's or administrator's certificate or permit and was functioning as a teacher or administrator at the time of the evaluation, then the district must withhold pages AG-0011 through AG-0013 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 and in accordance with *Ellen*. Pursuant to section 552.117(a)(1), the district must withhold personal information that pertains to a current or former employee of the district who elected, prior to the district's receipt of the request for information, to keep such information confidential. The district must withhold the e-mail addresses you have marked under section 552.137. The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor.

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



Cindy Nettles  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CN/eb

Ref: ID# 271629

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Michelle M. Martinez  
San Antonio Express-News  
P.O. Box 2171  
San Antonio, Texas 78297  
(w/o enclosures)