



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 29, 2007

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

OR2007-08316

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# 282418.

The Northside Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request from an investigator with the Texas Education Agency (the "TEA") for six categories of information pertaining to a named individual. You state that you will redact social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.147(b)(governmental body may redact social security number without necessity of requesting decision from this office under the Act). You also state that a portion of the requested information has been released to the requestor. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you acknowledge, and we agree, that you failed to comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in seeking a ruling from this office. A governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). A compelling reason exists when

third-party interests are at stake or when information is confidential under other law. Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977). Section 552.101 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason to overcome this presumption; therefore, we will consider the district's claim under this exception.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses information that other statutes make confidential. You raise section 552.101 in conjunction with 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 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 Open Records Decision No. 643, we determined that for purposes of section 21.355, the word "teacher" means 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* ORD 643 at 4. 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.*

Upon review, we agree that the submitted information constitutes evaluations. Thus, provided the employee at issue was required to hold and did hold the appropriate certificates and was teaching or serving as an administrator at the time of the submitted evaluations, the submitted information is confidential under section 21.355, and the district must withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See Abbott v. North East Indep. Sch. Dist.*, No. 03-04-00744-CV, 2006 WL 1293545 (Tex. App.—Austin May 12, 2006, no pet.) (concluding that written reprimand constitutes evaluation for purposes of Educ. Code § 21.355).

Finally, we note that TEA's request states that it is seeking this information under the authority provided to the State Board for Educator Certification ("SBEC") by section 249.14 of title 19 of the Texas Administrative Code.¹ Accordingly, we will consider whether section 249.14 of title 19 of the Texas Administrative Code permits TEA to obtain

¹Chapter 21 of the Education Code authorizes SBEC to regulate and oversee all aspects of the certification, continuing education, and standards of conduct of public school educators. *See* Educ. Code § 21.031(a). Section 21.041 of the Education Code states that SBEC may "provide for disciplinary proceedings, including the suspension or revocation of an educator certificate, as provided by Chapter 2001, Government Code." *Id.* § 21.041(b)(7). Section 21.041 also authorizes SBEC to "adopt rules as necessary for its own procedures." *Id.* § 21.041(a).

information that is otherwise protected by the exception discussed above. *See* Open Records Decision No. 451 at 4 (1986) (specific access provision prevails over generally applicable exception to public disclosure).

Chapter 249 of title 19 of the Texas Administrative Code governs disciplinary proceedings, sanctions, and contested cases involving SBEC. *See* 19 T.A.C. § 249.1. Section 249.14 provides in relevant part:

(a) Staff [of TEA] may obtain and investigate information concerning alleged improper conduct by an educator, applicant, examinee, or other person subject to this chapter that would warrant the board denying relief to or taking disciplinary action against the person or certificate.

...

(c) The executive director and staff may also obtain and act on other information providing grounds for investigation and possible action under this chapter.

19 T.A.C. § 249.14. We note that these regulations do not specifically grant access to information subject to section 21.355 of the Education Code. We further note that section 21.355 of the Education Code has its own access provision governing release. Generally, if confidentiality provisions or another statute specifically authorize release of information under certain circumstances or to particular entities, then the information may only be released or transferred in accordance therewith. *See* Attorney General Opinions GA-0055 (2003) at 3-4 (SBEC not entitled to access teacher appraisals made confidential by section 21.355 of the Education Code where section 21.352 of the Education Code expressly authorizes limited release of appraisals to other school districts in connection with teachers' employment applications), DM-353 (1995) at 4-5 n.6 (detailed provisions in state law for disclosure of records would not permit disclosure "to other governmental entities and officials . . . without violating the record's confidentiality"), JM-590 (1986) at 5 ("express mention or enumeration of one person, thing, consequence, or class is tantamount to an express exclusion of all others"); Open Records Decision No. 655 (1997) (because statute permitted Department of Public Safety to transfer confidential criminal history information only to certain entities for certain purposes, county could not obtain information from the department regarding applicants for county employment). We also note that an interagency transfer of this information is not permissible where, as here, the applicable statute enumerates the specific entities to which information encompassed by the statute may be disclosed, and the enumerated entities do not include the requesting governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 655 at 8-9 (1997), 516 at 4-5 (1989), 490 at 2 (1988); *see also* Attorney General Opinion GA-0055.

Furthermore, where general and specific statutes are in irreconcilable conflict, the specific provision typically prevails as an exception to the general provision unless the general provision was enacted later and there is clear evidence that the legislature intended the general provision to prevail. See Gov't Code § 311.026(b); *City of Lake Dallas v. Lake Cities Mun. Util. Auth.*, 555 S.W.2d 163, 168 (Tex. Civ. App.—Fort Worth 1977, writ ref'd n.r.e.). In this instance, although section 249.14 generally allows TEA access to information relating to suspected misconduct on the part of an educator, section 21.355 of the Education Code specifically protects educator and administrator evaluations, and specifically permits release to certain parties and in certain circumstances that do not include TEA's request in this instance. We therefore conclude that, notwithstanding the provisions of section 249.14, the district must withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code. See also Open Records Decision No. 629 (1994) (provision of Bingo Enabling Act that specifically provided for non-disclosure of information obtained in connection with examination of books and records of applicant or licensee prevailed over provision that generally provided for public access to applications, returns, reports, statements and audits submitted to or conducted by Texas Alcoholic Beverage Commission).

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,



Loan Hong-Turney
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LH/sdk

Ref: ID# 282418

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Tracy Thomas
Staff Investigator
Texas Education Agency
Office of Investigations
Educator and Certification and Standards
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 8701-1494
(w/o enclosures)