



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

April 1, 2008

Mr. Robert A. Schulman  
Feldman & Rogers, LLP  
517 Soledad Street  
San Antonio, Texas 78205-1508

OR2008-04226

Dear Mr. Schulman:

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# 306183.

The Winfree Academy Charter Schools (the "academy"), which you represent, received a request for information related to the requestor's exit interview and employee file. We note that you have redacted a social security number pursuant to section 552.147 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.114, and 552.135 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that the present request seeks ten categories of information related to the requestor's exit interview and employee file. You have only submitted six pages of information for our review. Thus, to the extent any additional information existed on the date the academy received this request, we assume you have released it. If you have not released any such information, you must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

---

<sup>1</sup>Section 552.147 authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act. Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

Next, we note that the United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office has informed this office that the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), 20 U.S.C. § 1232(a), does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for 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"). You have submitted, among other things, redacted education records that you have determined are protected by FERPA for our review. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing education records, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to the information at issue.<sup>3</sup> Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education record. Accordingly, we also do not address your arguments under section 552.114 of the Government Code. See Gov't Code §§ 552.026 (incorporating FERPA into the Act), .114 (excepting from disclosure "student records"); Open Records Decision No. 539 (1990) (determining the same analysis applies under section 552.114 of the Government Code and FERPA).

Section 552.135 of the Government Code provides in part:

(a) "Informer" means a student or former student or an employee or former employee of a school district who has furnished a report of another person's or persons' 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

---

<sup>2</sup>A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website: [http://www.oag.state.tx.us/opinopen/og\\_resources.shtml](http://www.oag.state.tx.us/opinopen/og_resources.shtml).

<sup>3</sup>In the future, if the academy does obtain parental consent to submit unredacted education records, and the academy seeks a ruling from this office on the proper redaction of those education records in compliance with FERPA, we will rule accordingly.

- (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 this 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), .135(a). Additionally, we note that individuals who provide information in the course of an investigation but do not make the initial report are not informants for the purposes of claiming section 552.135 of the Government Code. You state that some of the submitted information, which you have highlighted, reveals the identities of individuals who reported possible violations of section 21.12 of the Texas Penal Code and section 481.115 of the Health and Safety Code to the academy. Based on your representations and our review of the information in question, we conclude that the academy must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.135 of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup>

You state that the remaining information you have highlighted is subject to section 552.101 of the Government Code. 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. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Common-law privacy protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is 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. This office has found that some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses is protected by common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps). However, we note that common-law privacy does not protect information about a public employee's alleged misconduct on the job or complaints made about a public employee's job performance. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 438 (1986), 405 (1983), 230 (1979), 219 (1978). Furthermore, there is a legitimate public interest in a public employee's work performance. *See* Open Records Decision No. 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has interest in public employee's qualifications, work performance, and circumstances of employee's resignation or termination). We have reviewed the information at issue and conclude that

---

<sup>4</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure for the information at issue.

there is a legitimate public interest in this information because it pertains to the employee's work performance. Consequently, no portion of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the academy must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.135 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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/eeg

Ref: ID# 306183

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Alana Rosenblum  
7032 Brooks Avenue  
Richland Hills, Texas 76118  
(w/o enclosures)