



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

September 16, 2008

Ms. Bridget Robinson  
Walsh, Anderson, Brown, Schulze & Aldridge, P.C.  
P.O. Box 2156  
Austin, Texas 78768

OR2008-12745

Dear Ms. Robinson:

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# 321865.

The Onalaska Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for information regarding complaints made against a specified former district faculty member. You state that you are releasing some of the requested information to the requestor. You claim that 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 that the United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") informed this office that 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 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>1</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.

---

<sup>1</sup>A copy of this letter may be found on the attorney general's website, *available at* <http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

§ 99.3 (defining “personally identifiable information”). However, if the district obtains parental consent to submit unredacted education records, and the district seeks a ruling from this office on the proper redaction of those education records in compliance with FERPA, we will rule accordingly. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing education records to determine the applicability of FERPA, we will not address FERPA with respect to the requested information, other than to note that parents have a right of access to their own child’s education records. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(1)(A); 34 C.F.R. § 99.3. We further note that the DOE also has informed this office that if a state law prohibits a school district from providing a parent with access to the education records of his or her child and an opportunity to inspect and review the record, then the state statute conflicts with FERPA, and an educational agency or institution must comply with FERPA if it wishes to continue to receive federal education funds. Letter advisement from Ellen Campbell, Family Compliance Office, U.S. Department of Education to Robert Patterson, Open Records Division, Office of the Texas Attorney General (April 9, 2001). *See Equal Employment Opportunity Comm’n v. City of Orange*, 905 F. Supp 381, 382 (E.D. Tex. 1995); Open Records Decision No. 431 (1985) (FERPA prevails when in conflict with state law). Because the educational authority in possession of the education records is now responsible for determining the applicability of FERPA, we will only address your claimed exceptions to the disclosure of the requested 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. Section 21.355 of the Education Code provides that “[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential.” 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 a “teacher” for purposes of section 21.355 means a person who (1) 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 (2) is engaged in the process of teaching, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. *See id.* at 4; *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).

You contend that Exhibit 3 is confidential under section 21.355 of the Education Code. You state that the individual at issue holds a teaching certificate and indicate he was engaged in teaching at the time of the evaluations. Upon review of the information at issue, we agree that the documents in Exhibit 3 are written reprimands, and are therefore subject to section 21.355 of the Education Code. Accordingly, the district must withhold Exhibit 3 on this basis.

You also raise section 552.135 of the Government Code for Exhibit 2. This section 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].

Gov't Code § 552.135(a)-(b). 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, 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 section 552.135 of the Government Code. Upon review, we find that you have failed to demonstrate that Exhibit 2 identifies an informer for purposes of section 552.135. Thus, the district may not withhold any portion of Exhibit 2 under section 552.135. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure, 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 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). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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,



Amy L.S. Shipp  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

ALS/jb

Ref: ID# 321865

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jerry M. Young  
Coats Rose Yale Ryman & Lee, P.C.  
3 East Greenway Plaza, Suite 2000  
Houston, Texas 77046-0307  
(w/o enclosures)