



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 8, 2009

Mr. Richard M. Abernathy
Abernathy, Roeder, Boyd & Joplin, P.C.
Attorney for McKinney Independent School District
P.O. Box 1210
McKinney, Texas 75070-1210

OR2009-06148

Dear Mr. Abernathy:

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# 342567.

The McKinney Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request from an investigator with the Texas Education Agency ("TEA") for six categories of information pertaining to a named district employee. You state you have released some of the requested information to the requestor.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.135 of the Government Code. You state you notified the individual who is the subject of the requested information of her right to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released. *See Gov't Code § 552.304* (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") has informed this office that Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA") 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

¹You inform us the requestor has agreed to the redaction of attorney-client privileged information, social security numbers, home addresses and home telephone numbers, and college transcripts. Accordingly, any of this information within the submitted documents is not responsive to the present request, and we do not address such information in this ruling.

the purposes of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act.² 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 and unredacted education records, including a student handwritten statement to this office for review. *See* Open Records Decision No. 224 (1979) (student’s handwritten comments protected under FERPA because they would make identity of student easily traceable through handwriting, style of expression, or particular incidents related in the comments). Because our office is prohibited from reviewing education records, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to the information at issue. Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education record. However, to the extent you determine the information you have submitted is not protected by FERPA, we will consider your arguments against disclosure.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts 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 made confidential by statute. Section 21.355 of the Education Code provides that “[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential.” Educ. Code § 21.355. Additionally, the court has concluded that a written reprimand constitutes an evaluation for purposes of section 21.355 as it “reflects the principal’s judgment regarding [a teacher’s] actions, gives corrective direction, and provides for further review.” *North East Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Abbott*, 212 S.W.3d 364 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.). 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 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 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. You state that the submitted information relates to a teacher who held the appropriate teaching certificate and was teaching at the time of the evaluations. Based on your representations and our review, we agree that the information we have marked consists of teacher evaluations subject to section 21.355. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code. However, we find that the remaining documents do not constitute evaluations for purposes of section 21.355. Thus, the district may not withhold any of the remaining responsive information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code.

²A copy of this letter may be found on the attorney general’s website, available at <http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

You also assert that the remaining information is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege and section 552.135 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 also encompasses the common-law informer's privilege, which Texas courts have long recognized. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969); *Hawthorne v. State*, 10 S.W.2d 724, 725 (Tex. Crim. App. 1928). The common-law informer's privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority, provided that the subject of the information does not already know the informer's identity. Open Records Decision Nos. 515 at 3 (1988), 208 at 1-2 (1978).

Section 552.135 of the Government Code provides the following:

(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

(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). Section 552.135 protects an informer's identity, but does not encompass protection for witness information or statements.

Upon review, we find that none of the remaining information identifies informers for purposes of the common-law informer's privilege or section 552.135. Thus, the district may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege or section 552.135 of the Government Code.

We note TEA's request states 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.³ Accordingly, we will consider whether section 249.14 of title 19 of the Texas Administrative Code permits TEA to obtain information that is otherwise protected by the exceptions 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. § 249.4. Section 249.14 provides in relevant part:

(a) [TEA] staff 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 [SBEC] denying relief to or taking disciplinary action against the person or certificate.

...

(c) The TEA 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(a), (c). We note 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 provisions governing release of information. 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 21.353 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,

³Chapter 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).

the applicable statutes enumerate 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, 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.). 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 teacher evaluations. This section 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 information that is excepted from disclosure under section 21.355 of the Education Code. *See* 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). The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

Sincerely,



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

ALS/rl

Ref: ID# 342567

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)