



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 4, 2010

Ms. Sandi P. Tarski
Walsh, Anderson, Brown, Gallegos and Green, P.C.
Attorney for La Marque Independent School District
P.O. Box 2156
Austin, Texas 78768

OR2010-06391

Dear Ms. Tarski:

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# 378044.

The La Marque Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a named former employee. You state the district is releasing some information to the requestor. You state you will redact home telephone numbers, home addresses, personal cellular telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code under section 552.024 of the Government Code.¹ You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.114, and 552.135 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you inform us the district has redacted student-identifying information from the submitted information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a). We note the United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") has informed this office that 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

¹See Gov't Code § 552.024(c)(2) (if employee or official or former employee or official chooses not to allow public access to his or her personal information, the governmental body may redact the information without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office).

the purpose 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”). Because our office is prohibited from reviewing education records to determine whether appropriate redactions under FERPA have been made, we will not address the applicability of FERPA.³ Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records.⁴

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from public disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. You claim some of the submitted information is protected from disclosure under the federal Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (“HIPAA”), 42 U.S.C. §§ 1320d-1320d-8. At the direction of Congress, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (“HHS”) promulgated regulations setting privacy standards for medical records, which HHS issued as the Federal Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information. *See* Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, 42 U.S.C. § 1320d-2 (Supp. IV 1998) (historical & statutory note); Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information, 45 C.F.R. Pts. 160, 164 (“Privacy Rule”); *see also* Attorney General Opinion JC-0508 at 2 (2002). These standards govern the releasability of protected health information by a covered entity. *See* 45 C.F.R. pts. 160, 164. Under these standards, a covered entity may not use or disclose protected health information, except as provided by parts 160 and 164 of the Code of Federal Regulations. *See id.* § 164.502(a). This office has addressed the interplay of the Privacy Rule and the Act. In Open Records Decision No. 681 (2004), we noted section 164.512 of title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations provides a covered entity may use or disclose protected health information to the extent such use or disclosure is required by law and the use or disclosure complies with and is limited to the relevant requirements of such law. *See* 45 C.F.R. § 164.512(a)(1). We further noted the Act “is a mandate in Texas law that compels Texas governmental bodies to disclose information to the public.” *See* ORD 681 at 8; *see also* Gov’t Code §§ 552.002, .003, .021. We, therefore, held the disclosures under the Act come within section 164.512(a). Consequently, the Privacy Rule does not make information confidential for the purpose of section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See Abbott v. Tex.*

²A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General’s website: <http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

³Likewise, we also do not address your claim 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).

⁴In the future, if the district does obtain 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.

Dep't of Mental Health & Mental Retardation, 212 S.W.3d 648 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.); ORD 681 at 9; see also Open Records Decision No. 478 (1987) (as general rule, statutory confidentiality requires express language making information confidential). Thus, because the Privacy Rule does not make information that is subject to disclosure under the Act confidential, the district may withhold protected health information from the public only if the information is confidential under other law or an exception in subchapter C of the Act applies.

You claim the submitted documents contain information protected under the Medical Practices Act (“MPA”). Section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses information protected by the MPA, chapter 159 of the Occupations Code. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides in part:

(b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient’s behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Occ. Code § 159.002(b)-(c). This office has concluded that the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 487 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982). Upon review, we conclude none of the submitted information consists of medical records that are subject to the MPA, and none of it may be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

You also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 773.091 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides in relevant part:

(a) A communication between certified emergency medical services personnel or a physician providing medical supervision and a patient that is made in the course of providing emergency medical services to the patient is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(b) Records of the identity, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by emergency medical services personnel or by a physician providing medical supervision that are created by the emergency medical services personnel or physician or maintained by an emergency medical services provider are confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

Health & Safety Code § 773.091(a)-(b). The submitted information does not contain a communication between certified emergency medical services personnel or a physician providing medical supervision and a patient that was made in the course of providing emergency medical services to the patient. *See id.* § 773.091(a). It also does not contain a record of the identity, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by emergency medical services personnel or by a physician providing medical supervision that was created by the emergency medical services personnel or physician or maintained by an emergency medical services provider. *See id.* § 773.091(b). Accordingly, none of the information at issue is confidential under section 773.091, and the district may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that basis.

Next, you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code 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. In Open Records Decision No. 643 (1996), this office 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* ORD 643 at 3. Additionally, we determined that for the 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. *See id.* at 4. We note that a court has concluded that a written reprimand constitutes an evaluation for the purposes of section 21.355 because “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.).

You contend some of the submitted information is confidential under section 21.355. Upon review, we agree the information we have marked constitutes evaluations subject to section 21.355 of the Education Code. Thus, if the employee at issue held a teaching certificate and was engaged in the process of teaching at the time of the evaluations, the information we have marked is confidential under section 21.355 of the Education Code, and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code. To the extent this employee did not hold the requisite certificate, or was not engaged in the process of teaching, the information we have marked is not confidential under section 21.355, and may not be withheld under section 552.101. In either case, we find you have not demonstrated that the remaining information at issue constitutes an evaluation of a teacher for the purposes of section 21.355. We therefore conclude the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 21.048 of the Education Code, which addresses teacher certification examinations. Section 21.048(c-1) provides the following:

The results of an examination administered under this section are confidential and are not subject to disclosure under Chapter 552, Government Code, unless:

- (1) the disclosure is regarding notification to a parent of the assignment of an uncertified teacher to a classroom as required by Section 21.057; or
- (2) the educator has failed the examination more than five times.

Educ. Code § 21.048(c-1). We note a portion of the remaining submitted information contains ExCET exam results of the educator named in the request. We note that subsection 21.048(c-1)(1) is not applicable in this instance. Furthermore, the information reflects the educator has not failed the examinations more than five times. Thus, the information we have marked is confidential under section 21.048(c-1) of the Education Code and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by common-law privacy. Section 552.102 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Gov't Code § 552.102(a). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court ruled that the test to be applied to information claimed to be protected under section 552.102 is the same as the test formulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976) for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common-law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101. Accordingly, we address the district's section 552.102 claim in conjunction with its common-law privacy claim under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Common-law privacy 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.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be demonstrated. *Id.* at 681-82. The type of information considered intimate or 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. *See id.* at 683. This office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy: some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps), 545 (1990); and personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (finding personal financial information to include designation of beneficiary of employee's retirement benefits and optional insurance coverage; choice of particular insurance carrier; direct deposit authorization; and forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care, or dependent care), 545 (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage,

mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history). We note, however, the public generally has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public employees. *See* Open Records Decisions Nos. 562 at 10 (1990) (personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs, but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern); 542 (1990); 470 at 4 (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees); 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employees); 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). Upon review, we find the information we have marked is intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the district must withhold the marked information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, you have failed to demonstrate how any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Accordingly, none of the remaining information is confidential under the doctrine of common-law privacy, and it may not be withheld under either section 552.101 or section 552.102 of the Government Code on that basis.

Next, you assert some of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction the doctrine of constitutional privacy. Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. ORD 455 at 4. The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy," which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common-law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5; *see Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985). Upon review, we find the district has failed to demonstrate how any of the remaining information falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.102(b) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "a transcript from an institution of higher education maintained in the personnel file of a professional public school employee." Gov't Code § 552.102(b). This section further provides, however, that "the degree obtained or the curriculum on a transcript in the personnel file of the employee" are not excepted from disclosure. We therefore agree that except for the information that reveals the employee's name, the degree obtained, and the courses taken, the district must withhold the submitted transcripts, which we have marked, under section 552.102(b). *See* Open Records Decision No. 526 (1989). We note, however, that the district also seeks to withhold additional information from the marked transcripts and scores contained in documents other than a transcript under this exception. This information may not be withheld under section 552.102(b) of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provision controls scope of its protection).

Next, you claim some of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.135 of the Government Code, which provides in part:

(a) "Informer" means a student or a former student or an employee or former employee of a school district who has furnished a report of another person's 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). You state some of the remaining information contains the identifying information of informers who reported a possible violation of law to the district. You do not indicate any of the exceptions in section 552.135(c) are applicable in this instance. Therefore, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.135 of the Government Code. However, we find that none of the remaining information at issue is identifying for the purpose of section 552.135, and it may not be withheld on this basis.

We note some of the remaining information appears to be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, if the employee at issue held a teaching certificate and was engaged in the process of teaching at the time of the evaluations, the information we have marked must be withheld 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 section 21.048 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. Except for the information that reveals the employee's name, the degree obtained, and the courses taken, the district must withhold the transcripts we have marked under section 552.102(b) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.135 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor, but any information that is protected by copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

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, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



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

ALS/rl

Ref: ID# 378044

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)