



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 9, 2010

Mr. Deron Robinson
Henslee Schwartz, L.L.P.
306 West 7th Street, Suite 1045
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

OR2010-12023

Dear Mr. 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# 389812.

The Keene Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for the personnel file and disciplinary information pertaining to a named former employee. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.111, and 552.135 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.¹ We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See Gov't Code § 552.304* (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, 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") does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental or an adult student's consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for the purpose of our review in the open records

¹We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988)*. This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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 redacted and unredacted education records for our review. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing these education records to determine whether appropriate redactions under FERPA should be made, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to any of the submitted records, other than to note parents have a right of access to their own child’s education records. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(1)(A). Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records.³ However, we will consider your arguments against disclosure of the submitted 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. Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 21.355 of the Education Code. Section 21.355 provides “[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential.” Educ. Code § 21.355. This office has interpreted this section to apply to any document that evaluates, as that term is commonly understood, the performance of a teacher or administrator. Open Records Decision No. 643 (1996). In that opinion, this office also concluded a teacher is someone who is required to hold and does hold a certificate required under chapter 21 of the Education Code and is teaching at the time of his or her evaluation. *Id.* In addition, the court has concluded a written reprimand constitutes an evaluation for 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 do not indicate whether the individual at issue held a teacher’s certificate or permit under chapter 21 of the Education Code and was performing the functions of a teacher at the time of the respective evaluations. Therefore we must rule conditionally. To the extent the individual in question held a teacher’s certificate or permit and was functioning as a teacher at the time of the evaluations, the district must withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit B under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code. To the extent the individual in question did not hold a teacher’s certificate or permit or was not functioning as a teacher at the time of the evaluations, the

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

³In the future, if the district does obtain parental or an adult student’s 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.

marked information is not confidential under section 21.355 of the Education Code and may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Further, we conclude that the remaining information in Exhibit B, consisting of self report forms written by the teacher at issue, does not evaluate the employee for purposes of section 21.355. Accordingly, none of the remaining information in Exhibit B may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code.

We will now address your arguments against disclosure of Exhibit C. Section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Section 552.102(a) 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). Section 552.102 is applicable to information that relates to public officials and employees. See Open Records Decision No. 327 at 2 (1982) (anything relating to employee's employment and its terms constitutes information relevant to person's employment relationship and is part of employee's personnel file). 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(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test formulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976), for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common-law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101 of the Act. Accordingly, we will consider your claim under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and your claim under section 552.102(a) together.

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.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. 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. *Id.* at 683. 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 (1987) (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 that the information we have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the department must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in

conjunction with common-law privacy and section 552.102 of the Government Code. However, we find that the remaining information is either not highly intimate or embarrassing, or is of legitimate public interest. Therefore, the district may not withhold any portion of the remaining information in Exhibit C under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

You claim the remaining information in Exhibit C is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code. Section 552.111 excepts from disclosure "an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency." Gov't Code § 552.111. This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. *See Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990). In Open Records Decision No. 615, this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined that section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, and opinions that reflect the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *See* ORD 615 at 5. A governmental body's policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; *see also City of Garland v. The Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body's policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body's policy mission. *See* Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995). Moreover, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *See* ORD 615 at 5. If factual information, however, is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

You state that the information at issue consists of the advice, opinions, and recommendations of district employees involving policymaking matters. However, we note the remaining information pertains solely to an investigation of the named former employee's conduct. Accordingly, we find the remaining information in Exhibit C pertains to a routine personnel matter that does not rise to the level of policymaking. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information in Exhibit C under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information in Exhibit C may be subject to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code.⁴ Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). We note section 552.117 is also applicable to personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may only be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for information. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former official or employee who did not timely request under section 552.024 that the information be kept confidential. Accordingly, if the named former employee timely elected confidentiality under section 552.024, the district must withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit C under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. However, the marked personal cellular phone number may only be withheld if the cellular service was paid for with personal funds. If the employee at issue did not timely elect confidentiality, the district may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1).⁵

You assert the remaining information in Exhibit C is excepted from disclosure under section 552.135 of the Government Code. Section 552.135 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].

⁴The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

⁵Regardless of the applicability of section 552.117, section 552.147(b) of the Government Code 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.

(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 informers identity, but does not encompass protection for witness information or statements. Upon review, we find that you have failed to demonstrate that any of the remaining information in Exhibit C identifies informers for purposes of section 552.135. Thus, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information in Exhibit C under section 552.135.

In summary, to the extent the individual in question held a teacher's certificate or permit and was functioning as a teacher at the time of the evaluations, the district must withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit B 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 in Exhibit C under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and section 552.102 of the Government Code. If the named former employee timely elected to keep her personal information confidential, then the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the personal cellular telephone number we have marked may only be withheld if the cellular service was paid for with personal funds. The remaining information must be released to the requestor. This ruling does not address the applicability of FERPA to the submitted information. Should the district determine that all or portions of the submitted information consist of "education records" subject to FERPA, the district must dispose of that information in accordance with FERPA, rather than the Act.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jennifer Luttrall". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "J".

Jennifer Luttrall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JL/dls

Ref: ID# 389812

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)