



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 10, 2014

Ms. Leticia D. McGowan
School Attorney
Dallas Independent School District
3700 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75204

OR2014-09943

Dear Ms. McGowan:

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# 525335 (ORR# 12869).

The Dallas Independent School District (the "district") received a request for documents pertaining to the investigation of the requestor's client and documents pertaining to the requestor's client's performance of his duties at the district. You state 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, 552.102, and 552.135 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office has informed this office 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 or an adult student's consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act.¹ Consequently, state and local educational authorities that receive a request for education

¹A 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>.

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 unredacted education records for our review. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing these education records to determine whether appropriate redactions under FERPA have been made, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to any of the submitted 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. However, we will consider your arguments against disclosure of the submitted information.

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. Section 552.101 encompasses section 261.201(a) of the Family Code, which provides in part:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

- (1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and
- (2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a); *see also id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of this section as person under 18 years of age who is not and has not been married or who has not had the disabilities of minority removed for general purposes), 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of Family Code ch. 261). You claim the submitted information is confidential in its entirety under section 261.201. We note the district is not an agency authorized to conduct an investigation under chapter 261 of the Family Code. *See id.* § 261.103 (listing agencies that may conduct child abuse investigations). You assert the submitted information was obtained from the Dallas Police Department, the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (“DFPS”), or the district’s police department (the “department”). You state the district has on staff an employee who is shared with DFPS to receive and investigate child abuse claims. Upon review, however, the submitted information was not obtained from the Dallas Police Department, DFPS, or the department, but instead relates to an administrative investigation by the district. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the submitted information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse

or neglect, or consists of a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect under chapter 261 of the Family Code. Therefore, none of the submitted information is confidential under section 261.201 of the Family Code, and none of it may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 261.101 of the Family Code, which provides the identity of an individual making a report under chapter 261 is confidential. *See id.* § 261.101(d). As noted above, the district is not an agency authorized to conduct a chapter 261 investigation. *See id.* § 261.103. Upon review, we find none of the submitted information contains the identifying information of an individual who made a report under chapter 261 of the Family Code. Thus, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 261.101(d).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the common-law right to privacy, which protects information if it (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. 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 met. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683.

You cite to *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied), in support of your argument under common-law privacy for the submitted information. In *Ellen*, the court addressed the applicability of the common-law privacy doctrine to files of an investigation of sexual harassment. Here, however, the information at issue pertains to allegations of sexual harassment of district students. Upon review, we find these investigations do not constitute sexual harassment investigations in the employment context of the district for purposes of *Ellen*. Therefore, the common-law privacy protection afforded in *Ellen* is not applicable to these investigations, and the district may not withhold them under section 552.101 on that basis.

This office has also found that common-law privacy generally protects the identifying information of juvenile victims of abuse or neglect. *See* Open Records Decision No. 394 (1983); *cf.* Fam. Code § 261.201. However, this office has noted the public has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employees and their conduct in the workplace. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision 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), 470 at 4 (1987) (job performance does not generally constitute public employee's private affairs), 444 at 3 (1986) (public has obvious interest in information concerning qualifications and performance of government employees), 405 at 2 (1983) (manner in which public employee's job was performed cannot be said to be of minimal public interest). Upon review, we find the identifying information of the students

who are the subjects of an administrative investigation is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, we find the district must withhold the student sexual harassment victims' names, parent names, and home addresses pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have not demonstrated how any portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, no portion of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with 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). We understand you assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101, which is discussed above. *See Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court has expressly disagreed with *Hubert's* interpretation of section 552.102(a) and held its privacy standard differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). The supreme court then considered the applicability of section 552.102, and has held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Id.* Upon review, we find no portion of the remaining information is excepted under section 552.102(a). Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.102(a).

Section 552.135 of the Government Code provides in relevant part the following:

(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].

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, individuals who provide information in the course of an investigation, but do not make the initial report are not informants for purposes of

section 552.135 of the Government Code. You claim the remaining information contains personally identifiable information of informers who reported possible violations of criminal law. However, we find no portion of the remaining information contains the identity of an informer for section 552.135 purposes. Therefore, we conclude the district may not withhold any of the remaining information on the basis of section 552.135 of the Government Code.

In summary, the district must withhold the identifying information of the students who are the subjects of the administrative investigation under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The remaining information must be released.

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Sarah Casterline
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SEC/bhf

Ref: ID# 525335

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)