



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 21, 2016

Ms. Lauren M. Wood  
Counsel for Plano Independent School District  
Abernathy, Roeder, Boyd & Hullett, P.C.  
P.O. Box 1210  
McKinney, Texas 75070-1210

OR2016-01582

Dear Ms. Wood:

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# 596110.

The Plano Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for a specified report. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. You state the district will redact information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a). You also state you notified third parties of the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have received comments from two individuals. We have considered the submitted arguments 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.<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

---

<sup>1</sup>A 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>.

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 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 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 of the Government Code encompasses 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(a). 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). Additionally, a 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.” *Abbott v. North East Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 212 S.W.3d 364 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006. no pet.). In Open Records Decision No. 643, we concluded that a “teacher” for purposes of section 21.355 means a person who (1) is required to and does in fact hold a certificate or permit required under chapter 21 of the Education Code and (2) is teaching at the time of his or her evaluation. *See* ORD 643.

You claim the submitted information constitutes an evaluation of two teachers that is confidential under section 21.355 of the Education Code. You state the individuals at issue held the appropriate certificates at the time of the evaluation. However, upon review, we find the submitted information pertains to the employees at issue in their capacities as coaches. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the information at issue constitutes an evaluation of the performance of a teacher for the purposes of section 21.355 of the Education Code. *See* Educ. Code § 21.353 (teachers shall be appraised only on basis of classroom teaching performance and not in connection with extracurricular activities). Therefore, the district may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code. We will consider your other argument for the submitted information.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) 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 satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this

office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). You assert the submitted information is protected by common-law privacy. However, the submitted information pertains to individuals who have been de-identified, and thus, these individuals' privacy interests have been protected. Therefore, the district must release the submitted information.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body" unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c).<sup>2</sup> *See id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). Accordingly, the district must withhold the personal e-mail address, which we have marked, under section 552.137, unless the individual to whom the e-mail address belongs affirmatively consents to its release. *See id.* § 552.137(b).

In summary, the district must withhold the e-mail address we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the individual to whom the e-mail address belongs affirmatively consents to its release. The district must release the remaining information.

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](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,



Ashley Crutchfield  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

AC/dls

---

<sup>2</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Ref: ID# 596110

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)