



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 12, 2016

Ms. Leticia D. McGowan
School Attorney
Dallas Independent School District
3700 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75204-5491

OR2016-10842

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# 609802 (ORR# 14971).

The Dallas Independent School District (the "district") received a request for information related to specified incidents and investigations as well as district policies, directives, guidelines, and training for dealing with certain types of incidents. You state the district will release some of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.135 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. 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 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,

¹A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website at <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/og/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

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 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. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. Section 261.201 of the Family Code provides, in relevant part, as follows:

(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.

...

(k) Notwithstanding Subsection (a), an investigating agency, other than the [Texas Department of Family and Protective Services] or the Texas Juvenile Justice Department, on request, shall provide to the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child who is the subject of reported abuse or neglect, or to the child if the child is at least 18 years of age, information concerning the reported abuse or neglect that would otherwise be confidential under this section. The investigating agency shall withhold information under this subsection if the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of the child requesting the information is alleged to have committed the abuse or neglect.

(l) Before a child or a parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child may inspect or copy a record or file concerning the child under Subsection (k), the custodian of the record or file must redact:

...

(2) any information that is excepted from required disclosure under [the Act], or other law; and

(3) the identity of the person who made the report.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a), (k), (l)(2)-(3); *see 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 chapter 261 of the Family Code). You claim the submitted information is confidential 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 state the submitted information was obtained from the Dallas Police Department (“DPD”), the Department of Family and Protective Services (“DFPS”), or the district’s police department (the “department”). You also state the district has on staff an employee who is shared with DFPS to receive and investigate child abuse claims.

A portion of the submitted information consists of a report of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect made to the department. Accordingly, we find this information is subject to chapter 261 of the Family Code. We note the requestor is the legal representative of the child victim listed in the information, and is not alleged to have committed the abuse or neglect. Thus, pursuant to section 261.201(k), the information at issue may not be withheld from this requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of section 261.201(a). *See id.* § 261.201(k). However, section 261.201(l)(3) states the identity of the reporting party shall be withheld from disclosure. *Id.* § 261.201(l)(3). Accordingly, we find the district must withhold the identifying information of the reporting party, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(l)(3) of the Family Code.

Upon review, we find most of the remaining information was not obtained from DPD, DFPS, or the department, but instead relates to administrative investigations by the district. However, we are unable to determine whether the submitted Suspected Child Abuse Reporting Form (the “reporting form”) was produced to DPD, DFPS, or the department. Accordingly, we must rule conditionally. If the reporting form was produced to DPD, DFPS, or the department, we find this information consists of information used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse under chapter 261. As noted above, the requestor is the legal representative of the child victim listed in the information at issue.

Further, the requestor is not alleged to have committed the abuse or neglect. Thus, if the reporting form was produced to the department, then pursuant to section 261.201(k), the information at issue may not be withheld from this requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of section 261.201(a). *See id.* § 261.201(k). However, in that instance, the district must withhold the identity of the reporting party, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(1)(3) of the Family Code. However, if the reporting form was produced only to DPD or DFPS, then, because the district is not the investigating agency, the requestor does not have a right of access to the information pursuant to section 261.201(k), and in that instance, the district must withhold the reporting form in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a)(2) of the Family Code.

If the reporting form was not produced to DPD, DFPS, or the department, then this information does not consist of information used or developed in investigations of alleged or suspected child abuse under chapter 261 of the Family Code and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a)(2). Furthermore, the remaining information, which relates to an administrative investigation by the district, may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. However, we find portions of the information at issue, which we have marked, consist of the identifying information of a person who reported alleged or suspected abuse or neglect to Child Protective Services. This information is within the scope of section 261.201(a)(1) of the Family Code. Therefore, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a)(1) of the Family Code.

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 remaining information at issue consists of the identifying information of an individual who made a report under chapter 261 of the Family Code. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.101 of the Family Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code 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. This office has also held common-law privacy protects the identity of a juvenile offender. *See* Open Records Decision No. 394 (1983); *cf.* Fam. Code

§ 58.007(c). However, we are unable to determine the age of the offender in the information at issue. Accordingly, we must rule in the alternative. If the offender at issue was ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age at the time of the conduct at issue, then the district must withhold the name of the offender under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, if the suspect at issue was under ten years of age or was seventeen years of age or older at the time of the conduct, then the offender is not a juvenile and his identifying information may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

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].

(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). 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 report a possible violation of law are not informants for purposes of section 552.135. The district claims 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 information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(1)(3) of the Family Code. If the submitted reporting form was produced to the department, then the district must withhold the identity of the reporting party, which we marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(1)(3) of the Family Code. If the submitted reporting form was produced only to DPD or DFPS, then the district must withhold the reporting form in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a)(2) of the Family Code. The district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a)(1) of the Family Code. If the offender at issue was ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age at the time of the conduct at issue, then the district must withhold the name of the offender under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The district must release the remaining information to this requestor.²

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,



Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/som

²We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person's agent on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Thus, if the district receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the district must again seek a decision from this office.

Ref: ID# 609082

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)