



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 26, 2016

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

OR2016-16821

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# 619948 (Ref. No. 2016-059).

The Plano Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for 1) specified information pertaining to two district employees during a specified time period, 2) specified information pertaining to district training sessions pertaining to specified topics during a designated time period, and 3) information pertaining to two specified incidents.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. You also state you notified the district employees of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *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 a representative of the district employees. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

¹You state the district sought and received clarification of the request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used); *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380 (Tex. 2010) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

Initially, we note the United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the “DOE”) 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.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 unredacted education records for our review. We note the requestor represents the parents of the student to whom some of the submitted information pertains. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing these education records to determine the applicability of FERPA, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to any of the submitted records, other than to note that parents have a right of access under FERPA to their own child’s education records. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(1)(A); 34 C.F.R. § 99.3. Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. However, we will consider the district’s claims under section 552.101 to the extent the requestor does not have a right of access to the submitted information under FERPA.

Next, we note the district has only submitted information responsive to the first two categories of the request. To the extent information responsive to the remainder of the request existed on the date the district received the request, we assume you have released it. *See* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible). If you have not released any such information, you must do so at this time. *See* Gov’t Code §§ 552.301(a), .302.

We note the named individuals object to the disclosure of types of information not contained in the information the district has submitted to this office for review. This ruling does not address information that was not submitted by the district and is limited to the information the district has submitted for our review. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from Attorney General must submit copy of specific information requested).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” *Id.* § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses other statutes, such as 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

²A 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>.

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 assert the submitted information consists of written evaluations that are confidential under section 21.355. You inform us the teachers at issue held the appropriate certification at the time of the evaluations. Based on your representations and our review, we find some of the submitted information constitutes evaluations as contemplated by section 21.355. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code.³ However, we find the district and the district employees have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information constitutes an evaluation for the purposes of section 21.355 of the Education Code. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the Medical Practice Act (“MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in relevant part:

- (a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient, is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.
- (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.

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

Occ. Code § 159.002(a)-(c). Information subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See id.* §§ 159.002, .004. This office has concluded 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 find the information we have marked constitutes a record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that was created or is maintained by someone under the supervision of a physician. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.⁴

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.”⁵ Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). The Texas Supreme Court 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. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). Upon review, we find the district must withhold the date of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.⁶

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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). We note some of the information at issue pertains to a worker’s compensation claim, and thus, there is a legitimate public interest in this information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 545 at 4 (1990) (attorney general has found kinds of financial information not excepted from public disclosure by common-law privacy to generally be those regarding receipt of governmental funds or debts owed to governmental entities), 423 at 2 (1094) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). In addition, information pertaining to leave of public employees is generally a matter of legitimate public interest. *See* Open

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

⁵The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

⁶As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

Records Decision No. 336 at 2 (1982) (names of employees taking sick leave and dates of sick leave taken not private).

In *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied), the court addressed the applicability of the common-law privacy doctrine to files of an investigation of allegations of sexual harassment. The investigation files in *Ellen* contained individual witness statements, an affidavit by the individual accused of the misconduct responding to the allegations, and conclusions of the board of inquiry that conducted the investigation. *Id.* at 525. The court ordered the release of the affidavit of the person under investigation and the conclusions of the board of inquiry, stating the public's interest was sufficiently served by the disclosure of such documents. *Id.* In concluding, the *Ellen* court held "the public did not possess a legitimate interest in the identities of the individual witnesses, nor the details of their personal statements beyond what is contained in the documents that have been ordered released." *Id.* Thus, if there is an adequate summary of an investigation of alleged sexual harassment, the investigation summary must be released under *Ellen*, but the identities of the victims and witnesses of the alleged sexual harassment must be redacted, and their detailed statements must be withheld from disclosure. See Open Records Decision Nos. 393 (1983), 339 (1982). However, common-law privacy does not protect information about a public employee's alleged misconduct on the job or complaints made about a public employee's job performance. See Open Records Decision Nos. 438 (1986), 405 (1983), 230 (1979), 219 (1978).

We note the submitted information does not pertain to investigations of alleged sexual harassment. Thus, the district may not withhold any of the information in the submitted information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and the *Ellen* decision. However, we find some of the information at issue satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the district and the district employees have failed to demonstrate the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the district may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code applies to records a governmental body holds in an employment capacity and excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, 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. Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Section 552.024(a-1) of the Government Code provides, a "school district may not require an employee or former employee of the district to choose whether to allow public access to the employee's or former employee's social security number." *Id.* § 552.024(a-1). Thus, the district may only withhold under section 552.117 the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of the district who requests this

information be kept confidential under section 552.024. Section 552.117 is also applicable to 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) (statutory predecessor to section 552.117 of the Government Code not applicable to cellular telephone numbers provided and 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 the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, a governmental body must withhold information under section 552.117 on behalf of a current or former official or employee only if the individual made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. Accordingly, if the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality pursuant to section 552.024, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1), including the cellular telephone numbers if the cellular telephone services are not paid for by a governmental body. The district may not withhold this information under section 552.117 for those current or former employees who did not make a timely election to keep the information confidential.

Section 552.147(a-1) of the Government Code provides, "[t]he social security number of an employee of a school district in the custody of the district is confidential." Gov't Code § 552.147(a-1). Thus, section 552.147(a-1) makes the social security numbers of school district employees confidential, without such employees being required to first make a confidentiality election under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.024(a-1) (a school district may not require an employee or former employee of the district to choose whether to allow public access to the employee's or former employee's social security number). Reading sections 552.024(a-1) and 552.147(a-1) together, we conclude that section 552.147(a-1) makes confidential the social security numbers of both current and former school district employees. Accordingly, the district must withhold the social security number we have marked under section 552.147(a-1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the district must withhold the information we have marked 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 the MPA. The district must withhold the date of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. If the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality pursuant to section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code, including the cellular telephone numbers if the cellular telephone services are not paid for by a governmental body. The district must

withhold the social security number we have marked under section 552.147(a-1) of the Government Code. The district must release the remaining information.⁷

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,



Meredith L. Coffman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MLC/bw

Ref: ID# 619948

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

⁷We note the requestor has a special right of access to an e-mail address being released in this instance under section 552.137(b) of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009). Accordingly, if the district receives another request for this information from a requestor who does not have such a right of access, Open Records Decision No. 684 authorizes the district to redact the personal e-mail address at issue under section 552.137 of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting a decision under the Act.