



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 2, 2016

Ms. Melissa Mozingo
Counsel for the Bastrop Independent School District
Leasor Crass, PC
302 West Broad
Mansfield, Texas 76063

OR2016-24372

Dear Ms. Mozingo:

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# 632919.

The Bastrop Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for specified categories of information pertaining to a named former employee. You state you will withhold certain information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.117, 552.130, 552.135, 552.137, and 552.147 of the Government Code.² 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

¹Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination issued by this office authorizing all governmental bodies to withhold certain categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision, including W-2 and W-4 forms under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code.

²Although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 552.117 of the Government Code, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass other exceptions found in the Act. See Open Records Decision No. 676 at 1-2 (2002).

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.³ 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 education records, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to any of the submitted information. Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of such records. We will, however, consider the applicability of the claimed exceptions to the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 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 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 some of the submitted information consists of a written evaluation that is confidential under section 21.355. You indicate, and have submitted documentation reflecting, the teacher at issue held the appropriate certification at the time of the evaluation. Based on your representations and our review, we agree the information at issue constitutes an evaluation 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.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in part, the following:

- (a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act], and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent

³A 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>.

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 id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of chapter 261), 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). You claim some of 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). Upon review, however, we find the information we have marked was used or developed in an investigation conducted by Child Protective Services under chapter 261 of the Family Code, so as to fall within the scope of section 261.201(a). 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) of the Family Code.⁴ However, we find the remaining information at issue was not used or developed in an investigation conducted under chapter 261 of the Family Code but instead relates to an administrative investigation performed by the district. Thus, the district may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on this basis.

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 to assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses common-law 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). 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 of appeals 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 the privacy standard under section 552.102(a) differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. *See Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010).

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

The supreme court also considered the applicability of section 552.102(a) and held it excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *See id.* at 348. Upon review, we find the district must withhold the named former employee's date of birth under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.⁵ However, we find no portion of the remaining information at issue is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the district may not withhold any of the remaining information on that basis.

Section 552.102(b) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "a transcript from an institution of higher education maintained in the personnel file of a professional public school employee[.]" Gov't Code § 552.102(b). This exception further provides, however, "the degree obtained or the curriculum on a transcript in the personnel file of the employee" are not excepted from disclosure. *Id.* Upon review, we find the district must withhold the educational transcripts we have marked under section 552.102(b) of the Government Code, except for the information that reveals the employee's name, the degree obtained, and the courses taken. *See* Open Records Decision No. 526 (1989) (addressing statutory predecessor).

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code, except as provided by section 552.024(a-1). *See id.* §§ 552.117(a)(1), .024. 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. We note a post office box number is not a "home address" for purposes of section 552.117(a). *See* Open Records Decision No. 622 at 4 (1994) (legislative history makes clear that purpose of Gov't Code § 552.117 is to protect public employees from being harassed at home). 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). Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee or official who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee or official who did not timely request under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. We note you have submitted documentation demonstrating the individual

⁵As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

whose personal information is at issue elected to keep such information confidential. Therefore, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.⁶ However, we find the remaining information at issue is not subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code and may not be withheld on that basis.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Upon review, we find the information we have marked consists of motor vehicle record information subject to section 552.130. Therefore, the district must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. However, you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information at issue is subject to section 552.130. Thus, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

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 or persons' 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.

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

Id. § 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). You state some of the remaining information identifies students and employees who reported an alleged violation of criminal and civil laws to the district or the proper regulatory enforcement authority. Based on your representation and our review, we conclude the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.135 of the Government Code.⁷ However, you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information at issue reveals the identity of an informer for the purposes of section 552.135 of the Government Code. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue on that ground.

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). *Id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c) of the Government Code. Accordingly, the district must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner of the e-mail address affirmatively consents to its disclosure.

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.” *Id.* § 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 named former employee’s social security number in the remaining information under section 552.147(a-1) of the Government Code.⁸ However, we find the remaining information at issue does not consist of a social security number subject to section 552.147 of the Government Code and may not be withheld on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 21.048 of the Education Code provides, in relevant part, the following:

⁷As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

⁸As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

The results of an examination administered under this section are confidential and are not subject to disclosure under [the Act], unless the disclosure is regarding notification to a parent of the assignment of an uncertified teacher to a classroom as required by Section 21.057.

Educ. Code § 21.048(c-1). Upon review, we find the information we have marked reflects the results of an examination administered under section 21.048 of the Education Code. We have no indication section 21.057 of the Education Code is applicable in this instance. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 21.048(c-1) of the Education Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the informer's privilege, which has long been recognized by Texas courts. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969); *Hawthorne v. State*, 10 S.W.2d 724, 725 (Tex. Crim. App. 1928). The informer's privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority, provided the subject of the information does not already know the informer's identity. *See Open Records Decision No. 208* at 1-2 (1978). The informer's privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to "administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres." *Open Records Decision No. 279* at 1-2 (1981) (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (J. McNaughton rev. ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 582* at 2 (1990), 515 at 4 (1988). Upon review, we find the remaining information at issue does not identify an individual who made a report to the district, agency, or department. Thus, we conclude the district may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.101 on that basis.

As note above, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which is subject to the two part test described above. *See Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. 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 found common-law privacy generally protects the identifying information of a juvenile victim of abuse or neglect. *See Open Records Decision No. 394* (1983); *cf.* Fam. Code § 261.201. Additionally, this office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally private. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 600* (1992) (employee's designation of retirement beneficiary, choice of insurance carrier, election of optional coverages, direct deposit authorization, forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal

financial information), 455 at 9 (1987) (employment applicant's salary information not private), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). We also note 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).

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 remaining information at issue does not pertain to an investigation of alleged sexual harassment for purposes of the *Ellen* decision. 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 remaining information 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 has 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.

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 section 261.201(a) of the

Family Code. The district must withhold the named former employee's date of birth under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the educational transcripts we have marked under section 552.102(b) of the Government Code, except for the information that reveals the employee's name, the degree obtained, and the courses taken. The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.135 of the Government Code. The district must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner of the e-mail address affirmatively consents to its disclosure. The district must withhold the named former employee's social security number in the remaining information under section 552.147(a-1) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 21.048(c-1) of the Education Code. The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. 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, 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# 632919

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)