



KEN PAXTON  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 25, 2015

Mr. James R. Raup  
Counsel for the Round Rock Independent School District  
McGinnis Lochridge & Kilgore LLP  
600 Congress Avenue, Suite 2100  
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2015-12660

Dear Mr. Raup:

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# 569231.

The Round Rock Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received two requests from different requestors for personnel records related to a named former district employee. You state the district has released some information to the requestors. You also state the district has redacted certain information submitted to this office pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code, and under section 552.117 of the Government Code, as permitted by section 552.024(c) of the Government Code, and section 552.137 of the Government Code in accordance with Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).<sup>1</sup> You claim the submitted

---

<sup>1</sup>The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") has informed this office FERPA does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental or student consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act. The DOE has determined FERPA determinations must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website: <http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf>. Section 552.024 of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to withhold information subject to section 552.117 without requesting a decision from this office if the employee or official or former employee or official chooses not to allow public access to the information. *See id.* §§ 552.117, .024(c); *see also 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), .024(c-l) (requestor may appeal governmental body's decision to

information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.102 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed 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, in part, “[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential.” See 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). We have determined that for purposes of section 21.355, the word “teacher” means a person who is required to and does in fact hold a teaching certificate under subchapter B of chapter 21 of the Education Code and who is engaged in the process of teaching, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. See *id.* at 4.

You claim the submitted information consists of documents that evaluate the performance of a teacher. However, we note a portion of the submitted information consists of evaluations of the educator at issue in his capacity as a coach. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate this information consists of documents evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator for 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). Furthermore, we find you have not demonstrated any portion of the remaining information evaluates the performance of a teacher or administrator for purposes of section 21.355. Accordingly, 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.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrines of constitutional privacy and common-law privacy. Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual’s interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). The first type protects an individual’s autonomy within “zones of privacy” which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual’s privacy interests and the public’s need to know

---

withhold information under section 552.024(c) to attorney general), .024(c-2) (governmental body withholding information pursuant to section 552.024(c) must provide certain notice to requestor). Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain information, including personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the “most intimate aspects of human affairs.” *Id.* at 5 (quoting *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490 at 492 (5th Cir. 1985)).

We note the submitted information contains photographs of an identifiable adult individual in various states of undress. Therefore, we find the district must withhold the submitted photographs which depict an identifiable individual who is partially or completely nude under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy.<sup>2</sup>

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. We note, however, the public generally has a legitimate interest in information relating to public employment and public employees. *See* 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 (1987) (public employee’s job performance does not generally constitute employee’s private affairs) 444 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employee), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). This office has stated in numerous opinions the work behavior of a public employee and the conditions for the employee’s continued employment are generally matters of legitimate public interest not protected by the common-law right of privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 438 (1986), 405 at 2-3 (1983) (public has interest in manner in which public employee performs his job), 329 at 2 (1982) (information relating to complaints against public employees and discipline resulting therefrom is not protected under former section 552.101), 208 at 2 (1978) (information relating to complaint against public employee and disposition of the complaint is not protected under either the constitutional or common-law right of privacy). We understand you to claim the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under common-law privacy. Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, none 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

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

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, which is outlined 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 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). 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 you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.102(a) to any of the remaining information, and the district may not withhold any of the remaining information on this basis.

In summary, the district must withhold the submitted photographs which depict an identifiable individual who is partially or completely nude under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional 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](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,



Tim Neal  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

TN/bhf

Ref: ID# 569231

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestors  
(w/o enclosures)