



KEN PAXTON  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 26, 2016

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

OR2016-23973

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# 631818 (ORR# 15515).

The Dallas Independent School District (the "district") received a request for information pertaining to multiple named individuals. You state you will release some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, and 552.135 of the Government Code, as well as privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.<sup>1</sup> We have considered your 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>2</sup> Consequently,

---

<sup>1</sup>Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 552.102 of the Government Code, we note section 552.101 does not encompass other exceptions in the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990).

<sup>2</sup>A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website: <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. Thus, section 552.101 encompasses information other statutes make confidential. For information to be confidential under section 552.101, the provision of law must explicitly require confidentiality. You contend the information at issue is protected under the federal Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (“HIPAA”), 42 U.S.C. §§ 1320d-1320d-8. At the direction of Congress, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (“HHS”) promulgated regulations setting privacy standards for medical records, which HHS issued as the Federal Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information. *See* Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, 42 U.S.C. § 1320d-2 (Supp. IV 1998) (historical & statutory note); Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information, 45 C.F.R. pts. 160, 164 (“Privacy Rule”); *see also* Attorney General Opinion JC-0508 at 2 (2002). These standards govern the releasability of protected health information by a covered entity. *See* 45 C.F.R. pts. 160, 164. Under these standards, a covered entity may not use or disclose protected health information, except as provided by parts 160 and 164 of the Code of Federal Regulations. *See id.* § 164.502(a).

This office has addressed the interplay of the Privacy Rule and the Act. In Open Records Decision No. 681 (2004), we noted section 164.512 of title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations provides a covered entity may use or disclose protected health information to the extent such use or disclosure is required by law and the use or disclosure complies with and is limited to the relevant requirements of such law. *See id.* § 164.512(a)(1). We further noted the Act “is a mandate in Texas law that compels Texas governmental bodies to disclose information to the public.” ORD 681 at 8; *see also* Gov’t Code §§ 552.002, .003, .021. Therefore, we held the disclosures under the Act come within section 164.512(a). Consequently, the Privacy Rule does not make information confidential for the purpose of section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See Abbott v. Tex. Dep’t of Mental Health & Mental Retardation*, 212 S.W.3d 648 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.); ORD 681 at 9; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 478 (1987) (as general rule, statutory confidentiality requires express language making information confidential). Thus, because the Privacy Rule does not make information that is subject to disclosure under the Act confidential, the district may withhold protected health information from the public only if the information is confidential under other law or an exception in subchapter C of the Act applies.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503 enacts the attorney-client privilege. Rule 503(b)(1) provides as follows:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

(A) between the client or the client's representative and the client's lawyer or the lawyer's representative;

(B) between the client's lawyer and the lawyer's representative;

(C) by the client, the client's representative, the client's lawyer, or the lawyer's representative to a lawyer representing another party in a pending action or that lawyer's representative, if the communications concern a matter of common interest in the pending action;

(D) between the client's representatives or between the client and the client's representative; or

(E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). A communication is "confidential" if not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client or reasonably necessary to transmit the communication. *Id.* 503(a)(5).

When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. *See* ORD 676 at 6-7. Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must (1) show the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; (2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and (3) show the communication is confidential by explaining that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. *See id.* Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the entire communication is confidential under rule 503, provided the client has not waived the privilege or the communication does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein); *In re Valero Energy Corp.*, 973 S.W.2d 453, 457 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1998, orig. proceeding) (privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

You state the information at issue was communicated between legal counsel for the district and the district's administrative representatives. You explain the information was prepared for the purpose of providing legal services to the district. Additionally, you state the information at issue was intended to be confidential and has remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. *Cf. Harlandale Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Cornyn*, 25 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. App.—Austin 2000, pet. denied) (attorney's entire investigative report protected by attorney-client privilege where attorney was retained to conduct investigation in her capacity as attorney for purpose of providing legal services and advice). Accordingly, the district may withhold the information we have marked under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.<sup>3</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code 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 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 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 information at issue was obtained from the Dallas Police Department (“DPD”), the Texas 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. Upon review, we find the information we have marked either consists of the identifying information of a person who reported alleged or suspected abuse or neglect to Child Protective Services, or was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse under chapter 261. Therefore, the district must withhold this information under section 552.101 in conjunction with sections 261.201(a)(1)

---

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

and 261.201(a)(2). However, 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. We are unable to determine, however, whether the Suspected Child Abuse Reporting Forms were produced to DPD, DFPS, or the department. Accordingly, we rule in the alternative. To the extent the Suspected Child Abuse Reporting Forms were 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 or neglect under chapter 261 and must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 261.201(a)(2).

In the event the Suspected Child Abuse Reporting Forms were not produced to DPD, DFPS, or the department, then this information does not consist of information used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse under chapter 261 of the Family Code and may not be withheld on the basis of section 261.201(a)(2) of the Family Code. In this instance, however, we find portions of the reporting forms 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). Therefore, the district must withhold the representative sample of information we have marked in the reporting forms under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a)(1). However, none of the remaining information is confidential under section 261.201 and the district may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that basis.

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 (listing agencies that may conduct child abuse investigations). Upon review, we find none of the remaining information 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 the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 261.101.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by section 21.355 of the Education Code, which provides in part that “[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 for purposes of section 21.355, the term “teacher” means a person who is required to and does in fact hold a teaching certificate or permit 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* ORD 643 at 4. The Third Court of Appeals has concluded a written reprimand constitutes an evaluation for purposes of section 21.355, because “it reflects the principal’s judgment regarding [a teacher’s] actions, gives corrective direction, and provides for further review.” *See North East Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Abbott*, 212 S.W.3d 364 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.).

You state some of the remaining information consists of the named individuals' evaluations. You inform us these individuals were required to, and held certifications under subchapter B of chapter 21 of the Education Code at the time of the evaluations. You further state the individuals at issue were performing the duties of teachers at the time of the evaluations. Based on your representations and our review of the information, we find some of the remaining information is confidential under section 21.355 of the Education Code, and the district must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information constitutes evaluations of a teacher's performance as contemplated by section 21.355. Thus, the district may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 21.355.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information made confidential by the Medical Practice Act ("MPA"), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records. *See* Occ. Code §§ 151.001-168.202. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in relevant part, the following:

- (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.

*Id.* § 159.002(a)-(c). Information that is 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. However, upon review, we find no portion of the remaining information is subject to the MPA. Therefore, the district may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with the MPA.

Section 552.102(b) of the Government Code excepts from public 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, that "the degree obtained or the curriculum on a transcript in the personnel file of the employee" are not excepted from disclosure. *Id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision

No. 526 (1989). Thus, with the exception of the employees' name, courses taken, and degrees obtained, the district must withhold the submitted college transcripts we have marked under section 552.102(b).<sup>4</sup>

Section 552.102(a) 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). 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). Within the remaining information, the district must withhold all dates of birth pertaining to the district's employees under section 552.102(a). However, we find the remaining information is not excepted under section 552.102(a) and may not be withheld on that basis.

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 or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has found that common-law privacy generally protects the identifying information of juvenile victims of abuse or neglect. *See* Open Records Decision No. 394 (1983); *cf.* Fam. Code § 261.201.

In considering whether a public citizen's date of birth is private, the Third Court of Appeals looked to the supreme court's rationale in *Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts*, 354 S.W.3d at 336. *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at \*3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). The supreme court concluded public employees' dates of birth are private under section 552.102 of the Government Code because the employees' privacy interest substantially outweighed the negligible public interest in disclosure.<sup>5</sup> *Tex. Comptroller*, 354 S.W.3d at 347-48. Based on *Texas Comptroller*, the court of appeals concluded the privacy rights of public employees apply equally to public citizens, and thus, public citizens' dates of birth are also protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *City of Dallas*, 2015 WL 3394061, at \*3. Upon review, we find some of the remaining information at issue identifies juvenile victims of abuse or neglect. Accordingly, the district must withhold the identifying information of the juvenile victim of abuse or neglect, such as the child victims' names, identification numbers, pictures of the child

---

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

<sup>5</sup>As noted above, section 552.102(a) 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).

victims, home addresses and telephone numbers, and the name of the child victims' parents or guardians, a representative sample of which we have marked, in addition to all public citizens' dates of birth not pertaining to deidentified individuals, whose privacy interests are protected, under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.135 of the Government Code provides, in part, the following:

(a) "Informer" means a student or 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].

Gov't Code § 552.135(a), (b). 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). We note section 552.135 protects an informer's identity, but it does not generally encompass protection for witnesses or witness statements. You state some of the remaining information identifies students and employees who reported alleged violations of criminal and civil laws. Upon review, we find a portion of the remaining information identifies an individual who reported a possible violation of law for purposes of section 552.135. The district must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.135. 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.

In summary, to the extent the district determines the requested information consists of "education records" that must be withheld under FERPA, the district must dispose of any such information in accordance with FERPA rather than the Act. The district may withhold the information we have marked under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with sections 261.201(a)(1) and 261.201(a)(2) of the Family Code. If the submitted Suspected Child Abuse Reporting Forms were produced to DPD, DFPS, or the department, the district must withhold the submitted Suspected Child Abuse Reporting Forms in their entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a)(2) of the Family Code. If the submitted Suspected Child Abuse Reporting Forms were not produced to DPD, DFPS, or the department, the district must withhold the representative sample of information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a)(1) of the Family Code, and release the remaining portions of the Suspected Child Abuse Reporting Forms. 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. With the exception of the

employees' name, courses taken, and degrees obtained, the district must withhold the submitted college transcripts we have marked under section 552.102(b) of the Government Code. Within the remaining information, the district must withhold all dates of birth pertaining to the district's employees under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the identifying information of the juvenile victims of abuse or neglect, such as the child victims' names, identification numbers, pictures of the child victims, home addresses and telephone numbers, and the names of the child victims' parents or guardians, a representative sample of which we have marked, in addition to all public citizens' dates of birth not pertaining to deidentified individuals under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The district must withhold the information which we have marked under section 552.135 of the Government Code. 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,



Cole Hutchison  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CH/bhf

Ref: ID# 631818

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)