



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 14, 2016

Ms. JoAnna Talley
Public Officer
Office of Legal Services
Fort Worth Independent School District
100 North University Drive, Suite SW 172
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2016-27659

Dear Ms. Talley:

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# 637768 (Reference No W000671-091916).

The Fort Worth Independent School District (the "district") received a request for the disciplinary record of a named individual. You state the district will withhold some information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), 20 U.S.C. § 1232g. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.026 (incorporating FERPA into the Act), .114 (excepting from disclosure "student records"); Open Records Decision No. 539 (1990) (determining the same analysis applies under section 552.114 of the Government Code and FERPA).¹ You state you have released some information. We understand you do not have

¹The 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: <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/og/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

information responsive to a portion of the request.² You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.111, and 552.135 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. This section encompasses section 21.355 of the Education Code. Section 21.355(a) provides “[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential.” Educ. Code § 21.355(a). Additionally, the Third Court of Appeals 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.” *N. E. Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Abbott*, 212 S.W.3d 364 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.). 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. See Open Records Decision No. 643 at 3 (1996). We also determined a “teacher” for purposes of section 21.355 means a person who (1) is required to and does in fact hold a teaching certificate under subchapter B of chapter 21 of the Education Code or a school district teaching permit under section 21.055, and (2) is engaged in the process of teaching, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. See *id.* at 4.

You state the submitted information constitutes evaluative documents of an individual who was employed by the district as a teacher at the time of the documentation. Upon review, we find the information we have marked constitutes documents evaluating the performance of a teacher. Therefore, if the teacher held the appropriate certificate and was serving as a teacher at the time of the evaluations at issue, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code.³ If the teacher did not hold the appropriate certificate or was not acting as a teacher at the time of the evaluations at issue, the district may not withhold the marked information on this basis. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information at issue consists of documents evaluating the performance of a teacher for purposes of section 21.355 of the Education Code. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

²The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when a request for information was received or to prepare new information in response to a request. See *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

³As our ruling on this information is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against its disclosure.

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].

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). Additionally, witnesses and other individuals who provide information in the course of an investigation are not informants for purposes of section 552.135 of the Government Code.

You state the remaining information contains personally identifiable information of informers who reported possible violations of civil, criminal, or regulatory law. Based on your representation and our review, we find the information we have marked reveals the identity of an informer for purposes of section 552.135. Therefore, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.135 of the Government Code.⁴ However, we find the district has failed to demonstrate any portion of the remaining information reveals the identity of an informer for section 552.135 purposes. Therefore, none of the remaining information may be withheld on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the common-law informer’s privilege, which Texas courts have long recognized. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). 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

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

a criminal or civil statute. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4 (1988). However, individuals who provide information in the course of an investigation are not informants for the purposes of claiming the informer's privilege. The privilege excepts the informer's statement only to the extent necessary to protect that informer's identity. Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990). We note the informer's privilege does not apply where the informant's identity is known to the individual who is the subject of the complaint. *See* Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2 (1978).

You argue the remaining information reveals the identities of individuals "who furnished information relevant to possible violations of criminal and civil law and [d]istrict policy regarding teacher ethics and code of conduct to [d]istrict officials." Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information identifies an individual who made a report of a violation of any criminal or civil law for purposes of the informer's privilege. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.

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[.]"⁵ Gov't Code § 552.102(a). The Texas Supreme Court has 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). Accordingly, the district must withhold the date of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency[.]" Gov't Code § 552.111. This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. *See Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, orig. proceeding); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615, this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, orig. proceeding). We determined section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes

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

of the governmental body. ORD 615 at 5; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 364 (Tex. 2000); *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Texas Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.). A governmental body's policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body's policy mission. *See* Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995). However, a governmental body's policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. ORD 615 at 5-6; *see also Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d at 364 (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking).

Further, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 37 S.W.3d at 157; ORD 615 at 5. But, if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

This office has also concluded section 552.111 exempts from disclosure a preliminary draft of a document intended for public release in its final form because the draft necessarily represents the drafter's advice, opinion, and recommendation with regard to the form and content of the final document. *See* Open Records Decision No. 559 at 2 (1990) (applying statutory predecessor). Section 552.111 protects factual information in the draft that also will be included in the final version of the document. *See id.* at 2-3. Thus, section 552.111 encompasses the entire contents of a preliminary draft of a policymaking document, including comments, underlining, deletions, and proofreading marks, that will be released to the public in its final form. *See id.* at 2.

You assert some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.111. As previously stated, the deliberative process privilege only excepts communications pertaining to administrative and personnel matters of a broad scope that affect a governmental body's policy mission. *See* ORD 631 at 3. Upon review, we find the information at issue reflects it pertains to administrative and personnel issues involving a single district employee, and you have failed to explain the information pertains to administrative or personnel matters of a broad scope that affect the district's policy mission. Therefore, you have failed to demonstrate the deliberative process privilege applies to the information at issue. Accordingly, the district may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

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* 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 personal 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) (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). We note this section does not apply to an individual’s work or office telephone number. 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. Therefore, to the extent the individuals whose information are at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. However, to the extent the telephone numbers at issue are cellular telephone numbers, the district may only withhold them if a governmental body did not pay for the cellular telephone service. Conversely, to the extent the individuals at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the district may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code states “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see also id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Accordingly, we find the district must withhold the account number we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

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). *See id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). Upon review, we find the district must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we have marked

under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consents to their public 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. *Id.* § 552.024(a-1) (school district may not require employee or former employee of district to choose whether to allow public access to employee’s or former employee’s social security number). Reading sections 552.024(a-1) and 552.147(a-1) together, we conclude 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, if the teacher held the appropriate certificate and was serving as a teacher at the time of the evaluations at issue, the district must withhold the information we 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 552.135 of the Government Code. The district must withhold the date of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. To the extent the individuals whose information are at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. However, to the extent the telephone numbers at issue are cellular telephone numbers, the district may only withhold them if a governmental body did not pay for the cellular telephone service. The district must withhold the account number we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The district must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consents to their public disclosure. The district must withhold the social security number we have marked under section 552.147(a-1) of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Erin Groff". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Erin Groff
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EMG/som

Ref: ID# 637768

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)