



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 7, 2017

Ms. Leticia D. McGowan
Assistant General Counsel
Dallas Independent School District
9400 North Central Expressway, Room 612
Dallas, Texas 75231

OR2017-25412

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# 683428 (ORR# 16486).

The Dallas Independent School District (the "district") received a request for the personnel files of two named individuals and a specified investigation. You state you will release some of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, and 552.135 of the Government Code. 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 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.¹ 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

¹A 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>.

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 the submitted record. *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 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 encompasses section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in part:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, 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 [chapter 261 of the Family Code] 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 [chapter 261 of the Family Code] or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a); *see also id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of this section as person under 18 years of age who is not and has not been married or who has not had the disabilities of minority removed for general purposes), 261.001(1) (defining “abuse” for purposes of Family Code ch. 261). You contend a portion 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). 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 none of the information at issue was obtained from DPD, DFPS, or the department, but instead relates to an administrative investigation by the district. However, we are unable to determine whether the submitted Suspected Child Abuse Reporting Form (the “reporting form”) was produced to DPD, DFPS, or the department.

Accordingly, we must rule conditionally. If the reporting form was produced to DPD, DFPS, or the department, then we find this information consists of information used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse under chapter 261. In that instance, the district must withhold the reporting form in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a)(2) of the Family Code.

In the event the reporting form was 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). In this instance, however, we find a portion of the reporting form, which we have marked, consists of the identifying information of a person who reported alleged or suspected abuse or neglect to Child Protective Services. We find this information is within the scope of section 261.201(a)(1) of the Family Code. 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)(1) of the Family Code.² However, we find none of the remaining information, which relates to an administrative investigation by the district, is confidential under section 261.201 of the Family Code and none of it may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 21.355 of the Education Code, which provides that “[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential and is not subject to disclosure under [the Act].” Act of May 16, 2017, 85th Leg., R.S., S.B. 7, § 14 (to be codified as an amendment to 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 a portion of the information at issue is confidential under section 21.355. You inform us the teacher at issue held the appropriate certification under chapter 21 of the Education Code at the time of the incident. Based on your representations and our review, we agree that some of the documents, which we have marked, constitute evaluations as contemplated by section 21.355. Accordingly, the district must withhold the documents we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

Code.³ However, you have not demonstrated that any of the remaining information at issue evaluates the performance of a teacher for purposes of section 21.355; thus, none of the remaining information at issue may be withheld on that basis under section 552.101.

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. Upon review, we find some of the remaining information at issue identifies a juvenile victim of abuse. Thus, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.⁴

Section 552.102(b) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure higher education transcripts of professional public school employees, but does not except the employee's name, the courses taken, and the degree obtained from disclosure. Gov't Code § 552.102(b); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 526 (1989). Thus, with the exception of the employee's name, courses taken, and degrees obtained, the district must withhold the submitted transcripts pursuant to section 552.102(b) of the Government Code.⁵

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].

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

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

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

(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.

Gov't Code § 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). Additionally, individuals who provide information in the course of an investigation, but do not report a violation of law are not informants for purposes of section 552.135 of the Government Code. You state the remaining information identifies students and employees who reported an alleged violation of criminal and civil laws. Upon review, we find the district has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information 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 on that ground.

In summary, if the reporting form was produced to DPD, DFPS, or the department, then the district must withhold the reporting form in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a)(2) of the Family Code. If the reporting form was not produced to DPD, DFPS, or the department, then the district must withhold the information we have marked in the reporting form under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a)(1) of the Family Code and common-law privacy. In either case, the district must (1) withhold the additional information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy, (2) withhold the documents we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code, (3) with the exception of the employee's name, courses taken, and degrees obtained, withhold the submitted transcripts pursuant to section 552.102(b) of the Government Code, and (4) 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,



Emily Buchanan
Attorney
Open Records Division

EB/som

Ref: ID# 683428

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)