



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 24, 2018

Mr. Thomas E. Myers
Counsel for Hurst-Eules-Bedford Independent School District
Bracket & Ellis, P.C.
100 Main Street
Fort Worth, Texas 76102-3090

OR2018-04728A

Dear Mr. Myers:

Our office issued Open Records Letter No. 2018-04728 (2018) on February 28, 2018. Since that date, we have received new information that affects the facts on which this ruling was based. Consequently, this decision serves as the corrected ruling and is a substitute for the decision issued on February 28, 2018. *See generally* Gov't Code § 552.011 (providing that Office of Attorney General may issue decision to maintain uniformity in application, operation, and interpretation of Public Information Act (the "Act")). Your request was assigned ID# 710760.

The Hurst-Eules-Bedford Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for complaints of sexual harassment or sexual misconduct complaints filed against employees during a specified time period.¹ You state the district will redact information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), 20 U.S.C. § 1232g.² *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.026 (incorporating FERPA into the Act), .114

¹We note the district sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (if a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

²The 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 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. The DOE has determined FERPA determinations must be made by the educational authority in possession of the educational records. We have posted a copy of the letter from the DOE on the Attorney General's website at <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/og/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

(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). You further state the district will redact information subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code as permitted by section 552.024(c) of the Government Code, and social security numbers pursuant to 552.147(b) of the Government Code.³ You state the district released some information. Additionally, you state you informed one employee of the request and his right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue should not be released. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). You claim the submitted 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. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. Section 21.355 of the Education Code provides, in relevant part, “[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential.” Educ. Code § 21.355(a). 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.” *Abbott v. North East Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 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 or administrator. *See* Open Records Decision No. 643 (1996). In Open Records Decision No. 643, we determined 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 is in the process of teaching, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. *See id.* at 4.

You argue some of the submitted information consists of confidential evaluations of district teachers. You indicate the teachers at issue were certified as teachers by the State Board of Educator Certification and were acting as a teachers at the times the evaluations were prepared. Based on your representations and our review, we find 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. However, the remaining information you seek

³Section 552.117 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, emergency contact information, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.117. 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.* § 552.024(c). Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person’s social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See id.* § 552.147(b).

to withhold on this basis does not consist of an evaluation for purposes of section 21.355 of the Education Code. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of section 21.355.

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). You 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 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). 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*, 354 S.W.3d 336. 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 no portion of the submitted information 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 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-prong test discussed above. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. See Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). We note there is a legitimate public interest in the conduct of a government 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 (1986) (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), 423 at 2 (scope of public employee privacy is narrow).

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. *Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. The court ordered the release of the affidavit of the person under

investigation and the conclusions of the board of inquiry, stating that 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). We note, because 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, the identity of the individual accused of sexual harassment is not protected from public disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 438 (1986), 405 (1983), 230 (1979), 219 (1978). We also note supervisors are generally not witnesses for purposes of *Ellen*, except where their information appears in a non-supervisory context.

In this instance, we agree a portion of the submitted information pertains to sexual harassment investigations and, thus, is subject to the ruling in *Ellen*. Upon review, however, we find the information at issue does not contain an adequate summary of the investigation of alleged sexual harassment. Because there is no adequate summary of the investigation, the district must generally release the information at issue. However, the information at issue contains the identity and statement of the victims of the alleged sexual harassment. Accordingly, the district must withhold such information, which we marked, under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*. *See Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. However, we find none of the remaining information identifies a victim or witness to the investigations. Therefore, none of the remaining information at issue may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*. We also find a portion of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. The district must withhold this information, which we marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the district has not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the district may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, 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 marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*. 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,



Ramsey A. Abarca
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RAA/gw

Ref: ID# 710760

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)