



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 3, 2019

Dr. Gregory Bradley  
Assistant Superintendent  
Prosper Independent School District  
605 East Seventh Street  
Prosper, Texas 75078

OR2019-00111

Dear Dr. Bradley:

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# 744631 (Reference No. FF-092718).

The Prosper Independent School District (the "district") received a request for: e-mail correspondence between a named individual and district staff regarding a specified topic; official statements pertaining to two specified topics; information pertaining to specified meetings regarding specified topics; investigatory information involving all district staff and named individuals during stated time periods; and financial information, jurisdiction information, and organization structure pertaining to the district and the district's police department (the "department") during stated periods of time.<sup>1</sup> The district states it will provide most of the requested information the requestor. The district claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.135 of the Government Code. The district states it notified other interested parties of the request for information and of their rights to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We

---

<sup>1</sup>The district states, and provides documentation showing, the district sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when 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).

have received comments from one interested party. We have considered the submitted 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, 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”); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 224 (1979) (student’s handwritten comments protected under FERPA because they would make identity of student easily traceable through handwriting, style of expression, or particular incidents related in the comments). We note FERPA is not applicable to records that were created by a law enforcement unit of an educational agency or institution for a law enforcement purpose and that are maintained by the law enforcement unit. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(4)(B)(ii); 34 C.F.R. §§ 99.3.8. The district does not indicate, however, whether any of the submitted information is maintained exclusively by the department. Therefore, to the extent the submitted information is maintained by a component of the district other than the department, such records are subject to FERPA. The district has submitted redacted and 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); 34 C.F.R. § 99.3; *see also* *Equal Employment Opportunity Comm’n v. City of Orange, Tex.*, 905 F. Supp. 381, 382 (E.D. Tex. 1995) (holding FERPA prevails over inconsistent provision of state law). Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. However, we will consider the submitted 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. Section 552.101 encompasses section 21.355 of the Education Code, which provides, in relevant part, “[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential.” 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 administrator. *See* Open Records Decision No. 643 (1996). Additionally, the Third Court of Appeals has concluded a written reprimand constitutes an evaluation for purposes of section 21.355, as it “reflects the principal’s judgment regarding

---

<sup>2</sup>A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General’s website at <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/sites/default/files/files/divisions/open-government/20060725-USDOE-FERPA.pdf>.

[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 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 who is in the process of teaching, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. *See* ORD 643 at 4. The district claims the submitted information consists of evaluations that are confidential under section 21.355 of the Education Code. The district states, and the submitted information reveals, the individuals at issue held the appropriate certificates at the time of the evaluations. Based upon the district’s representations and our review, we conclude some of the submitted information, which we marked, consists of evaluations subject to section 21.355. Accordingly, 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.<sup>3</sup> However, we find the district failed to demonstrate the remaining information consists of documents evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator for purposes of section 21.355 of the Education Code. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the remaining 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 information protected by 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 [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 [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). Upon review, we find some of the submitted information, which we marked, relates to an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect conducted by the department. *See id.* § 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code); *see also id.* § 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of section 261.201 as a 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). Thus,

---

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

we find this information is subject to is subject to chapter 261 of the Family Code. As the district does not indicate the department has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information, we assume no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, we conclude the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code.<sup>4</sup> *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 21.048 of the Education Code, which addresses teacher certification examinations. Section 21.048(c-1) provides as follows:

The results of an examination administered under this section are confidential and are not subject to disclosure under [the Act], unless the disclosure is regarding notification to a parent of the assignment of an uncertified teacher to a classroom as required by Section 21.057.

Educ. Code § 21.048(c-1). Upon review, we find the information we marked reflects the results of examinations administered under section 21.048 of the Education Code. We have no indication section 21.057 of the Education Code is applicable in this instance. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.048(c-1) of the Education Code.<sup>5</sup>

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

(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].

(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

---

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

<sup>5</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

(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.

*Id.* § 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 are not informants for purposes of section 552.135 of the Government Code. The district and the interested party assert the remaining information identifies employees who reported alleged violations of criminal and civil laws. Upon review, we find the information we marked reveals the identity of an informer for purposes of section 552.135. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.135 of the Government Code. However, we find the district and the interested party failed to demonstrate how any of the remaining information at issue reveals the identity of an informer for purposes of section 552.135. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.135 of the Government Code.

The interested party claims some of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.102 of the Government Code. 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.” *Id.* § 552.102(a). We understand the interested party 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. 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). 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. Thus, under *Texas Comptroller*, section 552.102(a) is applicable to the birth date of an employee of a governmental body in a record maintained by his or her employer in an employment context. We note the name of one employee whose date of birth is at issue is being withheld under section 552.135 of the Government Code. Because this employee will

be de-identified, the privacy interest in her date of birth will, thus, be protected. Accordingly, the district must withhold the identifiable employees' dates of birth we marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. However, upon review, we find none of the remaining information is subject to section 552.102(a), and the district may not withhold any of the remaining information on that basis.

As noted above, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-prong test described above. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. 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). 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. This office has also determined common-law privacy generally protects the identities of juvenile offenders. *See* ORD 394; *cf.* Fam. Code § 58.008(b). The court of appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See 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.). We note dates of birth pertaining to individuals who have been de-identified are not protected as the de-identified individuals' privacy interests are, thus, protected. Upon review, we find some of the remaining information, which we marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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). However, section 552.102(b) does not except from public disclosure the employee's name, "the degree obtained[,] or the curriculum on a transcript in the personnel file of the employee." *Id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 526 (1989). Accordingly, with the exception of the employee's name, courses taken, and degrees obtained, the district must withhold the submitted college transcripts, which we marked, pursuant to section 552.102(b) of the Government Code.

The interested party asserts section 552.108 of the Government Code for some of the remaining information. We note section 552.108 protects the interests of governmental bodies, as distinguished from exceptions which are intended to protect the interests of third parties. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general), 177 at 3 (1977) (section 552.108 may be waived by a governmental body). As the district does not raise section 552.108, we will not consider the interested party's arguments under that exception. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.108 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).<sup>6</sup> *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.117(a)(1), .024. 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. We note 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 is not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). 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 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, the district may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. Conversely, to the extent the individuals at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the district may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information relating to a motor vehicle operator’s or driver’s license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the district must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 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). *Id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail

---

<sup>6</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

addresses at issue are not excluded by subsection (c). Accordingly, the district must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent 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.” *See 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 numbers we marked under section 552.147(a-1) of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

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 section 261.201(a) of the Family Code. The district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.048(c-1) of the Education Code. The district must withhold the employees’ dates of birth we marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. With the exception of the employee’s name, courses taken, and degrees obtained, the district must withhold the submitted college transcripts, which we marked, pursuant to section 552.102(b) of the Government Code. To the extent the individuals 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, the district may only withhold the marked cellular telephone numbers if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. The district must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.135 of the Government Code. The district must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. The district must withhold the

social security numbers we marked under section 552.147(a-1) of the Government Code. The district must release the remaining information; however, any information protected by copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

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,



Timothy Neal  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

TN/mo

Ref: ID# 744631

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party  
(w/o enclosures)