



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 1, 2019

Mr. Mike Leasor
Counsel for Mansfield Independent School District
Leasor Crass, P.C.
302 West Broad Street
Mansfield, Texas 76063

OR2019-08729

Dear Mr. Leasor:

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# 762386.

The Mansfield Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for all complaints, resolutions, and non-resolutions against a named district employee. You state some information will be made available to the requestor and the district will redact information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code.¹ You claim the submitted

¹We note the United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") has informed this office that FERPA does not permit a state educational agency or institution 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. *See* 34 C.F.R. § 99.3 (defining "personally identifiable information"). The DOE has determined that FERPA determinations must be made by the educational institution from which the education records were obtained. A copy of the DOE's letter to this office may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website: <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/sites/default/files/files/divisions/open-government/20060725-USDOE-FERPA.pdf>.

information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception 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. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976). 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). However, when no adequate summary exists, detailed statements regarding the allegations must be released, but the identities of witnesses and victims must still be redacted from the statements. We note that, 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 statements appear in a non-supervisory context.

In this instance, some of the submitted information pertains to a sexual harassment investigation and, thus, is subject to the ruling in *Ellen*. Upon review, we find the submitted information includes an adequate summary of this investigation. The investigation summary is not confidential under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. *See Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. However, we note information within the investigation summary that identifies the victims and witnesses is confidential under common-law privacy. *See id.*

Therefore, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*.²

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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 and is not subject to disclosure under [the Act].” 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 who is in the process of teaching, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. See *id.* at 4.

Upon review, we agree some of the remaining information consists of an evaluation of a teacher by the district. You state the teacher at issue held the appropriate certificate for the purpose of section 21.355 and was acting as a teacher at the time the evaluation was prepared. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 21.355. However, we find the remaining information does not consist of a document evaluating the performance of a teacher for the purposes of section 21.355. Thus, the district may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 on that basis.

In summary, the district must withhold (1) the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen* and (2) the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education 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/>

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

[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 "Lindsay E. Hale". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "L".

Lindsay E. Hale
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LEH/mo

Ref: ID# 762386

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)