



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 13, 2020

Mr. Vincent Harding
Associate General Counsel
Department of Legal Services
Fort Bend Independent School District
16431 Lexington Boulevard
Sugar Land, Texas 77479

OR2020-04621

Dear Mr. Harding:

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# 809150 (FBISD TPIA 23928).

The Fort Bend Independent School District (the "district") received a request for information pertaining to applicants for a specified district position.¹ You state the district has released some of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.117, 552.122, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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 encompassed by section 552.101 of

¹ You state the district sought and received clarification of the request for information. See Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating 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); *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380 (Tex. 2010) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

the Government Code, 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 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 its privacy standard differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). The supreme court then considered the applicability of section 552.102 and 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. *Id.* at 347. The district must withhold the district employee's date of birth, which we have marked, under section 552.102(a).² The remaining information is not excepted under section 552.102(a) and may not be withheld on that basis.

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). We must consider whether the Legislature intended the term “professional public school employee” in section 552.102(b) to include a police officer employed by the district. Section 552.102(b) does not define “professional public school employee.” When construing a statute, a court may consider the circumstances under which the Legislature enacted the statute as well as its legislative history. *Id.* § 311.023(2), (3); *City of Rockwall v. Hughes*, 246 S.W.3d 621, 626 n.6 (Tex. 2008). In 1989, the Legislature passed Senate Bill 404 (“S.B. 404”) as an amendment to the Act to include the statutory predecessor to section 552.102(b). The Senate sponsor of S.B. 404, Senator Don Henderson, stated before the Senate Committee for State Affairs the bill was a response to “people trying to get past a teacher's degree, past a teacher's hiring, . . . [and] past a school board's determination that a teacher was qualified to teach[.]” Hearing on S.B. 404 Before the Senate Comm. for State Affairs, 71st Leg., R.S. (February 27, 1989) (statement of Senator Henderson) (recording available from Senate Staff Services Office). During the Senate floor debate of the bill, Senator Henderson further questioned the purpose of “any citizen being able to look at any teacher's transcript” because “there are several other means by which we say teachers are qualified to teach in this state.” *Id.*; see also Debate on Tex. S.B. 404 on the Floor of the Senate, 71st Leg., R.S. (March 13, 1989) (statement of Senator Henderson describing S.B. 404 as relating to privacy of a teacher's transcript; statement of Senator Caperton summarizing S.B. 404 as balancing public's right to know with teacher's right of privacy) (recording available from Senate Staff Services Office). In addition, Representative Paul J. Hilbert, the House sponsor of S.B. 404, stated during the debate on the House floor that the statute was intended to protect teachers' college transcripts. See Debate on Tex. S.B. 404 on the Floor of the House, 71st Leg., R.S. (May 10 and 11, 1989) (statements of Representative Hilbert introducing S.B. 404 as applying to transcripts of teachers) (recording available from House Video/Audio Services). Therefore, we believe the legislative history of section 552.102(b) shows the

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

Legislature enacted the predecessor statute to section 552.102(b) to protect the transcripts of only professional educators, rather than the transcripts of all public school employees. *See* Open Records Decision No. 526 (1989) (addressing predecessor statute in light of previous lack of exception for “qualifications of professional public school employees to teach”) (emphasis added). We find the district has not established the district employee at issue is an educator for purposes of section 552.102(b). Thus, section 552.102(b) is not applicable to this district employee’s transcript. Further, we find the remaining individuals’ transcripts are not held by the district in an employment capacity. Therefore, the district may not withhold the submitted transcripts under section 552.102(b). *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987), 467 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications, including college transcripts, of public employees).

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. As noted above, 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.*, 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 or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. The Third Court of Appeals has concluded public citizens’ dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *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 this office has found that names, telephone numbers, and addresses are not excepted from public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 at 7 (1987). We note that an individual’s name, education, prior employment, and personal information are not ordinarily private information subject to common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 554 (1990), 448 (1986).

Upon review, we find the district must withhold the dates of birth in the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.³ However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the district may not withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code, except as provided by section 552.024(a-1). 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.*

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

§ 552.024(a-1). Thus, a school 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. Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, a governmental body must withhold information under section 552.117 on behalf of a current or former official or employee only if the individual made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made.

You state the current district employee whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality pursuant to section 552.024. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we have marked for this individual under section 552.117(a)(1). To the extent the former district employee whose telephone number we have indicated timely requested confidentiality pursuant to section 552.024, the district must withhold the telephone number under section 552.117(a)(1). The remaining information pertains to individuals who are not current are former district employees; thus, the district may not withhold their information under section 552.117(a)(1).

Section 552.122 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a] test item developed by a . . . governmental body[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.122(b). In Open Records Decision No. 626 (1994), this office determined that the term “test item” in section 552.122 includes “any standard means by which an individual’s or group’s knowledge or ability in a particular area is evaluated,” but does not encompass evaluations of an employee’s overall job performance or suitability. ORD 626 at 6. The question of whether specific information falls within the scope of section 552.122(b) must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *Id.* Traditionally, this office has applied section 552.122 where release of “test items” might compromise the effectiveness of future examinations. *Id.* at 4-5; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 118 (1976). Section 552.122 also protects the answers to test questions when the answers might reveal the questions themselves. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-640 at 3 (1987); ORD 626 at 8.

Upon our review, we find the information at issue consists of questions that evaluate each applicant’s general workplace skills, personal opinions, individual abilities, overall suitability for employment, and subjective ability to respond to a particular situation, and do not test any specific knowledge of an applicant. Accordingly, we determine this information does not constitute test items under section 552.122(b) and the district may not withhold the information at issue on this basis.

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). Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 is not applicable to an institutional e-mail address, an Internet website address, the general e-mail address of a business, an e-mail address of a person who has a contractual relationship with a governmental body, or an e-mail address maintained by a governmental entity for one of its officials or employees. The e-mail addresses at issue are

not of the types specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). *See id.* § 552.137(c). Accordingly, the district must withhold the personal e-mail addresses in the remaining information under section 552.137 unless the owners of the addresses affirmatively consent to their release.

Section 552.147(a-1) of the Government Code provides, “The social security number of an employee of a school district in the custody of the district is confidential.”⁴ *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 district employee’s social security number we have marked under section 552.147(a-1).

In summary, the district must withhold (1) the district employee’s date of birth we marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code; (2) the dates of birth in the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; (3) the information we have marked for the current district employee under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; (4) the telephone number we have indicated under section 552.117(a)(1) if the former district employee timely requested confidentiality pursuant to section 552.024 of the Government Code; (5) the personal e-mail addresses in the remaining information under section 552.137 of the Government Code unless the owners of the addresses affirmatively consent to their release; and (6) the district employee’s social security number we marked under section 552.147(a-1) of the Government Code. The district must release the remaining information.⁵

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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable

⁴ The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

⁵ The remaining information includes social security numbers and partial social security numbers. We note 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 under the Act. Gov’t Code § 552.147(b).

charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, 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/eb

Ref: ID# 809150

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)