



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 12, 2020

Ms. Janet Bubert
Counsel for the Perryton Independent School District
Underwood Law Firm, P.C.
1008 Macon, Suite 101
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2020-15984

Dear Ms. Bubert:

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# 831814.

The Perryton Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for six categories of specified communications during a stated time period.¹ You state the district has released some of the requested information. We understand the district will withhold student-identifying information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code.² You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.111, 552.116, and 552.135 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

¹ You state 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) (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).

² The 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 student 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 education records. A copy of this letter 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>.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information may have been the subject of previous requests for information, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter Nos. 2020-09099 (2020) and 2019-33758 (2019). In those rulings, we determined the district may withhold the submitted information under section 552.116 of the Government Code. We have no indication the law, facts, or circumstances on which the prior rulings were based have changed. Accordingly, to the extent the submitted information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, we conclude the district may rely on Open Records Letters Nos. 2020-09099 and 2019-33758 as previous determinations and withhold the identical information in accordance with those rulings. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure). To the extent the submitted information was not subject to the prior rulings, we will address your arguments against disclosure.

Next, we note some of the submitted information may have been the subject of an additional previous request for information, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2019-10239 (2019). In that ruling, we determined the district must release the submitted information. We note the Act does not permit the selective disclosure of information. Section 552.007 of the Government Code provides if a governmental body voluntarily releases information to any member of the public, the governmental body may not withhold such information from further disclosure unless its public release is expressly prohibited by law or the information is confidential by law. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007; Open Records Decision Nos. 518 at 3 (1989), 490 at 2 (1988); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 400 (1983) (governmental body may waive right to claim permissive exceptions to disclosure under the Act, but it may not disclose information made confidential by law). Accordingly, pursuant to section 552.007, the district may not now withhold the information that was previously released unless its release is expressly prohibited by law or the information is confidential by law. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007. Although you raise sections 552.111 and 552.116 of the Government Code, these sections are discretionary exceptions to disclosure and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 677 (2002) (governmental body may waive attorney work product privilege under section 552.111), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Thus, to the extent any of the information at issue was previously ordered released pursuant to Open Records Letter No. 2019-10239, the district may not now withhold this information under sections 552.111 and 552.116 of the Government Code. However, as sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.117, 552.135, and 552.137 of the Government Code can make information confidential under the Act, we will consider the applicability of these sections to the information at issue.³ Furthermore, to the extent the district has not released the information at issue, we will address your arguments under sections 552.111 and 552.116 of the Government Code.

³ 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).

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 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. We have also determined that for purposes of section 21.355, “administrator” means a person who is required to, and does in fact, hold an administrator’s certificate under subchapter B of chapter 21 of the Education Code, and is performing the functions as an administrator, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. *Id.* We note section 21.355 does not apply to evaluations relating to an individual’s duties as a coach. See Educ. Code § 21.353 (teachers shall be appraised only on basis of classroom teaching performance and not in connection with extracurricular activities).

Upon review, we find some of the information at issue, which we have marked, consists of an evaluation of an administrator by the district. The submitted information reveals the administrator at issue held the appropriate certificate for the purpose of section 21.355 and was acting as an administrator at the time the evaluation was prepared. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code.⁴ However, we find the remaining information at issue does not consist of documents evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator for purposes of section 21.355. Therefore, the district may not withhold any portion 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 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 and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate any portion of the information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public

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

interest. Thus, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy. Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy" which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5 (quoting *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate any portion of the information at issue falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 on the basis of constitutional privacy.

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). We understand you 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, which is discussed above. *See Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. 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. Having carefully reviewed the information at issue, we find no portion of the information at issue 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 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency[.]" Gov't Code § 552.111. This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993)*. The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. *See Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, writ ref'd n.r.e.); *Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990)*.

In Open Records Decision No. 615, this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v.*

Gilbreath, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *See* ORD 615 at 5. A governmental body’s policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body’s policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body’s policy mission. *See* Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995). Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); *see* ORD 615 at 5. But if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

Section 552.111 can also encompass communications between a governmental body and a third party, including a consultant or other party with a privity of interest. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process). For section 552.111 to apply, the governmental body must identify the third party and explain the nature of its relationship with the governmental body. Section 552.111 is not applicable to a communication between the governmental body and a third party unless the governmental body establishes it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the third party. *See* ORD 561.

You seek to withhold some of the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, and recommendations of district employees and officials regarding policymaking matters of the district. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated portions of the information at issue, which we have marked, consist of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the district. Thus, the district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code, to the extent it has not previously been released.⁵ However, we find the remaining information at issue consists of information that is administrative or purely factual in nature. Further, some of the remaining information at issue was received from an individual with whom you have not demonstrated the district shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process. Thus, you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue reveals advice, opinions, or recommendations that pertain to policymaking. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code on the basis of the deliberative process privilege.

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

Section 552.116 of the Government Code provides the following:

(a) An audit working paper of an audit of the state auditor or the auditor of a state agency, an institution of higher education as defined by Section 61.003, Education Code, a county, a municipality, a school district, a hospital district, or a joint board operating under Section 22.074, Transportation Code, including any audit relating to the criminal history background check of a public school employee, is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021. If information in an audit working paper is also maintained in another record, that other record is not excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 by this section.

(b) In this section:

(1) "Audit" means an audit authorized or required by a statute of this state or the United States, the charter or an ordinance of a municipality, an order of the commissioners court of a county, the bylaws adopted by or other action of the governing board of a hospital district, a resolution or other action of a board of trustees of a school district, including an audit by the district relating to the criminal history background check of a public school employee, or a resolution or other action of a joint board described by Subsection (a) and includes an investigation.

(2) "Audit working paper" includes all information, documentary or otherwise, prepared or maintained in conducting an audit or preparing an audit report, including:

(A) intra-agency and interagency communications; and

(B) drafts of the audit report or portions of those drafts.

Gov't Code § 552.116. You seek to withhold some of the remaining information at issue under section 552.116 of the Government Code. You assert the information at issue consists of audit working papers pertaining to certain internal investigations conducted by the district. However, you do not inform us the information at issue was prepared or is maintained in relation to an audit authorized or required by any of the laws or authorities specified in section 552.116(b)(1). Thus, we find you have not demonstrated the information at issue constitutes an audit or audit working papers for the purpose of section 552.116. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.116 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. *See id.* § 552.117(a)(1). 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 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 whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the marked cellular telephone numbers may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. Conversely, to the extent the individuals at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the district may not withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1).

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].

(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, witnesses and other individuals who provide information in the course of an investigation are not informants for purposes of

section 552.135 of the Government Code. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the information at issue reveals the identity of an informer for the purposes of section 552.135 of the Government Code. Therefore, the district may not withhold any portion of the remaining information on that ground.

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). *See id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 is not applicable to an institutional e-mail address, an Internet website address, an e-mail address that a governmental entity maintains for one of its officials or employees, or a personal e-mail address belonging to a district employee or official used to conduct official government business. *See Austin Bulldog v. Leffingwell*, 490 S.W.3d 240 (Tex. App.—Austin 2016, no pet.) (holding personal e-mail addresses of government officials used to conduct official government business are not e-mail addresses of “members of the public” for purposes of section 552.137(a)). Because we are unable to discern whether the e-mail addresses within the information at issue belong to district employees or officials or fall within the scope of section 552.137(c), we must rule conditionally. To the extent the e-mail addresses we have marked belong to members of the public, the district must withhold such e-mail addresses under section 552.137, unless the individuals to whom the e-mail addresses belong affirmatively consent to their release. *See id.* § 552.137(b). However, to the extent the e-mail addresses at issue are excluded by subsection 552.137(c) or belong to a district employee or official, the e-mail addresses may not be withheld under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent the submitted information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, we conclude the district may rely on Open Records Letters Nos. 2020-09099 and 2019-33758 as previous determinations and withhold the identical information in accordance with those rulings. The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code. The district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code, to the extent it has not previously been released. To the extent the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the marked cellular telephone numbers may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. To the extent the e-mail addresses we have marked belong to members of the public, the district must withhold such e-mail addresses under section 552.137, unless the individuals to whom the e-mail addresses belong affirmatively consent to their release. 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 <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 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,

Alexandra C. Burks
Attorney
Open Records Division

ACB/rm

Ref: ID# 831814

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)