



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 28, 2022

Mr. Victor I. Cerda
Counsel for the San Antonio Independent School District
Escamilla & Poneck, L.L.P.
700 North St. Mary's Street, Suite 850
San Antonio, Texas 78205

OR2022-33410

Dear Mr. Cerda:

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# 977559.

The San Antonio Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for the personnel file pertaining to a named individual. You state the district is redacting social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.¹ You also state the district has released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.102 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the interests of the individual named in the request. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, the district notified the named individual of the request for information and of his right to submit arguments to this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have received comments submitted on behalf of the notified individual (the "notified individual"). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

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[.]" *Id.* § 552.102(b). We must consider whether the Legislature intended the term "professional public school employee" in section 552.102(b) to include a district's Chief Financial Officer ("CFO"). Section 552.102(b) does not define "professional public school employee." When construing a statute, a court may consider

¹ 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* Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

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 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). Thus, we find the district has not established the CFO at issue is an educator for purposes of section 552.102(b). Therefore, the district may not withhold any portion of the college transcripts at issue under section 552.102(b) of the Government Code. 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. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 21.355 of the Education Code, which provides, in relevant part, “[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential under [the Act].” 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). In Open Records Decision No. 643, we determined, 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 of an administrator, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. See *id.*

The notified individual claims the information at issue is made confidential under section 21.355 of the Education Code. Upon review, we find no portion of the information at issue

evaluates the performance of an administrator who held an administrator's certificate under chapter 21 of the Education Code and was performing the functions of an administrator at the time of the evaluations for purposes of section 21.355. Therefore, the district may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education 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." 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. 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. Accordingly, the district must withhold the date of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.² However, upon review, we find no portion of the remaining information is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the district may not withhold any of it 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-part test discussed above. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. We note the public generally has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public 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 (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees), 467 (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications, including college transcripts, of public employees), 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employees). Upon review, 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 any portion of the

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

remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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 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).³ See Gov't Code §§ 552.117(a)(1), .024. 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. Accordingly, to the extent the individual 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.

In summary, the district must withhold the date of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. To the extent the individual 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. 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,

Blake Brennan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BBX/mo

³ 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.

Ref: ID# 977559

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

c: Third Party
(w/o enclosures)