



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 18, 2019

Mr. D. Craig Wood
Counsel for the Medina Valley Independent School District
Walsh Gallegos Trevino Russo & Kyle, P.C.
P.O. Box 460606
San Antonio, Texas 78246

OR2019-29447

Dear Mr. Wood:

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# 793262.

The Medina Valley Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for all information pertaining to a named district employee. The district claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception the district claims and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the district has submitted only two documents as responsive to the request for information. To the extent any additional responsive information existed on the date the district received the request, we assume the district has released it. If the district has not released any such information, it must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

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. Section 21.355 of the Education Code provides, in relevant part, "[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential[.]" 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. Further, in Open Records Decision No. 643, we determined an “administrator” for purposes of section 21.355 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).

The district argues some of the submitted information consists of confidential evaluations of the named employee by the district. The district informs us the named employee was certified as a teacher by the State Board of Educator Certification at the time the submitted information was prepared. However, we note the submitted information evaluates the employee at issue in his capacity as a coach and not as a teacher. Accordingly, the district has failed to demonstrate the submitted information consists of documents evaluating the performance of a teacher for purposes of section 21.355 of the Education Code. Thus, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis. The district must release the submitted 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,



Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/gw

Mr. D. Craig Wood - Page 3

Ref: ID# 793262

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)