



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 12, 2022

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

OR2022-01058

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# 924125.

The Comal Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for grievance and resignation information pertaining to a named individual. You claim the submitted 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." *Id.* § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 21.355 of the Education Code, which provides that "[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. 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.*

You assert the submitted grievance and resignation records are evaluative documents that are confidential under section 21.355. However, upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the submitted information constitutes documents evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator for the purposes of section 21.355 of the Education Code. 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). Therefore, the district may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code.

You also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 551.082 of the Government Code. This section allows a governmental body to conduct certain deliberations about a public-school employee in a closed meeting. *See* Gov’t Code § 551.082. However, this provision does not make information confidential for purposes of section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See* ORD 478. Thus, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 551.082 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). 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. However, this office has concluded the public has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employees and their conduct in the workplace. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision 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), 470 at 4 (job performance does not generally constitute public employee’s private affairs), 444 at 3 (1986) (public has obvious interest in information concerning qualifications and performance of government employees), 405 at 2 (1983) (manner in which public employee’s job was performed cannot be said to be of minimal public interest), 392 (1982) (reasons for employee’s resignation ordinarily not private). Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated how any of the submitted information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. 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,

Paige Lay  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

PL/jm

Ref: ID# 924152

c: Requestor