



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 9, 2022

Ms. Erika Orr
Public Information Lead
Dallas Independent School District
9400 North Central Expressway
Dallas, Texas 75231

OR2022-16647

Dear Ms. Orr:

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# 952838 (DISD Internal File No. R021549-032322).

The Dallas Independent School District (the "district") received a request for information pertaining to a specified case. You claim some of 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." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the common-law right of privacy, which protects information that is 1) highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release 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 (Tex. 1976). In *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied), the court addressed the applicability of the common-law privacy doctrine to files of an investigation of allegations of sexual harassment. The investigation files in *Ellen* contained individual witness statements, an affidavit by the individual accused of the misconduct responding to the allegations, and conclusions of the board of inquiry that conducted the investigation. *Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. The court ordered the release of the affidavit of the person under investigation and the conclusions of the board of inquiry, stating the public's interest was sufficiently served by the disclosure of such documents. *Id.* In concluding, the *Ellen* court held "the public did not possess a legitimate interest in the identities of the individual witnesses, nor the details of their personal statements beyond what is contained in the

documents that have been ordered released.” *Id.* Thus, if there is an adequate summary of an investigation of alleged sexual harassment, the investigation summary must be released under *Ellen*, along with the statement of the accused. However, the identities of the victims and witnesses of the alleged sexual harassment must be redacted, and their detailed statements must be withheld from disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 393 (1983), 339 (1982). However, when no adequate summary exists, detailed statements regarding the allegations must be released, but the identities of victims and witnesses must still be redacted from the statements. In either case, the identity of the individual accused of sexual harassment is not protected from public disclosure. We also note supervisors are generally not witnesses for purposes of *Ellen*, except where their statements appear in a non-supervisory context.

The submitted information relates to an investigation into an alleged sexual harassment. You state, and we agree, the submitted information consists of an adequate summary of the alleged sexual harassment. The summary is not confidential under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy; however, information within the summary identifying victims and witnesses must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. *See Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. Therefore, pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*, the district must withhold the identifying information of the victims and witnesses, which you have marked, within the adequate summary.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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). 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 note section 21.355 does not apply to evaluations of teacher interns. *See id.* at 5 (concluding teacher interns, trainees, and educational aides are not “teachers” for the purposes of section 21.355). 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.).

You argue some of the submitted information consists of confidential evaluations of a teacher by the district. You inform us the teacher at issue was certified as a teacher by the State Board of Educator Certification and was acting as a teacher at the time the evaluations were prepared. Based on these representations and our review, we find the district must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code.¹

¹ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not consider your remaining argument against disclosure.

In summary, the district must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*. The district must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education 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,

Nick Ybarra
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

NY/mo

Ref: ID# 952838

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)