



























































































Page 46 of 49 – Case Nos. 01-19-4025, 01-19-1252, 01-20-1003, 01-20-1004, 01-20-1005, 01-20-1006, and 01-20-1007

reason for the adverse action; and if so, whether the facially legitimate, non-retaliatory reason is a pretext for retaliation.

## **Analysis and Conclusions**

### **1. Allegation Regarding the CIAC's Retaliation**

The Complainant alleged that the CIAC retaliated against Parent 1, after Parent 1 complained about the Revised Transgender Participation Policy, by informing Parent 1, in March 2019, that the CIAC's Executive Director would no longer accept communications from her. OCR determined that Parent 1 engaged in protected activity on February 22, 2018, January 24, 2019, and March 28, 2019, when she sent emails expressing concern regarding the Revised Transgender Participation Policy to the CIAC's Executive Director;<sup>54</sup> and on February 28, 2019, when Parent 1 met with the Executive Director in person to discuss her concerns about the policy. OCR determined that the CIAC was aware of Parent 1's protected activity.

OCR determined, however, that the CIAC proffered a legitimate, non-retaliatory reason for the Executive Director's statement to Parent 1 that "further correspondence to CIAC has to come through your principal"; namely, that the CIAC staff typically did not communicate directly with parents and Parent 1 should have communicated her concerns with the athletic director or school administrator. OCR determined that the proffered reason was not a pretext for retaliation, as the Executive Director's instruction was consistent with the CIAC policy and the Executive Director's directives to other parents who had not engaged in protected activities. Therefore, OCR determined that there was insufficient evidence to substantiate the Complainant's allegation that the CIAC retaliated against Parent 1, after Parent 1 complained about the Revised Transgender Participation Policy, by informing Parent 1, in March 2019, that the Executive Director would no longer accept communications from her. Accordingly, OCR will take no further action with respect to this allegation.

### **2. Allegations Regarding Glastonbury Track Coach Retaliation**

OCR determined that Parent 2 engaged in protected activity by sending emails to the Athletic Director in May, June, and July 2018, expressing her concerns that as a result of the Revised Transgender Participation Policy "[c]isgender girls are no longer provided opportunities in scholastic athletics that are equal and proportionate to the opportunities that boys are provided"; meeting with the Athletic Director, the principal, and the superintendent, on or about August 1, 2018, to discuss these concerns; meeting with the Athletic Director and Parent 4, on or about March 15, 2019, to again discuss these concerns; and telephoning and sending an email to the School's Title IX Coordinator in March and April 2019. OCR determined that Parent 2 also engaged in protected activity in May and June 2018, and in March 2019, when she sent emails to the track coach regarding her objections to the policy and a petition that she had initiated in opposition to

---

<sup>54</sup> As discussed previously, Parent 1 communicated with the former the Executive Director in her email on February 22, 2018; and with the current Executive Director from January 24, 2019, onward.





