



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mrs Sarah Gillett: Professional conduct panel outcome

**Panel decision and reasons on behalf of the
Secretary of State for Education**

October 2022

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	6
Summary of evidence	7
Documents	7
Witnesses	8
Decision and reasons	8
Findings of fact	8
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	23
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	26

Professional conduct panel decision and recommendations, and decision on behalf of the Secretary of State

Teacher:	Mrs Sarah Gillett
Teacher ref number:	0101554
Teacher date of birth:	23 January 1974
TRA reference:	18694
Date of determination:	18 October 2022
Former employer:	ACE Schools Multi Academy Trust

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 10 October 2022 remotely via Microsoft TEAMS to consider the case of Mrs Gillett.

The panel members were Mr Gamel Byles (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr John Armstrong (lay panellist) and Ms Mona Sood (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Sarah Price of Blake Morgan solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Sarah Vince of Browne Jacobson solicitors.

Mrs Gillett was present and was represented by Mr Andrew Faux of The Reflective Practice.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Hearing dated 5 April 2022.

It is alleged that she is guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst employed at the ACE Schools Multi Academy Trust:

1. She engaged in inappropriate and/or unprofessional behaviour on one or more occasions towards one or more staff members, including by;

a. Threatening the dismissal of and/or engineering the redundancy of [redacted] in response to, and in retaliation for, a grievance that he raised about her in Summer 2016;

b. Following the Ofsted rating in 2019 and during subsequent meetings:

i. she told staff that they had let ACE down and/or were wasting tax-payers money;

ii. she told staff that there was no room in the school for staff who were not performing and/or that she needed to get rid of people if they were not good enough;

iii. she told staff that their mortgages were depending on it when referring to staff performance.

iv. she said to the whole body of staff ‘I love ya, but I am coming for ya’ or words to that effect;

c. Saying that she wanted to dismiss and/or get rid of staff ‘who had let you down’ during meetings;

d. Saying to [redacted] that he is ‘tiresome’, ‘immature and plain petty’ and referring to [redacted] leadership team as ‘dysfunctional’, as a result of him asking for training and support;

e. Saying to [redacted] ‘if you don’t make [redacted] redundant I will and then the Trust would decide whether or not your school needs a Head Teacher or not’ or words to that effect;

f. Saying in a senior leaders meeting ‘if you don’t like it here you can fuck off’ or words to that effect;

g. Aggressively responding to staff members if concerns were raised;

h. Displaying favouritism towards [Apprentice A] an apprentice, who was previously a vulnerable pupil at the school;

i. Displaying favouritism/nepotism towards [redacted], including by;

i. pressuring [redacted] to change [redacted] classroom observation rating;

ii. removing Witness A as [redacted] line management due to him challenging [redacted] performance;

iii. allowing [redacted] to not comply with the fire drill;

iv. creating an environment where staff felt they were not being able to raise concerns about [redacted] due to fear of retribution by her;

v. favourably promoting [redacted] through the ranks so that between 2012 to 2019 he moved from an NQT supply teacher to a UPR3 salary.

2. Her behaviour towards one or more staff members as may be found proven at 1a-1g above constituted bullying and/or intimidation and/or harassment;

3. Her conduct as may be proven above created an environment where staff felt inhibited from raising any concerns either informally or through the whistleblowing policy and/or grievance policies which in turn may create a serious risk that safeguarding issues are not raised by staff;

4. She represented to the Trust that she had a master’s degree in education in circumstances where;

a. she enrolled on the course but withdrew from it before taking the qualification;

b. she permitted this incorrect representation to be;

i. placed on the Trust’s website;

ii. communicated to the DoFE.

5. Her conduct as may be proven at 4 above lacked integrity and/or was dishonest.

Mr Faux confirmed that Mrs Gillett admitted the facts of particular 1d, but disputed all other allegations.

Preliminary applications

The panel heard an application made by the TRA to amend the allegation. In particular, the TRA requested that allegation 1h should be amended to remove reference to [redacted] and replace that with 'Apprentice A'. The panel noted that the application was not opposed by Mr Faux on behalf of Mrs Gillett. The panel heard and accepted the legal advice. The panel found that this proposed amendment did not cause any prejudice to the teacher or impact the fairness of these proceedings. The panel determined that the amendment should be made because this was in line with protocol in not naming pupils or former pupils.

The presenting officer also made an application for any evidence relating to Apprentice A to be heard in private. The application was not opposed. The panel heard and accepted the legal advice. The panel accepted the application to hear Apprentice A's evidence in private to ensure that matters of a personal sensitive nature were kept private. In making this decision the panel noted that there is a presumption that proceedings should take place in public, but felt that in this circumstances, Apprentice A's private interests were reasonably engaged and there was no prejudice to the interests of justice in Apprentice A's evidence being heard in private.

Next, the panel heard an application made by the presenting officer on behalf of the TRA to admit the witness statement of [redacted] as hearsay evidence. [redacted]. The application was not opposed by Mr Faux on behalf of Mrs Gillett. The panel heard and accepted the legal advice. The panel considered that it had been provided with justifiable reasons why [redacted] was not in attendance and that her evidence was not the sole or decisive evidence in relation to the allegations. The panel concluded [redacted] evidence should be admitted as hearsay evidence.

During the course of proceedings, an application was made by Mr Faux on behalf of Mrs Gillett to admit the relevant school's 2011 and 2013 Ofsted reports. The TRA did not oppose the application. The panel heard and accepted the legal advice. The panel determined that the documents were potentially relevant to the issues it had to determine and it was in the interests of a fair hearing to admit both reports. Therefore, the application was granted.

During the course of the proceedings, and specifically part way through Mrs Gillett's oral evidence, Mr Faux made an application on behalf of Mrs Gillett, for special measures, allowing Mrs Gillett to continue her evidence in private. Prior to this Mrs Gillett had indicated to the panel that she did not wish to give her evidence in private, despite the

fact that matters of her health may arise. The TRA did not oppose the application. The panel heard and accepted legal advice. The panel first considered whether Mrs Gillett was vulnerable. The panel had in mind Rule 4.71 which states the panel will treat any person as a vulnerable witness where their quality of evidence is likely to be adversely affected at a hearing, including where their evidence might be affected by any mental or physical impairment and where they require special consideration. The panel had been provided with information in relation to Mrs Gillett's health. The panel was satisfied that Mrs Gillett was a vulnerable witness. The panel then went on to consider what measures should be put in place to enable Mrs Gillett to give her best evidence. The panel considered Rule 4.72 which provides examples of possible measures. The panel bore in mind that Mr Faux had suggested that Mrs Gillett should continue her evidence in private. The panel accepted that this would be the least restrictive measure. The panel therefore directed that Mrs Gillett continue the remainder of her evidence in private.

Summary of evidence

Documents

In advance of the hearing, the panel received a bundle of documents which included:

Section 1: Notice of Hearing and Response – pages 5 to 14

Section 2: TRA witness statement and exhibits – pages 16 to 220

Section 3: TRA Documents – pages 222 to 361

Section 4: Teacher documents – pages 362 to 1113

In addition to the above, the panel also received the following documents prior to the start of the hearing:

- Notice of Hearing, 5 April 2022;
- [redacted]

During the course of the proceedings, the panel also agreed to accept two Ofsted reports from 2011 and 2013.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the hearing bundle, in advance of the hearing. The panel also read the additional documents it decided to admit.

Witnesses

The panel heard oral evidence from the following witnesses on behalf of the TRA:

- Witness A
- Witness B
- Witness C
- Witness D
- Witness E

The panel also heard from:

- Mrs Sarah Gillett, the Teacher
- Apprentice A [redacted] a former apprentice

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

The panel carefully considered the case before it and reached a decision.

Mrs Gillett was CEO of the ACE Schools Multi Academy Trust ("the Trust") between 1 June 2016 and 31 July 2019. In March 2019, concerns regarding Mrs Gillett's conduct was raised with the Chair of Trustees. The Trust commissioned an independent investigation on 13 May 2019. On 25 May 2019, Mrs Gillett was suspended from her position as CEO. Mrs Gillett left the Trust by way of mutual agreement, prior to any disciplinary hearing taking place. The Trust made a referral to the TRA on 10 September 2019.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

The panel found all of the TRA's witnesses to be credible and helpful.

With regards to Apprentice A, overall the panel found her evidence credible and helpful.

In regards to Mrs Gillett, the panel noted that Mrs Gillett did not always directly answer questions put to her and at times the panel found her answers to be evasive. She often redirected matters to place fault on others.

The panel noted that the Trust is based across several locations and three counties, employing around 300 people. The Trust specialises in teaching children with Special

Educational Needs ("SEN") and offers alternative provision for children who have been excluded from mainstream schools. As such, the Trust deals with some of the most vulnerable children with challenging behaviour within its catchment area. This was a challenging environment for the staff at the Trust and the panel acknowledged that despite this, the witnesses stated that they enjoyed working at the Trust.

The panel noted that the witnesses all gave a balanced view of Mrs Gillett. There was no dispute that Mrs Gillett was a highly skilled and driven individual. However, there were certain aspects of Mrs Gillett's leadership style that the witnesses stated were unacceptable and amounted to bullying.

During the proceedings, the panel were taken to Mrs Gillett's Colour Works profile. This gave an indication of Mrs Gillett's style of leadership and the Trust placed emphasis on the use of this assessment across all staff. The panel also noted the inclusion of Mrs Gillett's full Colour Works profile in her evidence in the bundle. Given that Mrs Gillett placed such importance on this tool to the extent that staff were encouraged to wear their colour badge, the panel considered that Mrs Gillett might have reflected more on her personality traits associated with her own profile.

The trigger for staff escalating concerns regarding Mrs Gillett's conduct was during an all staff meeting on 11 March 2019. The meeting took place following an Ofsted inspection. The Trust had received a 'Good' rating from Ofsted, parts of which were said to be 'Outstanding'. The witnesses who were present at that meeting told the panel they had expected the day to be positive and to have celebrated their achievements. However, the tone and comments made by Mrs Gillett during parts of the day were not what they had expected and were perceived to be unjustified.

The panel found the following particulars of the allegations against you proved, for these reasons:

1. You engaged in inappropriate and/or unprofessional behaviour on one or more occasions towards one or more staff members, including by;

a. Threatening the dismissal of and/or engineering the redundancy of [redacted] in response to, and in retaliation for, a grievance that he raised about you in Summer 2016

The panel heard evidence from Witness A that in June/July 2016, he raised a formal grievance against Mrs Gillett because he felt that she had not shown him professional courtesy and respect. Witness A told the panel that the grievance outcome was not upheld, but it was suggested that communication by Mrs Gillett could be improved. Witness A told the panel that he believed that when he raised the grievance, that his career at the Trust was over and that he would be "*managed out*". Witness A stated it was well known that Mrs Gillett did not tolerate being challenged. Witness A also told the

panel that during this process he disclosed concerns regarding nepotism towards [redacted], who was also a teacher in the Trust.

Witness A stated that once the grievance had concluded, Mrs Gillett had little to do with him. He noticed that he had stopped being invited to meetings and he believed he was also being unfairly and unreasonably overloaded with work by being given additional teaching responsibilities.

Witness D told the panel that she was present at the meeting as minute taker on 20 July 2016 to consider the grievance raised by Witness A against Mrs Gillett. Witness D told the panel that it was apparent to her that the outcome had already been decided before the meeting started and provided quotes to support her assertion. Witness D stated that after the meeting concluded, Mrs Gillett made comments to her such as "*I'm like an elephant. I won't forget*", "*revenge is sweet*" and "*I will get rid of him*".

Witness D also gave evidence regarding a restructure in the Trust. In her witness statement she stated "*After the School converted to an academy in June 2016, Mrs Gillett engineered a restructure of the Senior Leadership Team*". Witness D stated that it was her belief that the positions advertised were designed solely for certain staff members already within the Trust. Witness A stated that the restructure was announced during a Senior Leadership Team ("SLT") meeting in March 2017 when it became clear to him and one of his colleagues that the senior leadership roles were geared for certain individuals.

The panel was provided with copies of the relevant person specifications. The panel were given examples by Witness A, one of which required a master's qualification as an essential criteria. Witness A used this and other examples to show how he was placed at a material disadvantage in applying for any of the roles that were on offer compared to other internal candidates. Witness A told the panel that his post was made redundant and he was placed on "*gardening leave*" in April 2017. He subsequently left the Trust in August 2017.

Mrs Gillett told the panel that it took many months to plan a restructure and that the process was already under way at the time when Witness A raised the grievance. Mrs Gillett denied threatening or engineering Witness A's redundancy.

The panel found that the evidence was sufficient to prove that Mrs Gillett took the opportunity of the restructuring to ensure that only a select number of people which did not include Witness A would be able to be appointed to the senior roles in the Trust.

The panel assessed the weight and reliability of the evidence, and on the balance of probabilities, the panel found that the evidence demonstrated that Mrs Gillett had both threatened the dismissal of Witness A and engineered his redundancy in response to and

in retaliation for a grievance that he raised about her in summer 2016. Further, the panel found that this was both inappropriate and unprofessional.

b. Following the Ofsted rating in 2019 and during subsequent meetings:

i. you told staff that they had let ACE down and/or were wasting tax-payers money;

In Witness D's written statement, she stated that during a meeting on the 11 March 2019, Mrs Gillett "*specifically referred to members of staff who she believed had let her down*". The panel noted that in Witness D's statement which she prepared for the School's investigation, she described the Trust wide training day on 11 March 2019 and explained that the "*tone and language used on us was unprofessional and consisted of SG saying 'its tax payers money, and we have a responsibility to not keep people on, sack them'*".

The panel took account of the written evidence of [redacted] who stated "*She also said that we had let ACE down. I also remember her saying how we were wasting tax payer's money*". The panel was mindful that [redacted] evidence was hearsay evidence, and approached it with due caution. Nonetheless, found this evidence to have some resonance with the oral evidence of other witnesses.

In Witness C's restatement, she stated that it became apparent that Mrs Gillett was "*clearly in a bad mood*" and had "*wanted to achieve 'Outstanding' overall*" in relation to the Ofsted inspection.

Mrs Gillett told the panel that she denied making the comment outlined in this allegation.

The panel assessed the weight and reliability of the evidence, and on the balance of probabilities, it was satisfied that it was more likely than not that Mrs Gillett told staff they had let ACE down and were wasting tax payers' money. The panel noted earlier examples of Mrs Gillett using similar phrases in staff meetings. The panel found the comment made was an inappropriate and unprofessional comment, given the context in which it was said.

ii. you told staff that there was no room in the school for staff who were not performing and/or that you needed to get rid of people if they were not good enough;

In her written statement, Witness C stated that during a Middle Managers' meeting on 11 March 2019, "*Mrs Gillett said that there was no room in the school for staff who were not performing properly and that we needed to get rid of people if they were not good enough*"

In Witness D's oral evidence, she told the panel that she knew Mrs Gillett had a tough management style but that her comments were "*vicious*".

The panel also identified that there was a consistency in the evidence to references to "*getting rid of staff*" or instructing others "*to get rid*" of certain individuals.

Mrs Gillett told the panel that she denied making the comment outlined in this allegation.

The panel assessed the weight and reliability of the evidence, and on the balance of probabilities, it believed that it was more likely than not that Mrs Gillett told staff that there was no room in the school for staff who were not performing and that she needed to get rid of people if they were not good enough. The tone and context of the delivery in the meeting on 11 March 2019 was inappropriate and unprofessional. The panel noted the tone and style was consistent with previous behaviour.

iii. You told staff that their mortgages were depending on it when referring to staff performance.

In Witness C's oral evidence, she told the panel that Mrs Gillett told staff their mortgages were depending on staff performance.

Witness C described the context in her personal life that was relevant to this allegation. The panel accepted that such circumstances would explain why Witness C remembered this particular comment and was able to recall it in detail to the panel, saying that she was shocked by the comment, but other witnesses who were present did not recall the comment.

Mrs Gillett told the panel that she denied making the comment outlined in this allegation.

The panel assessed the weight and reliability of the evidence, and on the balance of probabilities, it believed that it was more likely than not that Mrs Gillett told staff their mortgages were depending on it when referring to staff performance. Further the panel found that this was inappropriate and unprofessional due to the context in which the comment was said.

iv. You said to the whole body of staff 'I love ya, but I am coming for ya' or words to that effect;

In her evidence, Witness D stated that at the conclusion of the training day on 11 March 2019, Mrs Gillett made this comment to all staff. She explained that it was said "*with such venom*". Witness C also confirmed that she heard Mrs Gillett make this comment. She stated that "*there was an awful deathly hush amongst staff*". Witness B also heard the comment, stating that it stuck with him and that it was made in a threatening rather than jovial way.

Mrs Gillett accepts that she made the comment, but that it was intended to be positive. In her statement she stated that the phrase came from a Spanish film, but corrected this at the start of these proceedings to clarify it was from a Turkish rather than a Spanish film.

The panel noted that the witnesses had confirmed they had not heard Mrs Gillett use that phrase on any previous occasion. Further, the film was described to the panel to be an obscure Turkish film and as such nobody else understood the context or the phrase, which was contrary to what Mrs Gillett had stated.

The panel assessed the weight and reliability of the evidence, and on the balance of probabilities, it believed that it was more likely than not that Mrs Gillett said to the whole body of staff 'I love ya, but I am coming for ya' or words to that effect.

Further the panel found that this comment was both inappropriate and unprofessional given the tone and context in which it was said. The panel noted the tone and style was consistent with previous behaviour.

c. Saying that you wanted to dismiss and/or get rid of staff 'who had let you down' during meetings;

Witness D told the panel that during one of Mrs Gillett's speeches on 11 March 2019, delivered to the whole staff cohort, she said certain people had let her down. Witness D explained that although Mrs Gillett had not named people, some of those present would have known one such person who Mrs Gillett was referring to (a teaching assistant who was said to be reduced to tears). Witness D also stated that Mrs Gillett made it clear that she was "*gunning*" for certain members of staff and specifically referred to members of staff who she believed had let her down.

Witness C stated that Mrs Gillett had said during a Middle Managers' meeting on 11 March 2019, "*there was no room in the school for staff who were not performing properly and we needed to get rid of people if they were not good enough*". The panel noted that Witness C's evidence on this strongly corroborated Witness D's evidence.

The panel assessed the weight and reliability of the evidence, and on the balance of probabilities, it believed that it was more likely than not that Mrs Gillett said that she wanted to dismiss and/or get rid of staff 'who had let you down' during meetings. Further the panel found that such comments were inappropriate and unprofessional given the tone and the manner in which it they were said.

d. Saying to [redacted] that he is 'tiresome', 'immature and plain petty' and referring to [redacted] leadership team as 'dysfunctional', as a result of him asking for training and support;

The allegation was admitted by Mrs Gillett and was supported by evidence presented to the panel. Mrs Gillett expressed remorse for this, but later in her evidence sought to justify the circumstances that led to her sending it. The panel was provided with a copy of the email sent to [redacted] by Mrs Gillett. The allegation was therefore, found proved. Further, the panel found that the tone and the content of the email wholly inappropriate,

offensive to the recipient, unprofessional, and was unwarranted in response to what appeared to be a reasonable request for support.

e. Saying to [redacted] ‘if you don’t make [redacted] redundant I will and then the Trust would decide whether or not your school needs a Head Teacher or not’ or words to that effect;

[redacted] told the panel that Mrs Gillett made this comment to him in a threatening manner. [redacted] described the impact this instruction had on him morally and also the subsequent adverse impact that it had on his health. [redacted] described the manner in which Mrs Gillett had instructed him to make [redacted] redundant as unacceptable.

Mrs Gillett told the panel that she denied making the comment outlined in this allegation.

The panel assessed the weight and reliability of the evidence, and on the balance of probabilities, it believed that it was more likely than not that Mrs Gillett said to [redacted] ‘if you don’t make [redacted] redundant I will and then the Trust would decide whether or not your school needs a Head Teacher or not’ or words to that effect. Further the panel found that this was both inappropriate and unprofessional.

f. Saying in a senior leaders meeting ‘if you don’t like it here you can fuck off’ or words to that effect;

Witness C told the panel that during the Middle Managers' meeting on 11 March 2019, Mrs Gillett said that if the staff did not like working for the Trust then "*we can all fuck off*". Witness C stated that there was "*stunned silence*" after this comment was made and was not challenged by anyone present at that time.

The panel also noted the evidence of Witness A, who stated that in a meeting in 2015/2016 Mrs Gillett referred to staff as "*useless fuckers*". The panel considered that Mrs Gillett's use of such language was embedded behaviour as there was evidence of similar comments being made from at least 2015/2016.

The panel placed particular weight on the impact that Witness C had told them of the effect of Mrs Gillett's remark.

In her evidence to the panel, Mrs Gillett denied making the comment outlined in this allegation. It was also submitted that she did not use such language in professional meetings.

The panel assessed the weight and reliability of the evidence, and on the balance of probabilities, it believed that it was more likely than not that Mrs Gillett said ‘if you don’t like it here you can fuck off’ or words to that effect during the Middle Managers' meeting that took place during the staff conference on 11 March 2019. The panel found that this

comment was inappropriate and unprofessional given the tone and context in which it was said.

g. Aggressively responding to staff members if concerns were raised;

Whilst the panel acknowledged the allegation could have been better particularised, it noted that Mrs Gillett had responded to the allegation in her written statement. Mrs Gillett commented that the allegation is untrue and she has always had an open door policy and was known for responding to emails on the day they were received. Mrs Gillett was open in her passion for and commitment to the Trust citing she was working 80 hours a week.

The panel carefully considered the evidence and found that there was evidence to support this allegation. In particular, the panel found that there was a theme throughout all of the witness evidence regarding Ms Gillett's aggressive manner, both verbally and in email communication.

The panel heard evidence about Mrs Gillett's propensity to send "*stinger*" or "*stinker*" emails berating staff. This was the evidence consistently presented by witnesses even those who had never met each other within the Trust.

The panel saw evidence of the written aggression in the email sent to [redacted] on 15 November 2018, the email sent to Witness D on 9 January 2019 and an email sent to Witness C on 25 March 2019. The panel heard about the impact that this had on witnesses. For example, Witness D stated "*the period from November 2018 especially filled me with such dread when going to work. I...was extremely anxious over every email and conversation I had with Mrs Gillett*".

The panel assessed the weight and reliability of the evidence, and on the balance of probabilities, it believed that it was more likely than not that Mrs Gillett aggressively responded to staff members if concerns were raised. Further the panel found that this was inappropriate and unprofessional.

i. Displaying favouritism/nepotism towards [redacted], including by;

i. pressuring Witness A to change [redacted] classroom observation rating;

Witness A told the panel that he had been [redacted]'s line manager, and as part of this role he carried out classroom observations of [redacted]. Witness A told the panel that on one occasion Mrs Gillett told him that he had been too harsh with his grading and directed him to change the judgements, during which she referenced her role as an Ofsted inspector. Witness A understood this to be an instruction from Mrs Gillett to unjustly inflate the grade on [redacted] classroom observation.

The panel also noted the evidence of [redacted], who stated that he had been warned by senior colleagues, in no uncertain terms, not to undertake lesson observations of

[redacted], as to do so may come at the cost of his job. [redacted] therefore quietly backed away from any such involvement with [redacted].

In Witness B's evidence, he stated that he had agreed to "*get rid*" of a lesson observation during which he graded [redacted] as "*Requires Improvement*". Witness B did not allege that Mrs Gillett told him to do this, but Witness B felt that this outcome would not do him any favours if the result was formally recorded because of the fear of Mrs Gillett becoming involved.

Witness C told the panel that when she first joined the Trust she was warned not to say anything bad about [redacted].

Mrs Gillett told the panel that the Trust's policy stated that a teacher should be given a second opportunity for an observation if the initial grade fell below 'Good'. However, there is no suggestion that Mrs Gillett stated that [redacted] should get a second opportunity. Witness A told the panel that Mrs Gillett had told him to change the grade from the original observation.

The panel assessed the weight and reliability of the evidence, and on the balance of probabilities, it believed that it was more likely than not that Mrs Gillett displayed nepotism in that she pressured Witness A to change [redacted] classroom observation rating. Further the panel found that this was inappropriate and unprofessional.

ii. removing Witness A as [redacted] line management due to him challenging [redacted] performance;

Witness A told the panel that when he reported concerns regarding [redacted] to the SLT and suggested a disciplinary investigation should take place, he was removed from being [redacted] line manager.

Mrs Gillett stated that she had nothing to do with removing Witness A as [redacted] line manager and did not get involved in such matters relating to [redacted]

The panel was mindful that Mrs Gillett would have had operational oversight of all matters pertaining to the Trust, but not specifically involved in every individual matter. The senior leaders would not ordinarily be involved in day to day operations of the Trust. Whilst it was Witness A's own line manager who informed him by email that his line management duties of [redacted] had been removed, the panel was satisfied that the evidence indicated this direction came from Mrs Gillett.

As the head of Bretonside, she would have been aware of the issue and the panel did not accept that she did not know about it or had any input as the roles of the senior leaders would not include such operational changes without her knowledge. Mrs Gillett was copied in to the email sent by Witness A to the SLT about the concerns he had regarding and suggested it was a potential misconduct or gross misconduct issue. The panel also

found that Mrs Gillett would have pored over details of the Trust's finances and staff structures on a routine basis, so it is unlikely that she was not involved in this decision.

The panel assessed the weight and reliability of the evidence, and on the balance of probabilities, it believed that it was more likely than not that Mrs Gillett removed Witness A as [redacted] line management due to him challenging [redacted] performance. Further the panel found that this was inappropriate and unprofessional.

iv. creating an environment where staff felt they were not being able to raise concerns about [redacted] due to fear of retribution by you;

The panel heard evidence from Witness C, Witness B and Witness D about receiving warnings not to get involved in [redacted] The evidence given to the panel indicated that there was fear of retribution if issues about [redacted] were raised. Even Witness B who had been friends with [redacted] and Mrs Gillett felt that he could not formally record that his lesson observation of [redacted] was marked as "Requires Improvement" for fear of what action Mrs Gillett would take against him. The panel heard from Witness A that whilst he was able to raise concerns regarding other matters, he was removed from being [redacted]'s line manager following him raising concerns about [redacted]'s performance.

The panel assessed the weight and reliability of the evidence, and on the balance of probabilities, it believed that it was more likely than not that Mrs Gillett created an environment where staff felt they were not able to raise concerns about [redacted] due to fear of retribution by her. Further, the panel found that this was both inappropriate and unprofessional.

2. Your behaviour towards one or more staff members as may be found proven at 1a-1g above constituted bullying and/or intimidation and/or harassment;

Having found particulars 1a to 1g found proved, the panel went on to consider if that proven conduct amounted to bullying and/or intimidation and/or harassment.

In making its determination, the panel considered that the evidence demonstrated a regular and consistent pattern of behaviour on the part of Mrs Gillett. The panel found evidence that Mrs Gillett would make threats, and act upon them, as illustrated by Witness A being made redundant after he stood up to her.

The panel noted that whilst there are many different definitions of bullying, they all speak of the same sorts of behaviours exhibited by Mrs Gillett. The panel reminded themselves of the content of the "*stinger*" or "*stinker*" emails sent to Witness D and [redacted]. In her evidence, Mrs Gillett accepted the email she sent to [redacted] demeaned both him and her. Mrs Gillett expressed remorse for sending the email.

The panel identified that witnesses gave evidence regarding the words and phrases used by Mrs Gillett, describing her as "*vicious*", "*venomous*" and "*threatening*". Witness C

made reference to Mrs Gillett having "*ultimate power*". The panel noted that Witness D stated in her verbal evidence that Mrs Gillett was "*known amongst staff as a bully*" and that emails were used to silence their target.

The panel considered the request for 360 degree feedback that Mrs Gillett sent out to her staff, inviting them to send their comments directly back to her, rather than through an anonymised mechanism. The panel found that this in itself will have moderated comments sent to Mrs Gillett as part of this appraisal. This demonstrated controlling behaviour on the part of Mrs Gillett.

Mrs Gillett denied being a bully. The panel found that Mrs Gillett chose to avert blame on to others for her wrongdoing. As an example, in Mrs Gillett's written response to the allegations, she described [redacted] comments as "*bullying themselves*". The panel did not accept the comment made by [redacted] constituted bullying. The panel was also concerned that Mrs Gillett sought to blame [redacted] for the highly offensive email that she had sent to him as set out above.

The panel assessed the weight and reliability of the evidence, and on the balance of probabilities, it believed that it was more likely than not that Mrs Gillett's behaviour constituted bullying. The panel found the conduct amounted to bullying so it did not go on to consider harassment or intimidation.

4. You represented to the Trust that you have a master's degree in education in circumstances where;

a. you enrolled on the course but withdrew from it before taking the qualification;

b. you permitted this incorrect representation to be;

i. placed on the Trust's website;

ii. communicated to the DofE.

The evidence from the university stated that Mrs Gillett "*commenced study in 2016-17 but then withdrew due to work pressures and did not complete any Masters' credits or qualification*". Mrs Gillett accepts that she enrolled on the course but stated that her research was postponed due to competing priorities. During the independent investigation, Mrs Gillett indicated her intention to seek an extension and complete the course of study. However, there is no evidence that this occurred.

Mrs Gillett first collated information regarding CV's/resumes from her senior leadership team in and around 24/25 April 2019. [redacted] collated the information from the Tiverton School ("Tiv") document as a starter for consideration. That document clearly showed Mrs Gillett's resume stated that she was a holder of a master's degree in education. The senior leadership team were asked to confirm the accuracy of this

information. Mrs Gillett had the opportunity to correct any inaccuracy but did not. In addition, Mrs Gillett submitted her CV which also contained the information she had obtained a master's degree in education.

Further, the same incorrect information was clearly included on a key page on the Trust's website which set out the achievements and qualifications of the CEO and directors. The panel considered that Mrs Gillett must have known that this incorrect information was published on the Trust's website and was also sent to the Department of Education. The panel felt it inconceivable that Mrs Gillett would not have known about this error and disregarded her oral evidence that she felt let down by a director for not doing this on her behalf.

The TRA invited the panel to make an adverse inference in relation to Mrs Gillett's refusal to answer questions when she was taken to the independent investigation. The panel carefully considered this and determined that it would not draw such an inference because Mrs Gillett provided an explanation during her evidence, as to why she did not wish to answer such questions.

The panel assessed the weight and reliability of the evidence, and on the balance of probabilities, it believed that it was more likely than not that Mrs Gillett enrolled on the course but withdrew from it before taking the qualification and it was more likely than not that Mrs Gillett permitted incorrect representation to be placed on the Trust's website and communicated to the DoFE.

5. Your conduct as may be proven at 4 above lacked integrity and/or was dishonest.

Having found particular 4 proved, the panel went on to consider if Mrs Gillett's conduct amounted to a lack of integrity and/or was dishonest.

Having heard all of the evidence and notwithstanding Mrs Gillett's assertion that she did not know that the incorrect information had been published, the panel found that Mrs Gillett was aware that she did not hold a master's degree in education, that she knew that her CV incorrectly stated that she did hold such a qualification and she also knew that misleading information had been placed on the Trust's website and communicated to the Department of Education.

The panel concluded that Mrs Gillett may have benefited from this misleading information in terms of her personal and professional reputation being unjustly enhanced by the inclusion of being a holder of a master's degree in education and in not correcting this information, particularly when she had the opportunity to do so. The panel found that amounted to dishonesty on her part.

In reaching this conclusion, the panel took into account that in the interview of May 2019, Mrs Gillett could not offer any reasonable explanation as to why this incorrect information

had been published and was unconvinced by her account to the panel in these proceedings.

Having found that Mrs Gillett's conduct amounted to dishonesty, the panel did not go on to consider whether Mrs Gillett's conduct amounted to a lack of integrity.

The panel found the following particulars of the allegations against you not proved, for these reasons:

h. Displaying favouritism towards [Apprentice A], an apprentice, who was previously a vulnerable pupil at the school;

[redacted]

The panel assessed the weight and reliability of the evidence, and on the balance of probabilities, it did not find this allegation proved.

i. Displaying favouritism/nepotism towards [redacted]t, including by;

(iii). allowing [redacted]t to not comply with the fire drill;

The panel heard from Witness A that [redacted] did not comply with fire drills on a regular basis. He explained that [redacted] would not leave immediately, would use the lift, and would not stand with the rest of the staff team outside.

Mrs Gillett stated that there was a period of around 4-6 weeks where [redacted] was excused from participating in fire drills due to health reasons in line with Occupational Health service recommendations.

The panel considered the evidence and found that it had not been provided with evidence that demonstrated the fact that it was due to Mrs Gillett's favouritism that [redacted] did not have to comply with fire drills over a period of time.

The panel assessed the weight and reliability of the evidence, and on the balance of probabilities, it did not find this allegation proven as it could not be said more likely than not that this was attributable to Mrs Gillett's own actions.

i. Displaying favouritism/nepotism towards [redacted], including by;

(v). favourably promoting [redacted] through the ranks so that between 2012 to 2019 he moved from an NQT supply teacher to a UPR3 salary.

The panel heard evidence that it was highly unusual for a teacher to progress as quickly as [redacted] did up the pay scales. Witness D stated that it was unusual but the panel found that she may not have been the best placed person to comment on whether this

was unwarranted unless she had been provided with information demonstrating his teaching abilities. The panel was not provided with such evidence.

During her evidence, Mrs Gillett referred to growing and developing the Trust's own internal staff and the panel accepted that she had track record of doing so. As an example, Witness B told the panel that Mrs Gillett encouraged him to apply for a more senior role, but at that time, he did not feel he had the relevant experience.

On balance, the panel found that there was insufficient evidence to find this allegation proved. The panel were not provided with evidence of when [redacted] joined the Trust, what pay grade he was placed on when he started, and when he was moved to UPR3. Whilst the panel accept that the progression may be thought remarkable, it did not have any evidence as to whether or not Mrs Gillett's relationship with [redacted] directly resulted in this pay scale progression.

The panel assessed the weight and reliability of the evidence, and on the balance of probabilities, it did not find this allegation proved.

3. Your conduct as may be proven above created an environment where staff felt inhibited from raising any concerns either informally or through the whistleblowing policy and/or grievance policies which in turn may create a serious risk that safeguarding issues are not raised by staff;

The panel was provided with no evidence that safeguarding concerns were not raised by staff in the Trust due to the culture of fear brought by Mrs Gillett. In making this determination, the panel was mindful that it was not provided with evidence that showed staff felt inhibited to raise concerns which may create a serious risk to safeguarding issues not being raised by staff. The panel considered that if such concerns had existed, this would have been identified by an Ofsted inspection. Further, the panel noted that Witness A did not feel inhibited to put in a grievance about Mrs Gillett's conduct in 2016.

The panel assessed the weight and reliability of the evidence, and on the balance of probabilities, it did not find this allegation proved.

Findings as to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute

Having found a number of the allegations proved (save for particulars 1h, 1i (iii), 1i (v) and 3), the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In doing so, the panel had regard to the document Teacher Misconduct: The Prohibition of Teachers, which is referred to as “the Advice”.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mrs Gillett, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mrs Gillett was in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach...

The Panel also considered that Part 1 of the Teacher Standards assisted them in their decision making in relation to UPC. The panel found that Mrs Gillett breached the following standards:

- Set high expectations which inspire, motivate and challenge pupils
 - Demonstrate consistency the positive attitudes, values and behaviour which are expected of pupils
- Fulfil wider professional responsibilities
 - develop effective professional relationships with colleagues, knowing how and when to draw on advice and specialist support.

The panel considered the way in which Mrs Gillett had engaged with staff was a factor in making this decision. The panel found that one of the most concerning aspects of Mrs Gillett’s behaviour was the tone of her email communication to staff. The panel noted that the Trust had adopted the Nolan Principles of public life through its staff conduct policy and that Mrs Gillett breached aspects of those Principles. The Panel has made findings that Mrs Gillett had demonstrated bullying behaviour and also acted dishonestly. The witnesses called by the TRA recalled to the panel about the adverse impact of Mrs Gillett’s behaviour on their health and wellbeing.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mrs Gillett amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel also considered whether Mrs Gillett’s conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice. The panel found that the offences of controlling or coercive behaviour and fraud or serious dishonesty were relevant. The Advice indicates that where behaviours associated with such an offence

exist, a panel is likely to conclude that an individual's conduct would amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mrs Gillett was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel took into account the way the teaching profession is viewed by others and considered the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel also took account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils' lives and the fact that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way that they behave.

The findings of misconduct are serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public perception. The panel therefore found that Mrs Gillett's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In summary, the panel found that Mrs Gillett's conduct amounted to both unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in relation to the facts found proved.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be made, the panel had to consider whether it would be an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it would be in the public interest to do so. Prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found all of them to be relevant in this case, namely, the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession, declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct, striking the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest.

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public. The panel found

that this was applicable because of the serious findings of bullying of staff. The panel had no concerns about Mrs Gillett's interaction with pupils.

The panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mrs Gillett were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Mrs Gillett was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

The panel considered that there was a strong public interest consideration in retaining teachers in the profession. However, given the serious findings the panel made in this case, it found that this outweighed the interest in Mrs Gillett being retained in the profession.

In view of the clear public interest considerations that were present, the panel considered carefully whether or not it would be proportionate to impose a prohibition order, taking into account the effect that this would have on Mrs Gillett.

In carrying out the balancing exercise, the panel had regard to the public interest considerations both in favour of, and against, prohibition as well as the interests of Mrs Gillett. The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours of a teacher have been proved. In the list of such behaviours, those that were relevant in this case were:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- abuse of position of trust;
- sustained or serious bullying, or deliberate behaviour that undermines pupils, the profession, the school or colleagues;
- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour;
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity.

Even though some of the behaviours found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors. Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

There was evidence that Mrs Gillett's actions were deliberate. There was no evidence to suggest that Mrs Gillett was acting under duress and, in fact, the panel found Mrs Gillett's actions to be calculated and motivated.

The panel was not provided with any evidence that Mrs Gillett had been subject to disciplinary proceedings/warnings prior to May 2019. The panel was not provided with any testimonial evidence regarding her character or attesting to her abilities as a teacher. The panel was provided with information regarding Mrs Gillett's strengths, and in particular her achievements in bringing the Trust together. The panel accepted that Mrs Gillett did focus on achieving positive outcomes for children. [redacted]. However, her drive to improve the Trust was at the expense of the way she communicated with, and treated her staff. The panel found that the adverse effects of Mrs Gillett's bullying behaviour on certain individuals outweighed the positives.

The panel first considered whether it would be proportionate to conclude this case with no recommendation of prohibition, considering whether the publication of the findings made by the panel would be sufficient.

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings would be sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mrs Gillett of prohibition.

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mrs Gillett. The serious findings which included bullying behaviours and dishonesty were a significant factors in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate for it to decide to recommend a review period of the order. The panel was mindful that the Advice states that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances, in any given case, that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 2 years.

The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would weigh in the favour of not offering a review period. The panel found that none of these applied.

The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would weigh in the favour of a longer review period before a review is considered appropriate. One of these behaviours included 'fraud or serious dishonesty'. The panel had found that Mrs Gillett had been dishonest in relation to holding a master's degree in education. Of greater concern was the panel's findings that Mrs Gillett had demonstrated bullying behaviours and the adverse impact this had on her colleagues. [redacted].

The panel noted that Mrs Gillett has not demonstrated any insight in to her conduct. There was limited remorse, but this was only in relation to the facts of the particulars admitted.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a review after a period of 5 years.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

I have given very careful consideration to this case and to the recommendation of the panel in respect of both sanction and review period.

In considering this case, I have also given very careful attention to the Advice that the Secretary of State has published concerning the prohibition of teachers.

In this case, the panel has found some of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. In this case, the panel has found some of the allegations not proven (including 1h, 1i (iii), 1i (v) and 3). I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mrs Sarah Gillett should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of five years.

In particular, the panel has found that Mrs Sarah Gillett is in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach...
- Set high expectations which inspire, motivate and challenge pupils
 - Demonstrate consistency the positive attitudes, values and behaviour which are expected of pupils
- Fulfil wider professional responsibilities
 - develop effective professional relationships with colleagues, knowing how and when to draw on advice and specialist support.

The panel finds that the conduct of Mrs Gillett fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding of bullying staff and dishonesty.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself, whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Mrs Gillett, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, "There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public. The panel found that this was applicable because of the serious findings of bullying of staff. The panel had no concerns about Mrs Gillett's interaction with pupils." A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, "The panel noted that Mrs Gillett has not demonstrated any insight in to her conduct. There was limited remorse, but this was only in relation to the facts of the particulars admitted." I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, "public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mrs Gillett were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession." I am particularly mindful of the finding of bullying staff in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

I have had to consider that the public has a high expectation of professional standards of all teachers and that the public might regard a failure to impose a prohibition order as a failure to uphold those high standards. In weighing these considerations, I have had to consider the matter from the point of view of an "ordinary intelligent and well-informed citizen."

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of unacceptable professional conduct, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mrs Gillett herself and the panel comment “The panel was not provided with any evidence that Mrs Gillett had been subject to disciplinary proceedings/warnings prior to May 2019. The panel was not provided with any testimonial evidence regarding her character or attesting to her abilities as a teacher. The panel was provided with information regarding Mrs Gillett's strengths, and in particular her achievements in bringing the Trust together. The panel accepted that Mrs Gillett did focus on achieving positive outcomes for children.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mrs Gillett from teaching. A prohibition order would also clearly deprive the public of her contribution to the profession for the period that it is in force.

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel's comments, “There was evidence that Mrs Gillett's actions were deliberate. There was no evidence to suggest that Mrs Gillett was acting under duress and, in fact, the panel found Mrs Gillett's actions to be calculated and motivated.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that Mrs Gillett's “drive to improve the Trust was at the expense of the way she communicated with, and treated her staff. The panel found that the adverse effects of Mrs Gillett's bullying behaviour on certain individuals outweighed the positives.”

I have give particular consideration to the following comment from the panel “The panel found that one of the most concerning aspects of Mrs Gillett's behaviour was the tone of her email communication to staff. The panel noted that the Trust had adopted the Nolan Principles of public life through its staff conduct policy and that Mrs Gillett breached aspects of those Principles. The Panel has made findings that Mrs Gillett had demonstrated bullying behaviour and also acted dishonestly. The witnesses called by the TRA recalled to the panel about the adverse impact of Mrs Gillett's behaviour on their health and wellbeing.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mrs Gillett has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, that is not backed up by full remorse or insight, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

For these reasons, I have concluded that a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest in order to achieve the intended aims of a prohibition order.

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended a 5 year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments "The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would weigh in the favour of a longer review period before a review is considered appropriate. One of these behaviours included 'fraud or serious dishonesty'. The panel had found that Mrs Gillett had been dishonest in relation to holding a master's degree in education. Of greater concern was the panel's findings that Mrs Gillett had demonstrated bullying behaviours and the adverse impact this had on her colleagues."

Factors mean that allowing a lesser review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are seriousness of the findings, involving bullying of staff and dishonesty, along with the lack of full insight and remorse.

I consider therefore that a five year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

This means that Mrs Sarah Gillett is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. She may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 2027, 5 years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If she does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Mrs Sarah Gillett remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

This order takes effect from the date on which it is served on the teacher.

Mrs Sarah Gillett has a right of appeal to the King's Bench Division of the High Court within 28 days from the date she is given notice of this order.



Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey

Date: 21 October 2022

This decision is taken by the decision maker named above on behalf of the Secretary of State.