

## THE TEACHING AGENCY

Decision of a Professional Conduct Panel and the Secretary of State

**Teacher:** Mr Frank John White

**Teacher ref no:** 97/54113

**Teacher date of birth:** 10 April 1951

**TA Case ref no:** 7289

**Date of Determination:** 10 October 2012

**Former Employer:** Witton Park High School, Blackburn, Lancashire

---

### **A. Introduction**

A Professional Conduct Panel (“the Panel”) of the Teaching Agency convened on 8, 9 and 10 October 2012 at 53-55 Butts Road, Earlsdon Park, Coventry, CV1 3BH to consider the case of Mr Frank John White.

The Panel members were Mrs Janet Draper (Lay Panellist, in the Chair), Mr Martin Pilkington (Lay Panellist) and Mr Mark Tweedle (Teacher Panellist).

The Legal Adviser to the Panel was Mr Douglas Readings, barrister.

The Presenting Officer for the Teaching Agency was Ms Sarah Knight of Bevan Brittan LLP, Solicitors.

Mr White was not present, but Mr Neil Dewhurst of NASUWT, Wigan, appeared on his behalf at the beginning of the hearing. He withdrew at the stage at which the Panel decided to proceed with the hearing in Mr White’s absence because he had not been able to obtain adequate instructions from Mr White.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

### **B. Allegations**

The Panel considered the allegation set out in the Notice of Proceedings dated 24 July 2012.

It was alleged that Mr Frank John White was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, in that:

Whilst employed as a teacher at Witton Park High School, Buncer Lane, Blackburn BB2 6TD ("the School"), between 2008 to 2010, he:

### **Allegation 1**

- a) on Friday 27th November 2009 threw a piece of wood across a classroom and shouted overly aggressively at pupils A and B;
- b) made inappropriate physical contact with pupils by hitting them with a piece of wood or his hand on several occasions;
- c) rubbed garlic on his hands and chased pupils before wiping his hands on them;
- d) made inappropriate and threatening comments towards a pupil C on Thursday 26th November 2009;
- e) made intimidating and threatening comments towards pupils on several occasions;
- f) made inappropriate and unprofessional remarks about members of staff;
- g) repeatedly swore;
- h) made racist remarks on several occasions;
- i) ate garlic and then breathed intentionally in pupils faces.

### **Allegation 2**

Failed to implement the necessary health and safety requirements in that he did not ensure that pupils wore safety goggles and aprons during design and technology lessons.

Mr Frank John White made no admission of any of the facts alleged, and made no admission of unacceptable professional conduct.

## **C. Summary of Evidence**

### Documents

In advance of the hearing, the Panel received a bundle of documents containing 376 pages, including:

Section 1: An anonymised pupil list.

Section 2: The Notice of Proceedings and letters sent to Mr White or his representative.

Section 3: The witness statements of Witness A, Witness B, Witness C, and pupils A to J.

Section 4: Various documents referred to in the witness statements, including the notes and records of disciplinary proceedings and witness statements and notes of interviews with pupils, policy documents and correspondence.

On the application of the Presenting Officer the Panel agreed to admit the additional bundle of 11 pages, and three extra pages which they agreed to insert in the Documents Bundle as pages numbered 36A, 36B and 36C.

The Panel Members confirmed that they had read all of the documents in advance of the hearing.

#### Brief summary of evidence given

The Panel heard the oral evidence of Witness A, Deputy Head Teacher, and Witness C, Curriculum Leader for Design and Technology at Witton Park High School, who gave evidence in accordance with their witness statements dated 7 December 2011 and 16 December 2011 respectively.

Witness A told the Panel about the investigations which she carried out, at the Head Teacher's request, and produced the documents concerning her investigations and the written statements which were taken from pupils and staff. Concerning the pupils A and B, she had no doubt that they were telling the truth, and she did not feel they had colluded. Pupil A had been in tears when she was interviewed, and she appeared to be genuinely frightened for her safety in Mr White's class. The allegation that Mr White threw a piece of wood was confirmed by Pupil F. When she was shown a Facebook entry purporting to be by Pupil A concerning her, she explained that it was not pupil A who had made the entry. Concerning pupil H, Witness A acknowledged that when she said in her witness statement that Mr White had admitted to her that he had said to pupil H "I will rip off your fucking head and shit down your neck", or words to that effect, he had actually admitted only that he had said in response: "If I were a member of Joe Public and money didn't change hands then I would probably rip off your head and shit down your chuffing neck" as recorded in the transcript of the investigatory interview prepared by Individual A. He said that he admitted telling female pupils that if they were his daughter they would have a red bum, and Witness A was of the opinion that this was threatening and inappropriate behaviour. She told the Panel that there were earlier complaints about Mr White's behaviour. Concerning health and safety measures, Mr White told Witness A that he gave pupils a choice as to whether they wore aprons or safety glasses, but in her opinion it was wrong for him not to tell pupils to use safety equipment.

In answer to questions, Witness A explained that she had followed HR advice when she decided to interview a sample of pupils, including C and J, rather than interview all the pupils present at the time. Concerning the allegations of racist remarks, Witness A said Mr White admitted an incident when the letter R fell off the school sign.

Witness C told the Panel that she had joined the School a few months after Mr White, in September 2000. The School has around 1,100 pupils, and the Design

and Technology team comprises 5 teachers, one instructor, one technician and one classroom support assistant. Witness C was promoted to Head of Faculty in 2006, and was assisted by Witness B as Second in Faculty until he left the School in 2009. The School is on a split site, and, because of the layout of the School, Witness B had more day-to-day dealings with Mr White than she did. When they first joined the School, she and Mr White had the same induction training, including health and safety matters. However, she subsequently found him very difficult to work with. He consistently refused to follow basic school policies, including policies on planning, behaviour management, "Every Child Matters" and health and safety issues. He did not behave in a respectful manner towards pupils or other members of staff. He was not a team player, and often failed to attend Faculty meetings, and refused to carry out Faculty business. He declined to stay after school to attend meetings, extra-curricular activities or assessments, despite Witness C's requests. He frequently missed handing in updated schemes of work, failed effectively to plan his lessons, and completely failed to input any entry in the lesson planner. When he was absent he left no cover work and no lesson plans. He refused to teach any other classes, even when timetabled to do so.

Witness C explained that Design and Technology comprises five compulsory fields or subjects that must be taught, from food to resistant materials, which are taught by a number of different teachers with different areas of expertise. The subjects and the pupils are tracked in relation to the marks given for each part of the course, using a carousel system. Mr White consistently refused to complete his part of the carousel system. He failed to mark pupils' work, and then guessed end of term levels, which resulted in inaccurate data.

In respect of pupils' safety, Witness C said that, despite the matter being raised with him, by Witness C and by Witness B, and regularly at Faculty meetings, Mr White failed to ensure that pupils were wearing the correct safety equipment in his lessons. He refused to wear safety equipment himself, and failed to demonstrate at the start of each lesson concerning the safety equipment and procedures which needed to be applied in that lesson. There were a number of injuries to pupils reported arising out of Mr White's classes, and Witness C produced a copy of an email dated 14 May 2008 concerning such injuries. Witness C produced two job specifications relating to Mr White (pages 36B and 36C), and pointed out that it was his responsibility to ensure the provision of a safe well-equipped teaching area. Mr White's own room was untidy and disorganized and constituted a fire risk. After he left the School, unopened boxes of new safety aprons were found which Mr White had never taken out of the boxes to give to his pupils.

A large quantity of garlic was also found in Mr White's workshop cupboards. Ms O'Boyle said that he was in the habit of eating raw garlic before he had to meet the Senior Leadership Team, the Deputy Head, or Witness C, in her capacity as Head of Faculty. He told her that he did this in order to make himself repulsive to the people he had to meet so that meetings would be shortened.

In answer to questions from the Panel, Witness C agreed that when she attended a lesson observation and observed a health and safety breach, she must have graded the lesson as unsatisfactory and spoken to Mr White about it at the end, but she could not recall how she followed it up. The Faculty workshops had their own risk

assessments for specific activities. Witness B constantly brought up complaints about Mr White. She had referred them up to Senior Management, but they had not been followed up, and she did not believe she had the authority to discipline Mr White, as a qualified and specialist teacher. She said she did not know why action had not been taken against Mr White at an earlier date.

#### **D. Amendment of Notice of Proceedings**

At the conclusion of the evidence, the Presenting Officer applied to make several amendments to the Allegation. The Legal Adviser advised the Panel that they had power to make each of the proposed amendments but should not do so if the effect of an amendment would be to widen the allegation against Mr White who was not present or represented.

The Panel decided as follows:

Paragraph 1 a) will not be amended because the proposed amendment would have widened the allegation against Mr White, and the addition of an allegation of swearing would be duplication.

Paragraph 1 c) will not be amended. The Panel considers that this is a specific, detailed allegation of fact, upon which Mr White is entitled to have a decision made.

Paragraph 1 d) will be amended to correct the order and amend the identity of the pupil referred to, so that it will read:

“On Thursday 26<sup>th</sup> November 2009 made inappropriate and threatening comments towards a pupil H”.

Paragraph 1 e) will be amended by deleting the words “and threatening” and adding the words “during lessons” so that it will read:

“made intimidating comments during lessons towards pupils on several occasions”.

Paragraph 1 h) will be amended and narrowed to reflect the evidence given so that it will read:

“made a racist remark to a member of staff;”.

Paragraph 1 i) will not be amended. The proposed amendment would unfairly widen the allegation against Mr White.

The allegation, as amended, is as follows:

It is alleged that Mr Frank John White was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, in that:

Whilst employed as a teacher at Witton Park High School, Buncer Lane, Blackburn BB2 6TD (“the School”), between 2008 to 2010, he:

**Allegation 1**

- a) on Friday 27<sup>th</sup> November 2009 he threw a piece of wood across a classroom and shouted overly aggressively at pupils A and B;
- c) rubbed garlic on his hands and chased pupils before wiping his hands on them;
- d) on Thursday 26<sup>th</sup> November 2009 made inappropriate and threatening comments towards a pupil H;
- e) made intimidating comments towards pupils during lessons on several occasions;
- f) made inappropriate and unprofessional remarks about members of staff;
- g) repeatedly swore;
- h) made a racist remark to a member of staff;
- i) ate garlic and then breathed intentionally in pupils faces.

**Allegation 2**

Failed to implement the necessary health and safety requirements in that he did not ensure that pupils wore safety goggles and aprons during design and technology lessons.

**E. Decision and Reasons**

We have now carefully considered the case before us and have reached a decision.

We confirm that we have read all the documents provided in the bundle in advance of the hearing.

A brief summary of the case is as follows. From June 2000 until he was dismissed in June 2010 Mr White was employed as a Teacher at Witton Park High School with responsibility for teaching Design and Technology and the duties of a form tutor. On Friday 27 November 2009 two female Year 9 pupils (A and B) expressed concerns to their pastoral leader Individual B concerning Mr White's behaviour during a class earlier on that day. They were asked to make separate written statements, which appear in the Documents Bundle at pages 40 and 50 respectively. They both alleged that Mr White had thrown a piece of wood, and had shouted and sworn at pupils, and had threatened to hit them. These allegations were investigated by Witness A, Deputy Head Teacher, who interviewed pupils A and B and a number of other pupils, with the assistance of a HR consultant Individual A and Education Welfare Officer, Individual C. She says a pattern of complaints emerged: allegations that Mr White swore in class, made derogatory remarks about

other members of staff and had made racist remarks; allegations that Mr White had hit or threatened to hit them, with his hand or with a piece of wood; allegations that Mr White had behaved inappropriately and bizarrely with garlic. An allegation was also received that a pupil H had been threatened by Mr White on 26 November 2007, not in the course of a class, that he would “fucking rip your head off and shit down your neck”.

As a result of these matters, further investigations were carried out by the School and disciplinary proceedings were commenced against Mr White, as a result of which he was dismissed. An appeal was unsuccessful.

### Findings of fact

Our findings of fact are as follows:

We have found the following particulars of the allegation against Mr White proven, for these reasons:

Whilst employed as a teacher at Witton Park High School, Buncer Lane, Blackburn BB2 6TD ("the School"), between 2008 to 2010, he:

#### **Allegation 1**

- a) on Friday 27th November 2009 he threw a piece of wood across a classroom and shouted overly aggressively at pupils A and B;

This allegation is found proved. The Panel accepts the evidence given in written statements by pupil A and pupil B. It notes that their evidence is hearsay, but that Witness A formed the opinion from their demeanour that they were telling the truth. Although there is a possibility of collusion, the evidence of these two pupils is corroborated by information given by pupil F that Mr White threw a piece of wood, and by Mr White's own admission that he "lost it" and that he threw a piece of wood. The Panel notes that pupil A says that she felt "really, really scared". There is a range of evidence from different pupils about whether Mr White shouted on this occasion. However, two members of staff reported that A was tearful and upset at the end of the day, and again some days later. In light of this and Mr White's admission that he "lost it" and felt "pissed off" by pupils A and B, the Panel is satisfied on the balance of probabilities that Mr White did shout overly aggressively at them.

- c) rubbed garlic on his hands and chased pupils before wiping his hands on them;

This allegation is found proved. Pupil A's statement says that Mr White was in the habit of chasing pupils around the classroom with "garlic hands" and touching them. Pupil E, in response to any open question asked by Mrs Atkinson about garlic, said: "Yes, he puts it on his hands, then rubs it in your face", and said he thought Mr White did this, "to be a clown". Pupil B said: "Sir has garlic in his drawer and he rubs it on his hands and eats it and it's horrible." Later in his

interview he said: "We don't take him on or he will get the garlic or something else." Witness C, in her witness statement which she confirmed in her oral evidence, told the Panel about finding a large quantity of garlic in Mr White's workshop cupboard. Mr White himself, when questioned about it, confirmed that he did keep and use garlic at School, but did not reply to the specific allegation about chasing pupils with "garlic hands" and touching them. In these circumstances the Panel found this allegation of fact proved on the balance of probabilities.

d) on Thursday 26<sup>th</sup> November 2009 made inappropriate and threatening comments towards a pupil H;

This allegation is found proved with the omission of the words "and threatening". The Panel has heard a number of slightly different versions of what Mr White is alleged to have said to pupil H. The statement of Ms Smith informed the Panel that she sat in at a restorative justice meeting with the Police and pupil H, and during that meeting pupil H had become upset and there was a break, during which pupil H told her that Mr White had said to him that he would "fucking shit down your throat". In his own written statement, pupil H wrote that Mr White had said to him: "... if I don't get no money out of you I will rip your head off and fucking shit down your neck." In her statement Witness A said that when she interviewed pupil H he told her that Mr White had said to him: "he would fucking rip your head off and shit down your neck". She also said "I later put this to Mr White and he admitted that he had said this to the pupil". However, she accepted in the course of her evidence that when he was interviewed, Mr White's words were, as recorded in the transcript of the interview: "If I were a member of Joe Public and money didn't change hands then I would probably rip off your head and shit down your chuffing neck". The Panel notes that pupil H was distressed at the time, and his recollection may be inaccurate. It has decided, on the balance of probabilities, to accept the version advanced by Mr White when he was interviewed, as recorded in the transcript.

In all the circumstances, bearing in mind Mr White's own explanation that he did not intend to be threatening, the Panel is satisfied that the words "If I were a member of Joe Public and money didn't change hands then I would probably rip off your head and shit down your chuffing neck" were inappropriate. However, the Panel is not satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the comments were threatening.

e) made intimidating comments towards pupils during lessons on several occasions;

This allegation is found proved. The Panel has carefully considered the evidence of the pupils who were interviewed by Witness A, including those who were chosen to provide an independent view, and the evidence of Mr White's own answers to Witness A's questions when she interviewed him. A pattern of behaviour emerges, especially from the evidence of pupils A, B, E, F and I. There is clear evidence which establishes on the balance of probabilities that Mr White regularly made comments such as that if a pupil was his daughter, she would have a red bum, he regularly banged down a mallet on to a table close to a



pupil, and he spoke aggressively, and threatened to hit pupils with pieces of wood, when the pupils believed that he had actually hit pupils previously. The Panel has disregarded references to using a mallet to attract attention, because such behaviour could not be interpreted as “comment” within the meaning of this paragraph.

The Panel noted that Mr White confirmed when he was interviewed that he had commented to pupils: “if you were my daughter you would have had a red bum by now”. This was obviously a general remark, reflecting the fact that Mr White acknowledged that he had made it to pupils on a number of occasions.

f) made inappropriate and unprofessional remarks about members of staff;

This allegation is found proved. The Panel notes that when he was interviewed by Witness A, Mr White admitted he imitated the accents of other people, and had amused pupils with an impression of another teacher Mr Archer. He admitted that he had told pupils that he thought Mrs Barnes, a Deputy Head, was a vampire and therefore he had started to eat garlic, but said that was only a joke. He admitted he had commented about Mrs Barnes and another member of staff and what he described as “the total cock up of the rotation system.” When his admissions are put together with the information from pupils, including pupils E, F and I, that he made comments about members of staff, the Panel is satisfied on the balance of probabilities that he did make inappropriate and unprofessional remarks to pupils about members of staff.

g) repeatedly swore;

This allegation is found proved. The Panel accepts the evidence of pupils E, I and J concerning Mr White swearing. Many statements from pupils contain general references to Mr White’s use of unacceptable language. There are also some specific allegations. Mr White has accepted in interview only that he used the words, bollocks, frigging, crud and bullshit, which he did not regard as a swearword. The Panel notes that pupil H referred to Mr White swearing on 26<sup>th</sup> November 2009, and pupils A and B in their statements describe specific swearing by Mr White on 27<sup>th</sup> November 2009. Drawing the various references together, the Panel finds as fact, on the balance of probabilities, that he used the following words at one time or another when talking to pupils: fucking, bastard, bullshit, shit, dickhead, frigging, bollocks, crap, crud, pissed off, pissing around, and fucking hell.

h) made a racist remark to a member of staff;

This allegation is found proved. The evidence of Witness C to the Panel was that when the letter R fell off a school sign, she heard him say: “Witton Pak, that’s more like it”. The Panel has heard that the School has a high proportion of pupils of Asian origin, and the word “Pak” would be an insulting, racist reference to a person of Asian origin. The Panel notes that Mr White recalled making a racist

comment, as he confirmed in his signed version of the notes of the interview with Witness A. These notes record him as saying: “the only racist comment he could recall was about a year back when he was stood outside the north building and the R fell off the school sign it said Witton Pak High School. FW said some of the best kids are Asians and he would not knock them”

The Panel found that Mr White’s remark, in context, was racist.

i) ate garlic and then breathed intentionally in pupils faces.

This allegation is not found proved. Pupils A and I have said that Mr White ate garlic and breathed over everybody in the class. The Panel notes that Witness C worked with him for a number of years and had experience of Mr White using garlic before interviews with senior members of staff in order to cause them to shorten the interview. Mr White confirmed in interview that he did use garlic at School, and a quantity of garlic was found in his cupboard at the School after he was suspended. The Panel concludes that Mr White regularly consumed garlic and must have smelled strongly of garlic. The Panel does not, however, believe there is evidence sufficient to establish on a balance of probabilities that Mr White deliberately chose to breathe in pupils’ faces.

## **Allegation 2**

Failed to implement the necessary health and safety requirements in that he did not ensure that pupils wore safety goggles and aprons during design and technology lessons.

This allegation is found proved. The Panel accepts the evidence of Witness C who was Mr White’s line manager. She frequently had to raise with him his failure to ensure that safety equipment was used by pupils when it should have been. She observed pupils in Mr White’s classes carrying out operations for which safety equipment such as goggles and glasses were required, but without such equipment. The Panel has noted that it was Mr White’s contractual duty “to ensure a safe, well equipped teaching area”. However, when interviewed by Witness A, Mr White said that it was his practice to let his pupils choose whether or not to use protective equipment. Notwithstanding the failure of Witness C, and senior management at the School, to follow up breaches of safety requirements as they might have been expected to do, the Panel is satisfied that there were many such breaches. The Panel has taken into account agendas and notes of Faculty meetings, accident reports, the email reporting a series of small accidents causing injuries to pupils, and the evidence of Witness C and of Witness B.

### Finding as to Unacceptable Professional Conduct

The Panel has found proved misbehaviour by Mr White over a wide range of his professional activity. The facts contained in the first part of the Notice of Proceedings which has been headed “Allegation 1” would by themselves amount to unacceptable professional conduct. He has behaved in a manner which is wholly inappropriate, intimidating pupils, criticising other members of staff, swearing and

making a racist comment. When the matter of ignoring basic safety requirements, under Allegation 2 is added, the Panel is in no doubt that Mr White's behaviour amounts to unacceptable professional conduct.

Mr White's behaviour involves several breaches of Part 1: Teaching, and Part Two: Personal and Professional Conduct, in Teachers' Standards. As the Preamble states, teachers are required to "make the education of their pupils their first concern" and "are accountable for achieving the highest possible standards in work and conduct." Mr White was in breach of the following specific sections of Part 1:

## **PART ONE: TEACHING**

### **"A teacher must:**

#### **1 Set high expectations which inspire, motivate and challenge pupils**

- establish a safe and stimulating environment for pupils, rooted in mutual respect"

and

- "demonstrate consistently the positive attitudes, values and behaviour which are expected of pupils."

and

#### **"7 Manage behaviour effectively to ensure a good and safe learning environment**

- have clear rules and routines for behaviour in classrooms, and take responsibility for promoting good and courteous behaviour both in classrooms and around the school, in accordance with the school's behaviour policy

...

- maintain good relationships with pupils, exercise appropriate authority, and act decisively when necessary."

and

#### **"8 Fulfil wider professional responsibilities**

...

- develop effective professional relationships with colleagues, knowing how and when to draw on advice and specialist support."

Mr White was in breach of the following specific sections of Part 2:

“A teacher is expected to demonstrate consistently high standards of personal and professional conduct. The following statements define the behaviour and attitudes which set the required standard for conduct throughout a teacher’s career.

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by:
  - o treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher’s professional position
  - o having regard for the need to safeguard pupils’ well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
  - o showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others.”

and

“Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.”

Mr White’s behaviour fell far below the standard expected of a teacher. The Panel has determined that the facts which have been proved constitute unacceptable professional conduct.

### **Panel’s Recommendation to the Secretary of State**

The Panel has applied the principle of proportionality, balancing the interests of the teacher against the interests of the public.

There is a suggestion in the evidence that ill-health, and a change of medication, may have contributed to Mr White’s misconduct on 26<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup> November 2009, but Mr White did not attend the hearing, and submitted no representations, or medical evidence, and the Panel was therefore unable to investigate that possibility. Mr White indicated to the School that his health did not affect his behaviour, and he did not take advantage of the opportunity to have Occupational Health support. The evidence demonstrates that Mr White’s behaviour was unsatisfactory for a period of at least several years before 2009.

Mr White had a clear job description and departmental guidelines to indicate how he should behave, but he failed to act as a responsible teacher. The Panel was surprised that no evidence was brought forward of earlier steps taken at the School to challenge and monitor Mr White’s conduct.

However, there is a risk to the public and to pupils if somebody who neglected the welfare and safety of his pupils over a long period of time, as Mr White did, is permitted to continue to teach children.

There are serious departures from the teaching and the personal and professional conduct elements of the latest teachers' standards. The behaviour which has been found proved is fundamentally incompatible with continuing to be a teacher.

Accordingly, the Panel recommends that a Prohibition Order should be made.

Mr White has not expressed regret or remorse, and there is no evidence of any insight into his failings. The evidence suggests a deeply entrenched attitude of lack of respect for authority. However, the Panel is concerned that Mr White's behaviour, over a long period of time, might have been the result of a deteriorating condition of ill-health, about which the Panel has no evidence. There is no indication from Mr White of any willingness to re-train, or to reform his conduct, but the Panel cannot exclude the possibility that Mr White might wish, at some time in the future, to apply for review of the Prohibition Order, and might then present evidence of satisfactory treatment and a return to good health.

For this reason the Panel recommends that Mr White should be permitted to apply for review of the Prohibition Order after a period of 4 years.

### **Secretary of State's Decision and Reasons**

**I have given careful consideration to the decision and recommendation of the panel in this case.**

**Mr White has evidenced unacceptable behaviour across a number of areas and over a period of time. His behaviours fall significantly short of the standards expected of qualified teachers and they have the ability to undermine the public's trust and confidence in the status and standing of the profession.**

**Mr White dealt with both pupils and colleagues in an unacceptable way and his language and attitudes are wholly unacceptable.**

**This pattern of behaviour therefore amounts to a serious departure from the expected standards and I accept the recommendation of the panel that it is in the public interest and proportionate to prohibit Mr White.**

**I have also given careful consideration to the issue of a review period. Mr White has shown little insight and the evidence appears to be clear that Mr White has a deeply entrenched attitude to authority. Ordinarily that would suggest that a review period is not appropriate. However it is clear that the panel had some real concerns about the health of Mr White and on that basis I support the recommendation that the review period be set at four years.**

This means that Mr Frank White is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. He may apply for the Prohibition Order to be set aside, **but not until 18 October 2016, 4 years from the date of this order at the earliest.** If he does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the Prohibition Order should be set

aside. Without a successful application, Mr Frank White remains barred from teaching indefinitely.

This Order takes effect from the date on which it is served on the Teacher. Mr Frank White has a right of appeal to the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this Order.

**Decision maker: Alan Meyrick**

**Date: 10 October 2012**