

NATIONAL COLLEGE FOR TEACHING AND LEADERSHIP

Decision of a Professional Conduct Panel and the Secretary of State

Teacher: Mr Colin Williams
Teacher ref no: 9643802
Teacher date of birth: 7 December 1956
TA Case ref no: 7917
Date of Determination: 15 May 2013
Former Employer: Sandfield Park School, Liverpool

A. Introduction

A Professional Conduct Panel ("the Panel") of National College for Teaching and Leadership (National College) convened on 14 and 15 May 2013 at 53-55 Butts Road, Earlsdon Park, Coventry, CV1 3HH to consider the case of Mr Colin Williams.

The Panel members were Ms Nicole Jackson (Lay Panellist – in the Chair), Ms Cynthia Bartlett (Teacher Panellist) and Mr Keith Jackson-Horner (Teacher Panellist).

The Legal Adviser to the Panel was Christopher Alder of Blake Laphorn Solicitors.

The Presenting Officer for the National College for Teaching and Leadership was Ms Louisa Atkin of Browne Jacobson Solicitors.

Mr Colin Williams was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded. The Panel's decision was announced in public.

B. Preliminary Issues

The Presenting Officer applied for the hearing to proceed in Mr Williams' absence.

The Panel announced its decision as follows:

"Having reviewed the Notice of Proceedings of 19 February 2013 and having heard representations from the National College of Teaching and Leadership we conclude that the Notice has been served appropriately and in accordance with the Teacher's Disciplinary Regulations and Disciplinary Procedures.

We have considered very carefully whether to proceed in Mr Williams' absence today. In this regard, we have considered each guideline set out in the case of Jones.

Mr Williams has corresponded with the General Teaching Council, Teaching Agency and National College.

We are satisfied that the Notice has been sent to the last known postal address for Mr Williams. We are certain that he is aware of this hearing, its date and venue. We have noted the detail of the email dated 2 May 2013 sent by Mr Williams' representative and his response to the Notice of Proceedings of 3 March 2013 both of which indicate that he does not intend to appear at this hearing. We note that he has not requested an adjournment or postponement of the hearing.

We have considered the nature of the case, the allegations and the evidence which is available to us. We have noted that witnesses are available to attend the hearing who can provide direct evidence. We have also noted that there is a detailed statement provided in the bundle regarding Mr Williams' evidence and representations from his representative.

We recognise the responsibility on this Panel to make such points and to test evidence as might be appropriate on Mr Williams' behalf. Given these factors we are satisfied that we can ensure that Mr Williams will receive a fair hearing.

We do not feel that it is necessary to delay consideration of the hearing and therefore we have decided that it is in the public interest to continue with the hearing today. "

C. Allegations

The Panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Proceedings dated 19 February 2013.

It was alleged that Mr Colin Williams was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that:

Whilst employed at Sandfield Park School, Liverpool, between September 2009 and June 2010, he:

- 1) acted dishonestly, in that he falsified evidence of pupils' work which was submitted as part of their portfolio for the Bronze Award accredited by the ASDAN awarding body;
- 2) acted dishonestly, in that he signed a declaration certifying that work had been completed by pupils, knowing this to be untrue;
- 3) failed to provide pupils with the opportunity to carry out the work required for the 'ASDAN' Bronze Award accreditation, in that he did not give pupils the opportunity to:
 - a. demonstrate their ability to use two different machine tools safely;
 - b. design, make, test and evaluate a product using one of the following; feed, fabric or rigid material.

Mr Williams was deemed not to have admitted the facts of the allegation, but the Panel did carefully consider the representations and evidence which Mr Williams had provided.

D. Summary of Evidence

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

Section 1	Anonymised Pupil List & Chronology	Pages 2 - 3
Section 2	Notice of Proceedings & Response	Pages 5 - 11
Section 3	National College for Teaching & Leadership Documents	Pages 13 - 231
Section 4	Teacher's Documents	Pages 233 - 256

In addition, the Panel agreed to accept the following:

1. email from the NUT to the Presenting Officer dated 2 May 2013 which was included at page 257 of the bundle.

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

Brief summary of evidence given

Please note that this is intended to be a summary – it does not reflect the complete evidence given.

The Presenting Officer made submissions to the Panel by way of an opening statement. The Presenting Officer made closing submissions.

The Presenting Officer called Witness A, senior teacher, Form Tutor and School's Examination Officer to give evidence. She confirmed the truth of the statement found at pages 30 to 31 of the bundle and gave further evidence. The Panel took her statement as read.

Witness A expanded on the evidence regarding her investigation and the discussions which she had had with Pupils A, B, C and the Learning Support Assistant Witness B. She explained that Pupils A, B and C had told her that they had not made pencil boxes. She provided additional detail regarding the special needs requirements of the pupils. Witness A described how the moderation process at the School was undertaken and the scope of the documents completed by Mr Williams as part of the pupils' ASDAN Bronze Award folders. She had been involved in checking that the relevant units had been completed. Witness A explained that, if Pupil A had not told her that he had not completed the pencil box, then she would have had no reason to question the completion of the pupils' folders. She gave further evidence of Mr Williams' reputation as a teacher and colleague and the support which was in place at the School to support teachers. She stated that Mr Williams had chosen the nature of the project for the pupils and he had not brought any concerns to her attention.

In answer to questions from the Panel, Witness A provided further detail about her professional experience. She provided evidence about the nature of special needs provision at the School and the pupils' abilities. She provided detail about the nature of the pupils in Mr Williams' Design and Technology class, and how they were pupils with special needs who needed appropriate support and guidance. The pupils would have been able to use the tools – with support. Pupils at the School did not repeat a year, although they may have started some of the course units earlier. Witness A provided evidence about the ASDAN Bronze Award and the expectations for completion of the verification documentation. She explained her understanding that Mr Williams had previously taught at a mainstream school, and would have been unlikely to have taught the ASDAN course. The evidence available in the course folders had been provided to show that the unit was complete. She gave background to a suggestion that Mr Williams' confidence had been low at this time.

The Presenting Officer called Witness B, Learning Support Assistant to give evidence. She confirmed the truth of the note of the interview with Witness B, found at pages 44 to 45 of the bundle. The Panel took the notes to be Witness B's statement and took the notes as read.

Witness B gave evidence to explain her role as a LSA - she provided support to all pupils in Mr Williams' Sixth Form Class, although she had been specifically designated to assist as an LSA one to one for one pupil. She would be part of all classes for the relevant pupils. Another LSA, Individual A, was also present with the class and there would not be a time when neither of them would be in the room. She had not seen any pupils using a fret saw or other machine tools. Mr Williams had taken photographs of the pupils with tools, but the pupils, whilst they held tools, did not use them. She also stated that pupils had not glued pre-made pencil case kits together. The pupils had measured pencils, written about how to make a pencil case, and had researched the internet but did not get to complete the practical aspects. She stated that no practical work was undertaken in the class. She described the positive working relationship she had with Mr Williams, and she had no concerns about his teaching.

In answer to questions from the Panel, Witness B gave additional evidence about her working relationship with Mr Williams, detail regarding the preparation of the Action Plan forms and how she, Individual A and Mr Williams would help the pupils to complete the forms. She described how the photographs were taken of the pupils holding the tool, as part of the ASDAN course. Pupils had asked Mr Williams why they could not use the tools, but he had not replied to them. Pupils had never used the tools during the technology course. There was one wooden pencil box in the room. She explained that there was a good atmosphere in the class room, and that there were good relationships between Mr Williams and the pupils. She stated that the pupils were happy. The pupils were physically capable of using the tools – Mr Williams had told them what the tools were, but they had not used them. Between January and May 2010 the pupils were involved in downloading and completing the Action Plans, researching on the internet and measuring pencils for the purpose of building a pencil case. She also confirmed that photographs, which showed pupils using power tools, were staged – had the tools been turned on then this could have created a risk to the safety of the pupils.

The Presenting Officer called Witness C, Head of Ward Teaching at AlderHey Hospital to give evidence. She confirmed the truth of her evidence. She was referred to pages 13 to 25 of the bundle which contained a copy of her investigation report. She gave evidence to the Panel regarding the background to her investigation and the interviews which she undertook with members of staff, specifically the interviews undertaken with Individual A and Mr Williams and indicated her impression of Mr Williams' approach within the interview and during the disciplinary hearing. She also explained her approach in terms of coordinating the evidence before reaching her conclusions.

In answer to questions from the Panel, Witness C gave additional evidence regarding Mr Williams' professional relationships with members of staff at the School. She did not feel that Mr Williams' had been under undue pressure from Individual B to deliver the pupil coursework files. She did not believe that Mr Williams was under any specific pressure, and it was his decision as to which project the pupils would undertake. She confirmed that during her investigation she did not find six pencil boxes – she found 3 pencil boxes and some parts of pencil boxes without names on. All of the boxes were identical and were found around Mr Williams' tool box. She provided additional evidence regarding investigating the background to the photographs and the staging of the pupils using the equipment – it would have been necessary for Mr Williams to have been supported by support staff in organising the photographs. She stated that Mr Williams had told her that pupils had not been allowed to use the tools – he maintained that the pupils were able to understand how to use the tools safely through a demonstration and did not need to actually use the tools. A decision was taken that it would not be appropriate to interview the pupils or take formal statements from them.

E. Decision and Reasons

The Panel announced its decision as follows:

"We have 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. We confirm that we have considered all of the evidence which is relevant to the allegations.

Summary

Mr Colin Williams was appointed as a Design and Technology Teacher at Sandfield Park School, ("the School"), in 2006. During May 2010 Witness A had been reviewing the course folders for the six pupils in Mr Williams' class undertaking the ASDAN Bronze Award Design Technology course. As the School's Examination Officer, Witness A was content that the pupils' unit folders appeared to be complete and contained all of the required ASDAN verification documentation, Action and Review documents and relevant unit materials. As a Form Tutor, she went on to speak with three pupils about the scope of the work in their files. The pupils told her that, contrary to what their Bronze Award files showed, they had not completed a key element of the unit. The pupils said that they had not made pencil boxes in Mr Williams' lesson. Witness A went on to speak with the class Learning Support Assistant, Witness B. Witness B told her that the pupils had not made pencil

boxes and they had not used machine tools. Mr Williams explained in an interview that he had made a mistake in respect of completing the documentation; but that the pupils had completed the relevant elements of the course unit and that he had not falsified documentation or acted dishonestly.

The Panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Proceedings dated 19 February 2013.

It was alleged that Mr Williams is guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that:

Whilst employed at Sandfield Park School, Liverpool between September 2009 and 20 June 2010, he:

1. acted dishonestly, in that he falsified evidence of pupils' work which was submitted as part of their portfolio for the Bronze Award accredited by the ASDAN awarding body;
2. acted dishonestly, in that he signed a declaration certifying that work had been completed by pupils, knowing this to be untrue;
3. failed to provide pupils with the opportunity to carry out the work required for the 'ASDAN' Bronze Award accreditation, in that he did not give pupils the opportunity to:
 - a) demonstrate their ability to use two different machine tools safely;
 - b) design, make, test and evaluate a product using one of the following; food, fabric or rigid materials.

Findings of fact

Our findings of fact are as follows:

With respect to particular 1

We considered all of the evidence which is relevant to this particular. We considered all of the relevant documentary evidence presented within the bundle.

We considered the evidence of Witness A and Witness B who gave oral evidence which related directly to the allegation. We found them to be credible witnesses. We have considered Mr Williams' statement and the representations which he has submitted.

We have considered copies of the relevant ASDAN verification documents and considered the notes of the interview which Mr Williams had with Witness C. Mr Williams signed the verification documentation stating that pupils had used an orbital sander tool and fret saw. Mr Williams also prepared and signed statements in April 2010 setting out that pupils had used an orbital sander and fret saw. These statements formed a part of the verification documentation for the pupils' files. Mr Williams stated that there were pictures of pupils which showed them "using said tools".

Witness B's evidence was that she had never seen pupils using machine tools. She stated that the pupils had not used a fret saw or sander to construct pencil boxes. This is corroborated by the interview notes with Individual A, her colleague Learning Support Assistant. We have given weight to the evidence of Witness B, Individual A and the evidence of Witness A regarding her discussions with the pupils all of which are consistent and credible. We are satisfied that the evidence proves, on the balance of probability, that pupils did not use a fret saw or sander or that they had made pencil boxes. We are satisfied that the statements which Mr Williams has made and referred to in the verification documents as referred to above are, therefore, false.

Having heard evidence from Witness B we are also satisfied that from January 2010 either she or Individual A were present in the Technology lessons at all times.

We are satisfied, on the balance of probability, that the evidence of the pupils' work submitted as part of their ASDAN Bronze Award portfolio was falsified by Mr Williams.

We considered the issue of dishonesty as alleged. We have considered the two stage test in relation to the question of dishonesty. We are satisfied, on the basis of the facts we have found proven, that reasonable and honest people would conclude that Mr Williams' actions in falsifying evidence of pupils' work were dishonest. Having considered the subjective element of the test, we are also satisfied that, as against the standard of reasonable and honest people, Mr Williams must have realised that his actions in falsifying evidence of pupils' work were dishonest.

Accordingly, we find it proven that Mr Williams acted dishonestly. We find this particular, in its entirety, proven.

With respect to particular 2

We considered all of the evidence which is relevant to this particular. We considered all of the relevant documentary evidence presented within the bundle.

We considered the evidence of Witness A and Witness C who gave oral evidence which related directly to the allegation. We found both witnesses to be credible. We considered Mr Williams' statement and his representations carefully.

We considered copies of the relevant documents which include the Bronze Award verification documents for Pupils A, B, D and E. We have also reviewed the statements completed by Mr Williams which stated that the work had been undertaken by Pupils A, B, C, D, E and F. Mr Williams accepted that pupils had not used the orbital sander. For the reasons set out above, we have found it proven that work had not been undertaken by the pupils and that the fret saw and orbital sander had not been used by them.

As set out above, we have found it proven that pencil boxes were not made by the pupils. Accordingly, we find it proven that the declarations, which Mr Williams made to certify that the work had been completed, were inaccurate. As the teacher of these six pupils for the ASDAN Bronze Award technology course, we find it proven

that Mr Williams must have known that his declarations, that the pupils had completed the work, were untrue.

We considered the issue of dishonesty as alleged. We have considered the two stage test in relation to the question of dishonesty. We are satisfied, on the basis of the facts we have found proven, that reasonable and honest people would conclude that Mr Williams' actions in declaring that work had been completed by pupils when it had not been completed, and given that he knew that the declarations were untrue, were dishonest. Having considered the subjective element of the test, we are also satisfied that, as against the standard of reasonable and honest people, Mr Williams must have realised that his actions in declaring that work had been completed by pupils when it had not and when he knew that the declarations were untrue, were dishonest.

Accordingly, we find it proven that Mr Williams acted dishonestly. We find this particular proven.

With respect to particular 3 a

We have, very carefully, considered the wording of this particular. We note that particular 3a alleges that Mr Williams did not give pupils the opportunity to demonstrate their ability to use two different machine tools safely.

We note that the wording of this particular has been taken, directly, from the verification document, and that the allegation is drawn within the context of the work being carried out as required by the ASDAN Bronze Award accreditation.

We considered all of the evidence which is relevant to this particular. We considered all of the relevant documentary evidence presented within the bundle.

We considered the evidence of Witness A and Witness B who gave oral evidence which related directly to the allegation. We found them both to be credible witnesses. We considered Mr Williams' statement and representations.

As set out above, we have found it proven that pupils in Mr Williams' class did not use a fret saw or orbital sander and did not make a pencil box. A pencil box was the product which was planned to be made as declared on the ASDAN verification documentation. We have noted that during her interview, Individual A identified that pupils did make an automaton at an earlier stage of the academic year and this involved them using a battery drill.

In terms of the wording of the allegation, we considered the issue of the safe use of tools and whether this had been demonstrated to pupils. We have reviewed the photographs which are available in the bundle. Witness B, in her evidence, stated that she had not previously seen these particular photographs, but was aware of other photographs with the pupils being staged to show pupils holding machine tools. Her evidence was that Mr Williams had not told pupils about safety issues in her presence.

Mr Williams states that he carried out a question and answer session with the pupils about how to use the tools safely, and that he did not believe that it was necessary

for the pupils to actually use the tools to be able to demonstrate their ability to use the tools or to be able to use them safely.

Irrespective of the issue relating to the safe use of machine tools, we are satisfied that the key issue in this particular relates to the alleged failure to provide pupils with the opportunity to carry out the work required, in that Mr Williams did not give pupils the opportunity to use two different machine tools. We are satisfied that an overriding expectation of a design and technology course, and the expectation of the ASDAN Bronze Award, is to enable pupils to actually use equipment, tools and materials. One key purpose, in our view, of the course is to take pupils beyond an academic or theoretical understanding of the subject, topics, tools, materials or risks and to give them the opportunity to engage, practically, with the subject. We were satisfied as to the evidence relating to this issue given the clear and knowledgeable testimony of Witness A.

In our decision, Mr Williams did not provide pupils with the opportunity to carry out the work of completing the pencil boxes or the opportunity to demonstrate their ability to use two different machine tools safely. We are satisfied that this was a central element of the course and Mr Williams failed to provide the opportunity for the pupils in his class.

For these reasons we are satisfied, on the balance of probability, that this particular is proven.

With respect to particular 3 b

We have considered the wording of this particular carefully and, as with particular 3 a, we have noted that the wording of this particular has been taken, directly, from the verification document. This allegation is drawn within the context of the work being carried out as required by the ASDAN Bronze Award accreditation.

We considered all of the evidence which is relevant to this particular. We considered all of the relevant documentary evidence presented within the bundle.

We considered the evidence of Witness A and Witness B who gave oral evidence which related directly to the allegation. We found them both to be credible witnesses. We considered Mr Williams' statement and representations. Mr Williams accepts that there was no testing or evaluation of what, he maintains, were completed pencil boxes. He was unable to facilitate the testing and evaluation stage because he had been, by that point, suspended.

We have carefully considered the wording of the ASDAN verification document which records that the product designed, tested and evaluated from food, rigid materials or fabric was "A Pencil Case". Whilst we have noted that an automaton was made using a battery drill earlier in the academic year, as a minor project, we accept that the allegation relates to the specific product identified in the ASDAN verification document.

Having considered the evidence carefully, we are satisfied that pupils were involved in the design of the boxes. The evidence of Witness B suggested that pupils were involved in elements of the design process, such as measuring the pencils and

research on the internet, and we have seen photographs of the pupils which appear to show a number of them designing the pencil boxes. We do not find it proven that pupils had not been given the opportunity to design the product.

We have previously decided that pencil cases were not made by pupils, as we set out above. It follows that there could not, therefore, have been any testing or evaluation steps.

As set out above, we are clear that, given the nature of the Technology course, Mr Williams should have given pupils the opportunity to carry out the work required for the ASDAN accreditation. In not allowing pupils the opportunity to make, test and evaluate the pencil case product, we are satisfied, on the balance of probability that Mr Williams failed to provide this opportunity for the pupils in his class.

Accordingly, other than in respect of the issue of design, we find, on the balance of probability, particular 3 b to be proven,

Findings as to Unacceptable Professional Conduct and/or Conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute

We have carefully considered whether the facts we have found proven amount to unacceptable professional conduct and / or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

We have considered the current Teachers' Standards. We are clear that Teachers must uphold public trust in the profession and maintain the highest standards of ethics and behaviour within and outside school and must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practice of the school in which they teach.

We are satisfied that Mr Williams' behaviour has fallen significantly and seriously short of the standard of conduct expected of teachers. He has acted dishonestly, which includes his falsification of evidence of pupils' work and the signing of declarations which he knew to be false. By his actions he failed to provide pupils with the opportunity to carry out work required for the ASDAN Bronze Award accreditation.

We are clear that it has been a consistent expectation of the profession and the public that teachers should demonstrate high standards of professional conduct and ethics. Mr Williams has behaved in a way which shows a failure to uphold these standards. Furthermore, such actions show, in our decision that he has failed to treat pupils with dignity given that he was prepared to declare and certify that they have completed work which they had not. Given the fundamental public and professional expectation that teachers should act with honesty and integrity, Mr Williams' actions in falsifying pupil assessment evidence and knowingly signing untrue declarations have, in our view, the potential to undermine public trust. Such actions also have the potential to cause damage to the reputation of the School and profession as well as to undermine his, and other teachers' status, as a role model within the community.

We are concerned that Mr Williams' actions had the potential to place pupils at risk of leaving the School without all potential qualifications or with incomplete skills – his

actions could have led to damage of the School's reputation as an accredited examination centre.

In all of the circumstances, we are satisfied that Mr Williams' conduct fell significantly short of the standard expected of the profession and amounts to unacceptable professional conduct and is conduct which has the potential to bring the profession into disrepute."

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 is 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 making this judgment the Panel had at the forefront of its deliberations whether a Prohibition Order would be a proportionate measure and in the public interest in relation to the allegations that we have found.

The Panel had particular and specific reference to the relevant Advice in respect of the relevant public interest considerations. Having done so the Panel found a number of public interest considerations that were relevant, namely, the protection of pupils in relation to the integrity of their qualifications and the examination process, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession as well as declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

Having carefully considered the Advice, we have noted elements of Mr Williams' conduct which are considered to be incompatible with being a teacher. We consider that factors which are relevant to this case are that Mr Williams behaved dishonestly in School and falsified evidence of pupils' work. He failed to provide pupils with full opportunity for them to complete an accredited assessment course. There is a strong public interest in respect of ensuring the protection of children and the need to uphold and maintain the integrity of the School as an accredited examination centre. Mr Williams' actions were deliberate and represent a serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers Standards.

Although Mr Williams felt he was under pressure and working in a stressful environment, there is no evidence to show that he was acting under duress. The Panel considers that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if the conduct we have found proven against Mr Williams were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession. Also the Panel considered that there is a strong public interest consideration involved in the need to declare proper standards of conduct in the profession.

Notwithstanding the clear public interest considerations that are present, the Panel considered carefully whether or not it would be proportionate to recommend the imposition of a Prohibition Order taking into account the effect that this would have on Mr Williams. The Panel took particular account of the mitigation that was presented to it by Mr Williams, which includes a number of supportive professional testimonials which identify confidence in his teaching ability. Witnesses called during the hearing confirmed that he had built good relationships with pupils at the School

and that he had a good working relationship with the Learning Support Assistants in his class. The actions which are identified in this case relate to a narrow time period and relate to a small cohort of pupils. The Panel were mindful of the fact that prior to these findings being made against him, Mr Williams was considered to be a person of good character with no criminal or disciplinary sanctions recorded against him. He has a previously good professional career.

In relation to the public interest considerations, when weighed in the balance with Mr Williams' interests, 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 proven. In the list of such behaviours which are relevant to this case are abuse of position of trust, misconduct seriously affecting the education of pupils, dishonesty and a serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teacher Standards. In light of the Panel's findings these behaviours set out in the Advice are all engaged and as such the Panel paid particular attention to these when conducting its balancing exercise.

Even though there were behaviours that would point to a Prohibition Order being appropriate, the Panel went on to consider whether or not there were sufficient mitigating factors available to militate against a Prohibition Order being an appropriate and proportionate measure to impose. In light of the Panel's findings it follows that, although Mr Williams did have a previously good history, there is no evidence to suggest that his actions were not deliberate, or that he was acting under duress. In fact, the Panel's findings were that Mr Williams actions were calculated and deliberate. He appears to have shown little insight into his actions or into the potential consequences which have flowed from his behaviour.

Having considered all of these matters carefully and closely the Panel decided that it would be both appropriate and proportionate to recommend to the Secretary of State that a Prohibition Order be imposed on Mr Williams with immediate effect.

The Panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate to recommend that a review period of the order should be considered. The Panel were mindful that the Advice given is that a Prohibition Order applies for life but that there may be circumstances in any given case that may make it appropriate for a review period of not less than two years to be recommended in order for the teacher to apply to set aside the order.

The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proven, would militate against a review period being recommended. None of the particular examples given are represented in this case. Although the Panel does not condone his behaviour, especially in respect of his dishonest actions, the Panel did not consider that the nature of the dishonesty was the most serious. We have considered the nature of Mr Williams' behaviour and noted that it did not place pupils at risk of harm. The Panel is satisfied that Mr Williams does not present a risk to pupils or children. He has had a previously good professional history and has presented a number of positive professional references. The Panel noted that Mr Williams has not taught for three years. For these reasons and taking these factors into account the Panel considered it to be proportionate, in all of the circumstances relevant to this case, that Mr Williams be given the opportunity to apply to review the Order after a period of two years has lapsed.

Secretary of State's Decision and Reasons

I have carefully considered the findings and recommendations of the Panel for this case. The Panel have found a number of the allegations proven and have concluded that these findings amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Mr Williams behaved dishonestly in School and falsified evidence of pupils' work. He failed to provide pupils with full opportunity for them to complete an accredited assessment course. There is a strong public interest in respect of ensuring the protection of children and the need to uphold and maintain the integrity of the School. Mr Williams' actions were deliberate and represent a serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers Standards.

In the circumstances I agree the Panel's recommendation that a Prohibition Order is both appropriate and in the public interest.

The Panel considered Mr William's mitigating evidence of a previously good professional history and several positive professional references.

I agree the Panel's recommendation that Mr. Williams should be allowed to apply for his Prohibition Order to be reviewed after a minimum of two years.

This means that Mr Colin Williams 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 22 May 2015, 2 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 Colin Williams remains barred from teaching indefinitely.

This Order takes effect from the date on which it is served on the Teacher.

Mr Colin Williams 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.

NAME OF DECISION MAKER Paul Heathcote
Date 16 May 2013