



National College for
Teaching & Leadership

Ms Beebee Garrib: Professional Conduct Panel outcome

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

16 May 2014

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| A. Introduction | 3 |
| B. Allegations | 4 |
| C. Preliminary applications | 5 |
| D. Summary of evidence | 7 |
| Documents | 7 |
| Witnesses | 7 |
| E. Decision and reasons | 7 |
| Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State | 13 |
| Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State | 15 |

Professional Conduct Panel decision and recommendations, and decision on behalf of the Secretary of State

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Teacher: | Ms Beebee Garrib |
| Teacher ref no: | 0365250 |
| Teacher date of birth: | 5 April 1980 |
| NCTL Case ref no: | 0009457 |
| Date of Determination: | 16 May 2014 |
| Former employer: | Devonshire Hill Primary School ("the School") |

A. Introduction

A Professional Conduct Panel ("the Panel") of the National College for Teaching and Leadership ("the National College") convened on 16 May 2014 at 53-55 Butts Road, Earlsdon Park, Coventry, CV1 3BH to consider the case of Ms Beebee Garrib.

The Panel members were Ms Alison Robb-Webb (Teacher Panellist and Chair), Mr Nicholas Andrew (Lay Panellist) and Mr Michael Lesser (Teacher Panellist).

The Legal Adviser to the Panel was Mrs Luisa Gibbons of Eversheds LLP Solicitors.

The Presenting Officer for the National College was Ms Rowena Rix of Kingsley Napley Solicitors.

Ms Beebee Garrib was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

B. Allegations

The Panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Proceedings dated 5 March 2014.

It was alleged that:

1. Ms Garrib is guilty of conviction of a relevant offence in that whilst employed at Devonshire Hill Primary School, she was convicted of the following offences in the Crown Court at Wood Green on 7 January 2013 and for which she was sentenced on 11 February 2013:

- a. Offence: Dishonestly make false representation to make gain for self/ another or cause loss to other/expose other to risk on 31/07/09 – 30/11/11

Sentence: To pay £2000 towards the costs of the prosecution. To pay compensation of £14541.60

- b. Offence: Make false representation to make gain for self or another or cause loss to other/expose other to risk on 01/08/11 – 30/11/11

Sentence: 8 weeks imprisonment consecutive to count 1. To pay compensation of £1012.50

- c. Offence: Doing series of acts tending and intended to pervert the course of justice on 07/11/11 – 11/11/11

Sentence: 8 weeks imprisonment consecutive to count 1; and

2. You are guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and / or conduct potentially bringing the profession into disrepute, in that whilst employed at Devonshire Hill Primary School (the School), during 2010, you dishonestly misused the School's letterhead paper in order to falsely claim that:

- a. Individual A was a student at the School; and

- b. Individual A was an employee of the School

Ms Garrib has admitted the fact of having been convicted of three separate offences although has not expressly stated that admission was in respect of the conviction that is the subject of these allegation. Ms Garrib has denied allegation 2 in its entirety.

Ms Garrib has been taken to have not admitted that her conviction was of relevant offences, nor that she is guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and / or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

C. Preliminary applications

Application to Proceed in the Absence of Ms Garrib

The Panel considered an application by the Presenting Officer to proceed in the absence of Ms Garrib.

The Panel is satisfied that the College has complied with the service requirements of Regulation 19 a to c of the Teachers' Disciplinary (England) Regulations 2012. The Notice of today's hearing has been sent by first class post to Ms Garrib on 5 March 2014. The Panel is satisfied that Ms Garrib has been provided with the requisite length of notice of at least 8 weeks in accordance with paragraph 4.10 of the Procedures. The Panel is also satisfied that the Notice of Proceedings contained the necessary details set out in paragraph 4.10 of the Procedures.

The Panel has determined to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Ms Garrib.

The Panel has taken account of the various factors drawn to its attention from the case of *R v Jones* and *Tait v Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons*.

The Panel understands that its discretion to commence a hearing in the absence of the teacher has to be exercised with the utmost care and caution, and that the discretion is a severely constrained one. The Panel however, considers that the teacher has waived her right to participate in this hearing. Ms Garrib has told the College that she was unwell and did not intend to attend the hearing. The Panel noted that during the School's disciplinary investigation, Ms Garrib produced medical certificates to explain her inability to attend investigatory interviews. However, Ms Garrib has not produced any such medical certificate for the proceedings before the Panel today. The attendance note of Ms Garrib's conversation with the College reports that she asserted that the documents she had provided would explain why she was unable to attend the hearing, but they contain no objective medical evidence of conditions after 2012.

The Panel did not consider that an adjournment would be likely to result in Ms Garrib attending the hearing. She has not requested an adjournment and if it is correct that she has been signed off until July 2014, her illness would have been of at least 2 months duration. There is no evidence that she would be recovered after July 2014. Ms Garrib has not engaged with these proceedings fully, for example she has not returned the completed Notice of Proceedings Form, and the extent of her engagement has been to send a number of documents for the Panel's consideration. The Panel do not therefore consider that an adjournment might result in Ms Garrib attending voluntarily, nor is it apparent how long an adjournment would be. Ms Garrib has not provided any indication that she wishes to be legally represented in these proceedings and has, by her conduct, waived her right to representation.

The Panel has considered the extent of the disadvantage of Ms Garrib not being able to give her account of events, and the Panel has considered that in this case that the disadvantage is minimal. Allegation 1 relates to a conviction, and therefore the Panel will not be able to re-examine the facts behind that conviction. The possible evidence Ms Garrib could provide would be limited to mitigation. The Panel has the benefit of a written explanation by Ms Garrib in respect of Allegation 2 and have received from her documentary evidence relating to mitigation. The Panel has in mind that, in due course, it will exercise vigilance in making its decision, taking into account the degree of risk of the Panel reaching the wrong decision as a result of not having heard Ms Garrib's account, and that she will not have had the opportunity to test the evidence of the witness who is to be called. The Panel considers that having received Ms Garrib's written representations, it will be able to consider such points as are favourable to her, as are reasonably available on the evidence.

The Panel has noted that the matters that are the subject of these allegations date back as far as July 2009, and some considerable period has already elapsed. Taking account of the public interest, the Panel do not consider that an adjournment would be appropriate given that the matters alleged are serious and there is an interest in the hearing taking place within a reasonable time.

Application to Amend Allegations

The Panel also received an application from the Presenting Officer to amend the allegations by amending the date in 1a to "on or around 01/07/09 – 30/11/11"; to amend the compensation payable in 1a to £14541.66; to add in respect of the sentence in 1a "16 weeks imprisonment"; to add the word "Dishonestly" at the beginning of the description of the offence in 1b; to add the words "on or around" in respect of the date in 1b and to amend the date in 1c to "on or around 09/11/11 – 11/11/11".

The Panel exercised caution in respect of this allegation since Ms Garrib was not present to make representations in respect of the proposed amendments. The Panel did not consider the amendments would cause unfairness or prejudice to Ms Garrib since they would not have affected the representations made by Ms Garrib. The amendments are, in the main, to make corrections to errors in the Notice of Hearing, in order to reflect accurately the certificate of conviction. Since Ms Garrib is well aware of the matters within the certificate of conviction, there is no risk of prejudice to her. The Panel noted that case law requires an allegation of dishonesty to be expressly alleged. In this case, the Panel do not consider it unfair to add the word "dishonestly". The word was used in the offence described in the certificate of conviction, and the conviction is conclusive proof that establishes the facts of the offence.

The Panel therefore decided to amend the allegations as proposed.

D. Summary of evidence

Documents

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

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Section 1: Chronology | Pages 1 – 3 |
| Section 2: Notice of Proceedings and Response | Pages 4 – 12 |
| Section 3: National College for Teaching and Leadership’s Witness Statements | Pages 13 – 18 and 19 – 20 |
| Section 4: National College for Teaching and Leadership Documents | Pages 21 – 558 |
| Section 5: Teacher Documents | Pages 559 - 592 |

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

The Panel agreed to admit an email from Ms Garrib dated 10 May 2014 which had been sent by Ms Garrib together with the teacher documents at pages 559 – 592 as its omission from the bundle had been an error. This document was numbered page 593. The Presenting Officer asked the Panel to accept an attendance note of a conversation between Ms Garrib and the College on 9 May 2014 which reported that Ms Garrib had said she was currently unwell and did not intend to attend the hearing. This was relevant to the Panel’s consideration as to whether to proceed in Ms Garrib’s absence and the Panel agreed to admit it. This document was numbered page 594.

Witnesses

The Panel heard oral evidence from the Headteacher of the School.

E. Decision and reasons

The Panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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 and the additional documents produced at the hearing itself.

Summary of Evidence

Ms Garrib was employed at the School in 2006. Ms Garrib was investigated by London Borough of Haringey and was arrested in November 2011. Ms Garrib was suspended from her duties at the School on 11 November 2011 following allegations of defrauding the Council of public monies and failing to disclose another surname by which she was known. Ms Garrib was interviewed by the police and officers of the Council's Corporate Anti-Fraud Team (CAFT) on 15 November 2011. She was then interviewed by CAFT on 20 January 2012. CAFT produced a Report of their investigation in February 2012.

The Headteacher gave evidence that the Council disclosed two letters to the School (on the School's headed paper) and informed the School that they had been found during a police search of Ms Garrib's home. These letters are the subject of Allegation 2.

Ms Garrib resigned her position from the School before the disciplinary hearing could take place.

On 7 January 2013, Ms Garrib was convicted of two counts of dishonestly making false representation to make gain for self/ another or cause loss to other/ expose other to risk. She was also convicted of doing a series of acts tending and intended to pervert course of public justice. On 11 February 2013, Ms Garrib was sentenced to a total of 32 weeks imprisonment, to pay compensation amounting to £15554.16 and costs of £2000.

Findings of Fact

Our findings of fact are as follows:

We have found the following particulars of the allegations against Ms Garrib proven, for these reasons:

1 Whilst employed at Devonshire Hill Primary School, she was convicted of the following offences in the Crown Court at Wood Green on 7 January 2013 and for which she was sentenced on 11 February 2013:

a Offence: Dishonestly make false representation to make gain for self/ another or cause loss to other/expose other to risk on or around 01/07/09 – 30/11/11

Sentence: To pay £2000 towards the costs of the prosecution. To pay compensation of £14541.66. 16 weeks Imprisonment.

b Offence: Dishonestly make false representation to make gain for self or another or cause loss to other/expose other to risk on or around 01/08/11 – 30/11/11

**Sentence: 8 weeks imprisonment consecutive to count 1.
To pay compensation of £1012.50**

**c Offence: Doing series of acts tending and intended to
pervert the course of justice on or around 09/11/11 – 11/11/11**

Sentence: 8 weeks imprisonment consecutive to count 1

The Panel has in its Bundle a Certificate of Conviction dated 7 February 2014. This confirms that Ms Garrib was convicted of the above offences.

It is noted that Ms Garrib has admitted having been convicted of three separate offences although she has not expressly stated that her admission was in respect of the conviction that is the subject of these allegation. Nevertheless, the Panel considers this to be a reasonable inference.

The Panel has accepted the Certificate of Conviction as conclusive proof that establishes the facts of the offences for which Ms Garrib was convicted.

In order to ascertain these facts, the Panel has had regard to the sentencing remarks within its Panel bundle. These state that the first offence for which Ms Garrib was convicted related to two frauds for different types of benefit, involving housing benefit and council tax benefit, over a considerable period of time from 1 July 2009 until 30 November 2011, from which she obtained benefits amounting to £14541.66. The sentencing remarks go on to state that the second offence for which Ms Garrib was convicted related to a further fraud in making a dishonest claim on 8 August 2011 for income support, amounting to £1012.50. The sentencing remarks then explain that the third offence related to an incident that took place the day after the police visited her on 9 November 2011 in connection with their investigation. The remarks state that she made a withdrawal of money from her bank account in an attempt to frustrate the investigation and buried very considerable sums of money in her garden. The remarks go on to state that when the police visited her, she deliberately lied to them in order to conceal that money.

2 Whilst employed at Devonshire Hill Primary School (the School), during 2010, she dishonestly misused the School's letterhead paper in order to falsely claim that (a) Individual A was a student at the School and (b) Individual A was an employee of the School

The Panel received and accepted advice from the Legal Adviser that it first had to decide if it was satisfied on a balance of probabilities that Ms Garrib had misused the School's letterhead paper in order to make false claims regarding Mr Gentil. If it was so satisfied, there was a further requirement to consider two questions when deciding whether her actions were dishonest. Firstly, was the Panel satisfied on the balance of probabilities that Ms Garrib's actions would be regarded as dishonest according to the standards of

ordinary reasonable and honest people? If so, was the Panel satisfied on the balance of probabilities that Ms Garrib must have realised that her actions would be regarded as dishonest by those standards. The Panel accepted that it was only if the answers to both these questions was yes, that the allegation of dishonesty could be established in this case.

The Panel has in its Bundle the two letters with which this allegation is concerned. Both are written on the School's headed paper. One purports to have been written by the Headteacher, and one purports to have been written by the Council's Acting Payroll Officer. The Panel has accepted the Headteacher's evidence that she did not write the letter purported to have been written by her. The Panel has seen minutes of an investigation meeting in which the Acting Payroll Officer was interviewed and denied having written the other letter. The Panel has accepted the account given by the Acting Payroll Officer. The Panel also has within its bundle other letters written by the Acting Payroll Officer to Ms Garrib written on Haringey Council headed paper. The Panel were of the view that, had the acting Payroll Officer written the letter regarding Mr Gentil's status, she would not have used the School's headed paper, being an employee of the Council rather than the School. The Panel noted that the Acting Payroll Officer had previously written a similar letter with regard to Ms Garrib's own employment at the School, and it seems likely that this letter provided Ms Garrib with both the name of the Acting Payroll Officer and the format usually used by her in such letters.

The Panel accepted the evidence of the Headteacher that these letters were provided to her by officers of the Council who told her that the letters had been found by the police when a search was carried out of Ms Garrib's house.

Ms Garrib has denied this allegation, saying that she did not write the letter, that it was found on a laptop belonging to her uncle, and that she could not have used it to obtain pecuniary advantage since the immigration status of Mr Gentil (her husband) meant that he was unable to receive any recourse to public funds.

The Panel do not accept Ms Garrib's explanation. The Panel accepted the Head teacher's evidence that Ms Garrib would have had access to the School's letterhead since it was stored on the School's computer system. Given her access to the letterhead and that the letterhead had been seized from Ms Garrib's home, the Panel considered it to be a reasonable inference that Ms Garrib was responsible for the letters. The Panel did not believe Ms Garrib's uncle could have had any possible motivation for creating the letters, and that it is more likely that Ms Garrib would have had a motive in creating some sort of advantage for her husband. The Panel do not consider it relevant that her husband had no recourse to public funds; the letters were clearly created for a specific purpose and this may or may not have involved attempting to access public funds. The Headteacher gave evidence that any letters written on the School's letterhead had to be seen by her before being sent and that she had not been asked by Ms Garrib to review the letters. She also gave evidence that Ms Garrib's husband was not a student, nor

employed by the School. The Panel therefore concluded on the balance of probabilities that Ms Garrib misused the School's letterhead in order to make false claims.

The Panel has therefore found proven that Ms Garrib misused the School's letterhead paper in order to falsely claim that a) Individual A was a student at the School, and b) Individual A was an employee of the School.

With regard to the question of dishonesty, on an objective test, the Panel was satisfied that reasonable and honest people would consider it dishonest to use School letterhead paper to make a false claim regarding a person's status with regard to the School. The Panel went on to consider whether Ms Garrib would have known that what she was doing was by those standards dishonest. The Panel considers that her actions were so obviously dishonest by ordinary standards that there could be no doubt that she must have known.

Findings as to Unacceptable Professional Conduct and/or Conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and/or conviction of a relevant offence

In considering the allegations that the Panel has found proven, the Panel has had regard to the definitions in The Teacher Misconduct – Prohibition of Teachers Advice, which we refer to as the 'Guidance'.

With regard to Allegation 1, the Panel is satisfied that the conduct of Ms Garrib in relation to the facts it has found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. We consider that by reference to Part Two, Ms Garrib 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
not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs;

The Panel noted that the individual's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and/ or working in an education setting. Teachers have to be trustworthy both in respect of their influence on children and to ensure that schools can have confidence in their teachers.

The Panel has also taken account of how the teaching profession is viewed by others. The Panel considered that Ms Garrib's behaviour in committing the offence could affect the public confidence in the teaching profession given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community.

The Panel has noted that Ms Garrib's behaviour has ultimately led to her receiving a sentence of imprisonment. The Recorder noted that the offences were so serious that

they warranted immediate imprisonment. The Panel shared the court's view of the seriousness of these offences.

This is a case involving an offence involving fraud or serious dishonesty which the Guidance states is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The Panel has taken into account the evidence submitted by Ms Garrib relating to the purported context for the offences committed and the evidence that has been adduced attesting to her character and her teaching record.

The Panel has found the offending behaviour that led to the conviction to be so serious as to be relevant to the teacher's ongoing suitability to teach. The Panel considers that a finding that this conviction is a relevant offence is necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

The Panel is satisfied that the conduct of Ms Garrib in relation to the facts alleged in Allegation 2 and found proven, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The Panel considers that by reference to Part Two, Ms Garrib 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
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs;
- 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;

The Panel is satisfied that the conduct of Ms Garrib fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession, fundamentally damaging the relationship of trust placed by a school and the community in her as a teacher.

The Panel has also considered whether Ms Garrib's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on page 8 and 9 of the Guidance. The Panel has found that, although not convicted in respect of the matters found proven at Allegation 2, the offence of fraud or serious dishonesty is relevant. The Guidance 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 is satisfied that Ms Garrib is guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel has taken into account how 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 has taken account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils' lives and that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models.

The findings of misconduct are serious and the conduct displayed would likely have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher, potentially damaging public perception. The Panel therefore finds that Ms Garrib's actions alleged at Allegation 2 and found proven for the reasons above, constitute conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the Panel's findings in respect of unacceptable unprofessional conduct, conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and conviction of a relevant offence, 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 considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a Prohibition Order should be made, the Panel has to consider whether it is an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it is 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 has considered the particular public interest considerations set out in the Teacher Misconduct – Prohibition of Teachers Advice and having done so has found those that are relevant in this case are the maintenance of public confidence in the profession/declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In light of the Panel's findings against Ms Garrib, which involved serious and repeated dishonesty, the Panel considers that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Garrib were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession. The Panel considered that there was a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession.

Notwithstanding 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 Ms Garrib.

In carrying out the balancing exercise the Panel has considered the public interest considerations both in favour of and against prohibition as well as the interests of Ms Garrib. The Panel took further account of the Teacher Misconduct – Prohibition of Teachers 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 those that are relevant are:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the teachers' standards
- abuse of position or trust
- dishonesty especially where there have been serious consequences, and/or it has been repeated and/or covered up
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of The Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures

There were behaviours that would point to a Prohibition Order being appropriate. However, the Panel went on to consider whether or not there were sufficient mitigating factors to militate against a Prohibition Order being an appropriate and proportionate measure to impose, particularly taking into account the nature and severity of the behaviour in this case.

In forming a judgement as to whether a prohibition order would be appropriate, the Panel took particular account of the mitigation evidence that was presented to it by Ms Garrib including a reference by the former Headteacher of the School who considered her to be an excellent teacher with a loving and nurturing nature outside of the school environment. The Panel also took account of a testimonial provided by her sister who attested to the support Ms Garrib had given her. The Panel has also had regard to the Headteacher's oral evidence that Ms Garrib had been a good teacher. The Panel has also had regard to medical and support network reports. The Panel was also mindful of the fact that prior to these matters, Ms Garrib had no previous disciplinary order imposed on her by the Secretary of State, the GTCE or other relevant body.

The Panel considered Ms Garrib's actions to have been deliberate. Her actions were committed over a prolonged period and involved a number of different deceptions. The Panel had also seen a note seized from Ms Garrib's house listing actions she would need to complete in order to perpetrate such deceptions. The Panel noted that Ms Garrib attempted to cover up her actions.

Ms Garrib has provided the Panel with representations that she committed the offences whilst being the subject of serious physical, emotional and sexual abuse. However, the Panel noticed that Ms Garrib's pattern of behaviour persisted over a long period of time regardless of fundamental changes to her circumstances, for instance change to her marital circumstances. There is no independent account to corroborate Ms Garrib's account that she was the victim of physical and sexual violence; those who refer to abuse generally depended on Ms Garrib's account of the alleged abuse. Ms Garrib's sister has referred to abuse suffered by Ms Garrib but provides no timescales as to the period over which the alleged abuse was suffered. The Panel considered it noteworthy that there

was no reference to being the subject of abuse when Ms Garrib was interviewed by the police under caution. The Panel noted that the court did not accept that there was pressure in this situation and took the view that she was motivated by greed and persisted in the fraud, because she was able to get away with it. The Panel has applied its own independent judgement to the matter, and has reached the same conclusion.

The Panel is of the view that Prohibition is both proportionate and appropriate. We have decided that the public interest considerations outweigh the interests of Ms Garrib. Accordingly, the Panel makes 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 appropriate for them to decide to recommend that a review period of the order should be suggested. The Panel were mindful that the Teacher Misconduct – Prohibition of Teachers Advice advises 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 two years.

The Teacher Misconduct – Prohibition of Teachers Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proven, would militate against a review period being recommended. These behaviours include fraud or serious dishonesty. The Panel has found that Ms Garrib has been convicted of serious offences of dishonesty and has found that she has committed other acts of dishonesty.

Whilst Ms Garrib pleaded guilty to the offences for which she was convicted and has expressed regret; she has continued to deny the acts of dishonesty regarding misuse of the School's headed paper. Given the recurrence of acts of dishonesty, the Panel could not be satisfied she would act with integrity in the future.

The Panel felt the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate and as such decided that it would be proportionate in all the circumstances for the Prohibition Order to be recommended without provision for a review period.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

I have carefully considered the findings and recommendations of the panel in this case. The panel have found all the allegations proven and determined that those facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct, conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and conviction of relevant offences.

Ms Garrib has been convicted on two counts of dishonestly making false representations to make gain for self or another or cause loss to other/expose other to risk and doing a series of acts tending and intended to pervert the course

of justice. In addition she dishonestly misused the school's letterhead to falsely claim that Individual A was both a student and employee at the school.

In deciding whether a prohibition order would be an appropriate and proportionate sanction the panel have properly given full regard to the public interest considerations in this case, in particular the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

Ms Garrib's behaviour involved serious and repeated dishonesty and public confidence would be seriously weakened if this behaviour wasn't treated with the utmost seriousness.

The panel have taken due account of the mitigation evidence presented to it. This included positive references and testimonials as to her teaching ability and nurturing nature. Ms Garrib also provided representations relating to her particular personal circumstances at the time of the offences albeit there was no independent account to corroborate these representations.

The panel consider that Ms Garrib's actions were deliberate and motivated by greed and in all the circumstances I agree with their recommendation that a prohibition order is an appropriate and proportionate sanction.

The panel went on to consider whether it would be appropriate for a review period to be recommended. They have properly considered this against the '*Teacher misconduct – the prohibition of teachers*' advice. This indicates that there are certain behaviours that, if proven, would militate against a review period being recommended. Those behaviours include fraud or serious dishonesty.

I agree with the panel's recommendation that the order should be without the opportunity to apply for it to be set aside.

This means that Ms Beebee Garrib is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. Furthermore, in view of the seriousness of the allegations found proved against her, I have decided that Ms Beebee Garrib shall not be entitled to apply for restoration of her eligibility to teach.

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

Ms Beebee Garrib has a right of appeal to the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court within 28 days from the date she is given notice of this Order.

NAME OF DECISION MAKER: Paul Heathcote



Date: 20 May 2014

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