



National College for  
Teaching & Leadership

# **Richard Martin Taylor: Professional Conduct Panel outcome**

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

**June 2014**

# Contents

A. Introduction	3
B. Allegations	4
C. Preliminary applications	5
D. Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Witnesses	6
E. Decision and reasons	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	9
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	11

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

**Teacher:** Mr Richard Martin Taylor

**Teacher ref no:** 99/55194

**Teacher date of birth:** 6 September 1976

**NCTL Case ref no:** 9884

**Date of Determination:** 30 June 2014

### **A. Introduction**

A Professional Conduct Panel (“the Panel”) of the National College for Teaching and Leadership (“the National College”) convened on Monday 30 June 2014 at 53-55 Butts Road, Earlsdon Park, Coventry, CV1 3BH to consider the case of Mr Richard Martin Taylor.

The Panel members were Mr Peter Cooper (Teacher Panellist – in the Chair), Mr Michael Lewis (Teacher Panellist) and Ms Janet Draper (Lay Panellist).

The Legal Adviser to the Panel was Mr Paddy Roche of Morgan Cole LLP Solicitors.

The Presenting Officer for the National College was Ms Laura Hackney of Browne Jacobson LLP Solicitors.

Mr Richard Martin Taylor was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public.

## B. Allegations

The Panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Proceedings.

It was alleged that Mr Richard Martin Taylor was guilty of Unacceptable Professional Conduct and/or Conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that:-

1. Whilst employed at Whitefriars Primary School, Kings Lynn, he:-
  - a. Acted dishonestly, in that he knowingly provided false information to the Head Teacher and/or Local Authority, including that:
    - i. On or around 20 May 2004 he told the Head Teacher that the date of an interview at a School in Alton had been changed, despite knowing that this was untrue;
    - ii. In May 2004 he told the Head Teacher that he had stayed overnight at a Hotel in Alton, despite knowing that this was untrue;
  - b. Acted dishonestly, in that he altered and/or falsified documents in order to justify an account of his movements to the School, including:
    - i. A Hotel booking form;
    - ii. Train tickets;
  - c. Acted dishonestly, in that he sought to claim expenses for the cost of a Hotel in Alton from Hampshire LEA without informing them that it had not been used for the purpose it had been booked for, which was to allow him to attend an interview in Alton;
2. Prior to his appointment to a teaching post at The Grove School during the 2006/07 academic year, he:
  - a. Provided false information on his Application Form about:
    - i. His reasons for leaving his employment at Whitefriars Primary School;
    - ii. His reasons for leaving his employment at the Montessori School in Madrid;
    - iii. The duration of his employment at the Montessori School in Madrid;

- b. Acted dishonestly, in that he deliberately provided false information on his Application Form, in order to improve his prospects of securing a teaching post which he had applied for;
3. In respect of his application for a teaching post at St Dominic's School during the 2012/13 academic year, he:
  - a. Provided false information on his Application Form about the length of his employment at The Grove School;
  - b. Acted dishonestly, in that he deliberately provided false information on his Application Form, in order to improve his prospects of securing the teaching post which he had applied for.

No plea had been indicated by Mr Taylor.

## **C. Preliminary applications**

The teacher being absent the Presenting officer applied for the case to proceed. The Panel was satisfied that the Notice of Proceedings had been properly served in accordance with the requirements of rule 4.10. and the Panel had evidence that Mr Taylor had signed for correspondence from the National College at the address being used. The teacher had not responded to the Notice of Proceedings or engaged at all with the NCTL in the lead up to the Disciplinary hearing. Having considered the guidance in the cases of R v Jones and Tait v Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons the Panel decided that in the public interest the hearing should proceed in the absence of Mr Taylor as he had effectively waived his right to be present.

## **D. Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section 1	Chronology	Pages 2 – 3.
Section 2	Notice of Proceedings	Pages 5 – 14.
Section 3	NCTL Witness Statements	Pages 16 – 26.
Section 4	NCTL Documents	Pages 28 – 101.

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

## **Witnesses**

The Panel heard oral evidence from the following National College witnesses:-

1. Witness A.
2. Witness B.
3. Witness C.

## **E. Decision and reasons**

The Panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:-

“We have carefully considered this case and have reached a decision.

### **Case Summary**

This case concerns allegations that on three separate occasions, over several years, Mr Taylor behaved dishonestly in providing false information. On the first occasion it is alleged that he lied about where he had been when his current school employers had been led to believe he was attending a job interview at another school. When challenged about his movements he produced a hotel booking form and train tickets which he had altered to support his false account and he submitted a claim for reimbursement of hotel expenses to the Local Authority despite the fact that he had not stayed at the hotel as claimed.

On two further occasions in 2006 and 2012 on job application forms to different schools it is alleged that he included information as to his previous teaching posts which he knew to be false. Those details related to the length of his employment at previous schools and false details concerning the reason for terminating his employment. The National College allege that these false details were provided dishonestly and with a view to improving his prospects of securing the teaching posts he was seeking.

Mr Taylor has not provided any response to the National College’s evidence as disclosed in the case papers. There is an indication that he has had issues in that he suffers from Type 1 diabetes.

## Findings of Fact

Our findings of fact are as follows:-

We have found the following particulars of the allegation against Richard Martin Taylor proven, for these reasons:

1. Whilst employed at Whitefriars Primary School, Kings Lynn, he:-
  - a. Acted dishonestly, in that he knowingly provided false information to the Head Teacher and/or Local Authority, including that:
    - i. On or around 20 May 2004 he told the Head Teacher that the date of an interview at a School in Alton had been changed, despite knowing that this was untrue;
    - ii. In May 2004 he told the Head Teacher that he had stayed overnight at a Hotel in Alton, despite knowing that this was untrue;
  - b. Acted dishonestly, in that he altered and/or falsified documents in order to justify an account of his movements to the School, including:
    - i. A Hotel booking form;
    - ii. Train tickets;
  - c. Acted dishonestly, in that he sought to claim expenses for the cost of a Hotel in Alton from Hampshire LEA without informing them that it had not been used for the purpose it had been booked for, which was to allow him to attend an interview in Alton;

Our reasons are that we heard the evidence given by the then Headmistress of Whitefriars Primary School, Witness A. Witness A was a straightforward and clear witness and we had no reason to disbelieve her account of events. Their evidence was that, on enquiry by them on Mr Taylor's return to school on 20 May 2004, he told them that he had not attended the interview in Alton as it had been moved forward by one day. He claimed he could not afford to stay in Alton another night so he had not gone to the interview. He, therefore, also caused them to believe that he had stayed in the Alton hotel for one night. At a meeting with Mr Taylor on 24 May 2004 he produced what purported to be a genuine receipt from the Alton Hotel (p44) for his claimed overnight stay and various rail tickets (pp 48/49) in support of the account of his movements that he had given.

Enquiries made of the hotel and the school in Alton established that Mr Taylor never stayed at the hotel as he claimed initially and that he did not attend the school for his interview although the date and time of his appointment was never altered – (see p41 – letter from the school and p42 – letter from the hotel).

They further told the hearing that, subsequently, there was a formal investigatory meeting held on 17 June 2004 attended by themselves and Individual D. At that meeting Mr Taylor made admissions as follows. He accepted that he had not made it down to Alton for his interview. He admitted that he had not gone to Alton at all but had gone to Nottingham instead.

He further admitted that he had altered a reservation form issued by the hotel and also had altered the date on one rail ticket and two stamps from ticket inspectors on the tickets. He explained how he had made the alterations. Those were the documents he had given to Witness A on 24 May.

He further acknowledged that he had sent an expenses claim to the finance department of Hampshire LEA for the cost of overnight accommodation at the Alton hotel (even though he had not stayed there). He accepted that he had not sent a covering letter with the claim. We are therefore satisfied he did not disclose the true facts to the finance department.

Each of these particulars alleges that Mr Taylor acted dishonestly in behaving as he did and we are satisfied both that Mr Taylor's conduct was dishonest by the standards of ordinary, decent people and that Mr Taylor must have known that his conduct was dishonest.

We therefore find that in each instance his conduct was dishonest.

2. Prior to his appointment to a teaching post at The Grove School during the 2006/07 academic year, he:
  - a. Provided false information on his Application Form about:
    - i. His reasons for leaving his employment at Whitefriars Primary School;
    - ii. His reasons for leaving his employment at the Montessori School in Madrid;
    - iii. The duration of his employment at the Montessori School in Madrid;
  - b. Acted dishonestly, in that he deliberately provided false information on his Application Form, in order to improve his prospects of securing a teaching post which he had applied for;

We have seen the application form submitted to the Grove School (p72). It contains information as to the reasons for Mr Taylor leaving both Whitefriars Primary School and the Montessori School which does not accord with the true position. In the application form Mr Taylor indicates that he left those schools for contractual reasons. However, the real reason for his leaving each school is set out in the documents at pp 88 and 92 of the case papers. It is clear that he left Whitefriars School while subject to an unresolved



disciplinary investigation and that he left the Montessori School on tendering his resignation following an alleged incident in the playground with a pupil.

In relation to the duration of his employment at the Montessori school examination of the same documents in the case papers establishes that the information given on the application form misrepresents the true position.

We have no doubt that these false statements were designed to improve the prospects of Mr Taylor securing the teaching post for which he had applied and were made deliberately and dishonestly.

3. In respect of his application for a teaching post at St Dominic's School during the 2012/13 academic year, he:
  - a. Provided false information on his Application Form about the length of his employment at The Grove School;
  - b. Acted dishonestly, in that he deliberately provided false information on his Application Form, in order to improve his prospects of securing the teaching post which he had applied for.

Witness B in their evidence to the hearing told us that Mr Taylor was employed at the Grove School between January 2007 to August 2007 when he tendered his resignation – a period of 8 months. They was an entirely credible witness and we believed them.

In his application form for a teaching post at St Dominic's School (p99) Mr Taylor declares that the period was from September 2007 – August 2010, a period of just under 3 years. This is clearly a false representation and, for the same reasons as indicated above, we are satisfied it was made dishonestly.

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

Unacceptable professional conduct is misconduct of a serious nature falling significantly short of the standard of behaviour expected of a teacher. Conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute should be judged in a similar way.

In this case we are concerned with three separate occasions on which Mr Taylor has deliberately provided false information to his current employer and two prospective future employers. We have concluded that his behaviour has been dishonest on each occasion – it was repeated such that there is a pattern of behaviour. The alterations made to the hotel reservation form and the rail tickets disclose an element of planned deception and were very deliberate and considered acts. We have also concluded that the inaccurate information entered on Mr Taylor's job application forms was intended to disguise gaps in his teaching record and thus enhance his prospects of obtaining employment.

The Teachers Standards require members of the profession to act with honesty and integrity and exhibit high standards in both their personal and professional lives. Behaving dishonestly in the manner outlined falls far below that expectation and we therefore judge that this is a case of both unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The conduct that we have found proved in this case damages the collective reputation of the profession and is totally unacceptable. Teachers are required to behave as role models to those they teach and to maintain high standards of behaviour. In that regard Mr Taylor has let down both himself and the profession as a whole.

## **Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State**

We have found Mr Taylor guilty of dishonest conduct on three separate occasions over a period of years.

Prohibition Orders are made in the public interest which includes:-

The protection of pupils and other members of the public

The maintenance of public confidence in the profession

Declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct

Mr Taylor has not engaged at all in the National College's disciplinary process so we have no indication of his attitude to these incidents or whether he has any insight into his conduct. The repetition of his dishonesty and covering up of his behaviour as evidenced by his moving on from one teaching post to another causes us great anxiety. We do not know to what extent Mr Taylor's diabetes may have contributed to his conduct generally – if at all.

Reference has been made during this case, by Witness A, to Mr Taylor's failure, while employed at her school ten years ago, to manage his condition. They told us that when he was fit and well he was a good teacher but, despite being offered a great deal of support, he "wasn't doing anything" to help himself. Since then he has completed application forms for teaching posts elsewhere that contain deliberately misleading details. Having resigned from one teaching post at the Grove School in 2007 when concerns were raised about the accuracy of details he had given re his previous career history he went on to repeat this misconduct in his application to St Dominic's School in September 2012.

We have no idea what Mr Taylor is now doing nor do we have any indication as to his current state of health or stability.

However Mr Taylor's conduct has fallen far short of the behaviour the public expect teachers to exhibit and has been both repeated and deliberate. Without any contribution

from Mr Taylor himself to these proceedings or any knowledge of his current circumstances we recommend that a Prohibition Order should be imposed in this case and that there should be no review period. We believe that on the information available to the Panel such an outcome is the only disposal which adequately satisfies our duty to the public to maintain confidence in the profession, protect its reputation and uphold proper standards of conduct.

## **Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State**

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

This is a case that involves three separate occasions on which Mr Taylor has deliberately provided false information to his current employer and two prospective future employers. The panel has concluded that Mr Taylor's behaviour has been dishonest on each occasion. In addition, the repetition amounts to a pattern of behaviour. The alterations made to the hotel reservation form and the rail tickets show an element of planned deception and were deliberate and considered acts. It is also evident that the inaccurate information entered on Mr Taylor's job application forms was intended to disguise gaps in his teaching record and thus enhance his prospects of obtaining employment.

The Teachers' Standards require members of the profession to act with honesty and integrity and exhibit high standards in both their personal and professional lives. Mr Taylor's behaviour was dishonest and falls far below that expectation.


I have considered both the public interest and the interest of Mr Taylor. On balance I believe that it is in the public interest to prohibit Mr Taylor, as the panel recommends.

I have also given consideration to the matter of a review period. The deliberate and repeated pattern of dishonesty in this case leads me to support the recommendation of the panel that there be no review period. Mr Taylor has not provided any evidence of insight or remorse.

This means that Mr Richard Taylor 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 him, I have decided that Mr Richard Taylor shall not be entitled to apply for restoration of his eligibility to teach.

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

Mr Richard Taylor 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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Alan Meyrick', with a stylized flourish at the end.

**NAME OF DECISION MAKER: Alan Meyrick**

**Date: 3 July 20114**

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