



National College for
Teaching & Leadership

Mrs Linda Grainger Professional conduct panel outcome

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

September 2016

Contents

A. Introduction	3
B. Allegations	4
C. Preliminary applications	5
D. Summary of evidence	6
Documents	6
Witnesses	6
E. Decision and reasons	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	14
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	17

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

Teacher: Mrs Linda Grainger
Teacher ref number: 7667456
Teacher date of birth: 6 October 1957
NCTL case reference: 14625
Date of determination: 28 September 2016
Former employer: Queensway Infant and Nursery School, Thetford, Norfolk

A. Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the National College for Teaching and Leadership (“the National College”) convened on 26 to 28 September 2016 at 53 to 55 Butts Road, Earlsdon Park, Coventry CV1 3BH to consider the case of Mrs Linda Grainger.

The panel members were Mr John Elliott (lay panellist – in the chair), Mr Chris Rushton (lay panellist) and Mrs Kathy Thomson (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Guy Micklewright of Blake Morgan LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the National College was Mr Peter Lownds of counsel.

Mrs Linda Grainger 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 12 May 2016.

It was alleged that Mrs Linda Grainger is guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that whilst employed at Queensway Infant and Nursery School, you:

1. Fraudulently completed, or was aware of the existence of, a fraudulently completed application form for your daughter, Individual X, to take part in the Early Years Teacher Training Programme
2. Failed to follow appropriate recruitment and selection processes in relation to your daughter, Individual X in that:
 - a) Vacancies were not advertised
 - b) An opportunity to undertake the Psychotherapeutic Counselling Course was not advertised
3. Inappropriately authorised increases to pay levels in relation to your daughter, Individual X
4. Inappropriately authorised increases in hours in relation to your daughter, Individual X
5. Inappropriately commissioned Individual Y to carry out decorating work at the School
6. In relation to the financial management of the School you:
 - a) Failed to obtain second signatures for financial transactions
 - b) Failed to obtain prior approval from the Governing Body for expenditures
 - c) Inappropriately ordered stationery in January 2015
7. Your actions set out in paragraph 1 above were dishonest.

Mrs Grainger denies all of the allegations.

Mrs Grainger denies unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

C. Preliminary applications

The panel considered an application from the presenting officer to proceed in the absence of Mrs Grainger.

The panel first considered whether it was satisfied that the Notice of Proceedings had been served on the teacher. The panel was satisfied that the Notice was sent in sufficient time, was in the correct format and, indeed, had been received by the teacher, who has made detailed submissions through counsel.

The panel then considered whether to exercise its discretion to proceed in Mrs Grainger's absence. The panel was satisfied that it was appropriate to do so. The panel had the benefit of a letter dated 22 September 2016, drafted by counsel, setting out the reasons why Mrs Grainger did not wish to attend the proceedings and, indeed, wished them to go ahead in her absence. The panel noted that the teacher had made this decision with the benefit of legal advice. Mrs Grainger had plainly waived her right to appear. In all the circumstances of the case, and given that six witnesses are due to give evidence – four being present and two are listed for tomorrow – the panel is satisfied that it would not be in the public interest to adjourn the hearing.

The panel considered an application by the presenting officer to exclude part of the evidence contained in the witness statement of Individual Z. Those parts of the statement which the presenting officer submits are inadmissible, are objected to on the basis that they are opinion evidence. The presenting officer submits that the opinion evidence given is not evidence relating to matters which are outside the ordinary knowledge and experience of lay persons and, in any event, Individual Z does not satisfy the criteria for an expert witness.

The panel is an experienced panel and well able to take account of that evidence which can properly assist it and that which can not. The panel determined to admit the statement of Individual Z into evidence. However, where Individual Z expresses his opinion about matters which are matters for the panel alone – for example, the credibility of witnesses – the panel will disregard it.

An application was made by the presenting officer to amend the allegation to withdraw allegation 6.a). The panel agreed, given that the NCTL took the view that it was no longer a proper allegation to bring against Mrs Grainger, that it was in the interests of justice to make that amendment.

D. Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology – pages 2 to 3

Section 2: Notice of Proceedings and response – pages 5 to 10

Section 3: NCTL witness statements – pages 23 to 45

Section 4: NCTL documents – pages 47 to 211

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 45a to 45lll and 213 to 366

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

Correspondence from Mrs Grainger's representatives – pages 367 to 373

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents in advance of the hearing.

Witnesses

The panel heard oral evidence from:

Witness A – Acting Deputy Headteacher

Witness B – Acting Headteacher

Witness C – Finance Officer

Witness D – Former Chair of Governors

Witness E – Vice-Chair of Governors

Witness F – Investigating Officer

E. Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

The panel confirms that it has read all the documents provided in the bundle in advance of the hearing.

Mrs Grainger had been employed at Queensway Infant and Nursery School, Thetford, since 1 January 2002 as acting headteacher before, after three months, being appointed as headteacher.

The allegations against Mrs Grainger fall into four categories. Firstly, it is alleged that, in what was a clear conflict of interest, Mrs Grainger employed her daughter, Individual X, as a teaching assistant without undertaking the appropriate recruitment processes. The favouritism shown to a family member went further, in that Mrs Grainger arranged for her daughter's hours and pay to be increased, as well as providing her with an opportunity to undertake a psychotherapeutic counselling course not offered to other staff. Secondly, it is alleged that Individual X's partner, later husband, Individual Y, was inappropriately engaged as a contractor to carry out decorating work at the school. It is said that necessary tendering procedures were not followed because of his relationship with Mrs Grainger's daughter. Thirdly, it is alleged that Mrs Grainger inappropriately ordered approximately £10,000 worth of stationery, attempting to manipulate the invoices so that none of them was in excess of the amount which would require the approval of the school governors. Fourthly, it is alleged that Mrs Grainger forged the signature of the deputy headteacher, Witness B, on an application form for Individual X to take part in an 'Early Years Teacher Training Programme' or, alternatively, that she was aware that it was forged. It is the NCTL's case that, in either case, Mrs Grainger acted dishonestly.

Findings of fact

Our findings of fact are as follows:

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

1. Fraudulently completed, or was aware of the existence of, a fraudulently completed application form for your daughter, Individual X, to take part in the Early Years Teacher Training Programme

The panel finds this particular proved.

Mrs Grainger was involved in the creation of the 'line manager's supporting statement' on the form. The panel accepted that, although the statement itself was that of Witness A, the assistant headteacher, the handwriting was that of Mrs Grainger. The panel further noted that Mrs Grainger accepts in her witness statement that she filled in the personal information of Individual X. Therefore, on Mrs Grainger's own evidence, there was a time when the form was in her possession. The panel accepted Witness B's evidence that her signature on the form was not hers. There was no dispute that, prior to the date the form was completed, Mrs Grainger had forged the signature of Witness D, the former chair of governors, on school policies, albeit that Mrs Grainger asserts she did so with Witness D's permission. Witness D denies that she gave such permission.

The evidence, as a whole, suggests that Mrs Grainger was anxious to appear to distance herself from her daughter whilst actually being actively involved in her line management, and signing the form in the name of Witness B would achieve this.

On the form itself, where Witness B and Witness A are given as referees, the email contact given is "office@queensway-inf.norfolk.sch.org." However, in the 'payment of fees/charges' section, where Witness B's name is put in the box entitled "Name of the Line manager/person with authority to commit funding", the email address given is "head@queensway-inf.norfolk.sch.uk." This is the same email address used by Mrs Grainger on other documents. The purpose of using a different email address must have been to avoid Witness B becoming aware that her name had been put down as the person with authority to commit funding. The fact that the email address was Mrs Grainger's suggests that it was she who forged Witness B's signature.

For all the above reasons, the panel concludes that, on the balance of probabilities, the signature of Witness B was not only forged but that it was Mrs Grainger who forged it.

2. Failed to follow appropriate recruitment and selection processes in relation to your daughter, Individual X in that:

a) Vacancies were not advertised

The panel finds this allegation proved. The panel considers that, when recruiting staff, it was incumbent upon Mrs Grainger to follow appropriate procedures. It is clear to the panel that there was a management need for a higher level teaching assistant (HLTA) to be recruited to cover for an employee who had been suspended. According to the evidence of Witness A, Witness B and Witness D, 25 hours per week of cover was required to fill that role. The panel does not accept Mrs Grainger's characterisation of the situation as an "emergency", nor does it accept that Witness A was unable to cope.

The panel was surprised that there was no evidence of any attempt being made to recruit an HLTA. It would have been open to Mrs Grainger to attempt to recruit such a person from a variety of sources, such as through a local authority pool or through an agency. Instead, she immediately recruited her daughter, somebody without any teaching qualifications or any significant teaching assistant experience. Her experience at that time comprised only four terms as a 1:1 SEN teaching assistant between 2005 and 2010.

The panel accepts Witness B's evidence, supported by that of Witness A, that no proper recruitment interview of Individual X was ever carried out. Moreover, Individual X was only able to commit to 10 hours work per week. This was insufficient for the role. The

panel accepts Witness B's evidence that at that time teaching assistants were not hard to recruit. Therefore, there may well have been other people with similar or better experience and qualifications than Individual X who would have been able to undertake the role on a full-time basis. In addition, no attempt was made after Individual X was engaged to find another teaching assistant to provide the remaining 15 further hours needed.

The panel considered that it may have been acceptable, on a short-term basis, to employ Individual X to meet an urgent need if there were no more suitable candidates immediately available. However, once it became clear that the role was to become permanent, it was necessary for a full and proper recruitment process to be undertaken. That did not happen.

The inescapable conclusion is that Individual X was recruited for a role for which she had little experience, insufficient qualifications and an inability to work the hours required. The panel concludes that the role was not advertised because Mrs Grainger inappropriately favoured Individual X because she was her daughter.

b) An opportunity to undertake the Psychotherapeutic Counselling Course was not advertised

The panel finds this particular proved. The course which Individual X was put forward for was an 'Advanced Diploma in Psychotherapeutic Counselling'. In the panel's view, an expensive course such as this needs to be advertised within the school in order to ensure equality of opportunity among staff. It is said by Mrs Grainger that the reason why Individual X was put forward for this advanced course was because, following an Ofsted inspection in October 2014, it was identified that the School should do more with family liaison and literacy. She says that the course was not advertised, as a counselling course had been identified as part of Individual X's professional development needs.

The panel accepts the evidence of Witness D and Witness E, the former chair of governors, that this course was not a specific Ofsted requirement. It is of note that Individual X already had a psychology degree. In her witness evidence Individual X says, "I discussed with Witness B how I was still aiming towards becoming a psychotherapist as a long term goal."

Given the fact that Individual X was Mrs Grainger's daughter, it was incumbent on Mrs Grainger to ensure that proper professional boundaries were rigorously maintained and that there was no favouritism seen to be shown to her daughter. If it was the case that the course was an appropriate one for a suitable member of staff to undertake, then it was necessary for it to be advertised to all potentially suitable members of staff. To offer that opportunity only to her daughter was inappropriate.

3. Inappropriately authorised increases to pay levels in relation to your daughter, Individual X

The panel finds this allegation proved. Mrs Grainger's case is that she distanced herself from the management of her daughter and that she passed that responsibility onto the deputy head and the chair of governors. The panel does not accept that this was the case. It accepted the evidence of Witness A and Witness B. Both gave evidence that there was no consultation with them regarding pay. It was clear to the panel that Mrs Grainger retained the sole responsibility for the pay and conditions of her daughter. The panel also concludes that there was no consultation regarding pay with governors or the local authority, who were, at best, simply presented with decisions which had already been made and implemented by Mrs Grainger.

Individual X was due to go on maternity leave in October 2014. The panel was very surprised to learn that a retention allowance was awarded with effect from 1 September 2014, which meant that she was paid at point 6 on the unqualified teachers pay range; the maximum pay point for unqualified teachers.

The head of governors, Witness E, was unaware that Individual X was being paid that allowance. In the panel's experience, the payment of such allowances is extremely rare in schools.

The panel notes that all increases in Individual X's pay were initiated and implemented by Mrs Grainger. This was contrary to the promises she had made to governors that she would distance herself from the management of her daughter to avoid any conflict of interest. The governors were under the impression that the deputy headteacher, Witness B, would be responsible for managing Individual X's terms and conditions of employment. Witness B knew nothing about this.

The panel notes that there was a newly qualified teacher in the school who had been appointed before Individual X joined. Despite this, Individual X, who had no teaching qualifications, was ultimately placed on the same pay scale point as her. Witness C gave evidence that when she challenged this at a financial revision meeting she was told by Mrs Grainger that, "it all depended on where you started". This is not a proper justification.

It was clear to the panel that the only reason behind the highly unusual and disproportionate increases to Individual X's pay was the flagrant favouritism Mrs Grainger showed to her daughter.

4. Inappropriately authorised increases in hours in relation to your daughter, Individual X

The panel finds this allegation proved. The panel accepts there was a clear desire among staff in the school for extra teaching assistant support. There was a justifiable management need for either more teaching assistants or more hours being worked by current staff. The panel accepts that there was support from the senior management team for an increase in Individual X's hours because she was performing well in her initial role. However, both Witness D and Witness E gave evidence that they had reservations about the employment of Individual X. Witness D said, "I was totally against it; I objected." Having been made aware of staff support from the senior management team, she later dropped her objections.

The panel considers it was incumbent on Mrs Grainger to consider and explore alternatives to increasing Individual X's hours. She did not do this. Furthermore, she did not properly consult with governors and, once again, presented them with a decision that had already been made.

5. Inappropriately commissioned Individual Y to carry out decorating work at the School

The panel finds this allegation proved. Mrs Grainger, in considering Individual Y as a potential contractor for the work he undertook, was in a position where she had a clear conflict of interest. She knew that Individual Y was in a relationship with her daughter. The panel noted that the address and the telephone number on the invoices sent to the School by Individual Y was the same as Mrs Grainger's. In addition, the email address on the invoices was that of Mrs Grainger's husband. The panel infers that Individual Y's business was well known to Mrs Grainger.

Mrs Grainger should have delegated the task of commissioning the decorating work to, for example, the deputy headteacher, in order that Individual Y's quotation could be considered by somebody without any conflict of interest. The panel accepted the evidence of Witness C, the School's finance officer and personal assistant to Mrs Grainger, that the process of commissioning the work neither accorded with the School's practice at that time nor with the requirements of the Local Education Authority. Verbal rather than written quotes were taken from other contractors by Mrs Grainger, and she appears to have actively promoted Individual Y. The inference the panel draws is that

Mrs Grainger engaged Individual Y because he was the partner of her daughter and she manipulated the process to ensure that it was he who won the contract.

The panel does not accept Mrs Grainger's argument that this was acceptable just because other members of staff's family may have been involved in the School. The significant difference is that Mrs Grainger had the power to engage contractors whereas other staff did not. That is where the conflict of interest lay.

6. In relation to the financial management of the School you:

b) Failed to obtain prior approval from the Governing Body for expenditures

c) Inappropriately ordered stationery in January 2015

The panel finds these allegations proved. The 'Finance Policy 2014' makes plain that any expenditure over £3,000 requires governing body approval. That policy also provides that orders must not be artificially split in order to evade that requirement. It is axiomatic that these requirements exist in order to ensure that the governing body can retain proper oversight of the financial management of the school. Mrs Grainger ordered approximately £10,000 ex VAT worth of stationery. There are five separate invoices. One of those invoices exceed the £3,000 limit ex VAT. Mrs Grainger states in her witness statement that she immediately informed the governors about it. However, it seems to the panel that the governors were, in fact, informed by Witness C. The panel accepts her evidence that she emailed governors to seek authorisation to pay that invoice.

The panel does not accept that a small infant school would require, let alone need, to order £10,000 worth of stationery in one financial year. Furthermore, the panel does not accept the reason given by Mrs Grainger that the five invoices reflected different budgets for different departments. It is clear to the panel that the manner in which the stationery was ordered was a calculated, albeit unsuccessful, attempt to avoid having to seek governing body approval for the order.

7. Your actions set out in paragraph 1 above were dishonest.

The panel finds this particular proved. The panel considers that, a teacher forging the signature of another teacher on an application form, particularly where it relates to the obtaining of funding, is something which would be considered dishonest by the standards of reasonable and honest people. The panel was further satisfied that, at the time at

which she forged Witness B's signature, Mrs Grainger knew that acting in that way was dishonest.

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

Having found a number of the allegations to have been proven, the panel has gone on to consider whether the facts of those proven allegations amount to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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

The panel is satisfied that the conduct of Mrs Linda Grainger in relation to the facts found proven, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considers that by reference to Part Two, Mrs Grainger 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
- teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach
- teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities

The panel is satisfied that the conduct of Mrs Grainger fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel has also considered whether Mrs Grainger’s conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 8 and 9 of the Advice.

The panel finds that the offence of fraud or serious dishonesty is relevant.

The Advice indicates that where behaviours associated with such an offence exist, a panel is likely to conclude that an individual’s conduct would amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

Mrs Grainger lost sight of her professional obligations and duties. She failed to maintain proper professional boundaries, although she was aware they were required. She made promises to the governing body that she did not keep. She plainly favoured her daughter, offering her opportunities in terms of pay and progression that were not open to others, and was dishonest in the pursuit of this. In short, the panel is satisfied she put family first; school and the public purse second.

Accordingly, the panel is satisfied that Mrs Linda Grainger 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 in the way they behave.

The panel considers that such egregious behaviour would be wholly damaging to the reputation of the profession.

The panel therefore finds that Mrs Grainger's actions 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 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 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 Advice and having done so has found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In light of the panel's findings against Mrs Grainger, which involved dishonesty and improper management of school finances, there is a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession as the conduct found against Mrs Grainger was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

The panel accepted evidence, both from governors and members of staff, that when challenged Mrs Grainger "always had a plausible explanation" or avoided, ignored or overruled any criticism. Witness D, the chair of governors, said she was also bullied and marginalised. The panel was clear that Mrs Grainger ran the School as her own personal fiefdom.

Similarly, the panel considers that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mrs Grainger were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of 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, including taking into account the effect that this would have on Mrs Grainger.

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 Mrs Grainger. 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, those that are relevant in this case are:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or well-being of pupils
- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving vulnerable pupils) or violation of the rights of pupils
- dishonesty especially where there have been serious consequences, and/or it has been repeated and/or covered up
- sustained or serious bullying, or other deliberate behaviour that undermines pupils, the profession, the school or colleagues

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 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.

The panel acknowledges that Mrs Grainger has not had any previous disciplinary findings made against her.

In the panel's view, there is no other mitigation in this case. The panel has carefully considered the testimonials advanced on behalf of Mrs Grainger. In the panel's view, only one of these testimonials contains relevant information, namely that provided by Individual Z. The panel accepts that a number of her professional colleagues, outside the school, considered her to be a competent headteacher.

Whilst the panel also notes that Mrs Grainger's husband was seriously ill in 2015, the misconduct significantly predates this.

Throughout the school investigation Mrs Grainger went to great lengths to avoid accepting responsibility for her clear shortcomings. In the documents submitted in evidence by Mrs Grainger before the panel, at pages 213 to 224, described as 'Mrs Grainger's Response Statement', she says, "the only thing that I did not get right was not going for a short term temporary contract then advertising but, in all honesty, the end result would probably have been the same based on previous experience of trying to get anybody suitable to apply for a job in Thetford schools. That is hardly an offence that merits dismissal...".

In the panel's view, Mrs Grainger remains wholly unrepentant, lacks any insight into why her conduct was unacceptable and the impact it had on teaching and learning, pupil resources, and staff morale.

The panel is of the view that prohibition is both proportionate and appropriate. The panel has decided that the public interest considerations outweigh the interests of Mrs Grainger. The seriousness of Mrs Grainger's conduct and her lack of insight are significant factors in forming that conclusion. 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 be appropriate for them to decide to recommend that a review period of the order should be considered. The panel were mindful that the 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 2 years.

The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proven, would militate against a review period being recommended. One of these behaviours is fraud or serious dishonesty. The panel has found that Mrs Grainger has been responsible for dishonestly forging the signature of the deputy headteacher.

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. The conduct found proved amounted to serious dishonesty, and sustained and deliberate financial mismanagement. Mrs Grainger has demonstrated no insight into her behaviour.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

In this case the panel has found all the facts proven. In addition, the panel has found that the facts amount to both unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

It is important to note that in this case the panel has also found dishonesty.

The panel has shown how Mrs Grainger 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
- teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach
- teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities

I have also, like the panel, taken into account the Advice published by the Secretary of State, 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 in this case are:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or well-being of pupils
- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving vulnerable pupils) or violation of the rights of pupils
- dishonesty especially where there have been serious consequences, and/or it has been repeated and/or covered up
- sustained or serious bullying, or other deliberate behaviour that undermines pupils, the profession, the school or colleagues

I have taken into account the need to balance the interests of the teacher and the interests of the public. I have also taken into account the need to be proportionate.

In this case, I have considered the recommendation of the panel with due care. I consider that their recommendation is proportionate and I support it. Mrs Grainger should be prohibited from teaching.

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. I have read the advice of the panel with care and taken into account what they have said about mitigation and about insight.

In my view the panel's recommendation in respect of the review period also balances the public interest and the interest of the teacher and is proportionate.

This means that Mrs Linda Grainger 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 Mrs Linda Grainger 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.

Mrs Linda Grainger 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.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Alan Meyrick', is written in a cursive style.

Decision maker: Alan Meyrick

Date: 30 September 2016

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