



National College for  
Teaching & Leadership

# **Caroline Bradbury: Professional Conduct panel outcome**

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

**March 2015**

# 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	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**

<b>Teacher:</b>	Ms Caroline Bradbury
<b>Teacher ref no:</b>	7452923
<b>Teacher date of birth:</b>	18 December 1955
<b>NCTL Case ref no:</b>	10892
<b>Date of Determination:</b>	2 December 2014 and 20 March 2015
<b>Former employer:</b>	Northampton School for Girls

### **A. Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the National College for Teaching and Leadership (“the National College”) convened on 2 December 2014 and 20 March 2015 at 53-55 Butts Road, Earlsdon Park, Coventry, CV1 3BH to consider the case of Ms Caroline Bradbury.

The panel members were Ms Cynthia Bartlett (Teacher panellist – in the Chair), Professor Ian Hughes (Lay panellist) and Dr Robert Cawley (Teacher panellist).

The Legal Adviser to the panel was Mrs Fiona Walker of Eversheds LLP Solicitors.

The Presenting Officer for the National College was Mr Christopher Geering of Counsel, 2 Hare Court.

Ms Caroline Bradbury was present and was represented by Ms Jennifer Danvers of Counsel, Cloisters Chambers.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

## B. Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Proceedings dated 24 July 2014.

It was alleged that Ms Caroline Bradbury was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant criminal offence, in that:

1. On 25 January 2011, at the Northampton Magistrates Court, she was convicted for the offence of driving a motor vehicle with excess alcohol on 9 January 2011, contrary to section 5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and was subsequently sentenced on 16 February 2011 with:

- a. supervision requirement;
- b. imprisonment for a period of 12 months to be suspended for 24 months;
- c. disqualification from driving obligatory for 36 months from 25 January 2011;
- d. disqualification from driving to be reduced if the course is completed; and
- e. programme requirement for a period of 20 days;

2. Her sentence for the offence described at paragraph 1 above was subsequently varied on 19 August 2011 to record that:

- a. she had completed the rehab course;
- b. her disqualification from driving was reduced to 27 months;

That she was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that:

3. She was found to be under the influence of alcohol and/or to have inappropriately applied the medication for [redacted] whilst at the School on:

- a. 3 October 2012;
- b. 15 November 2012;
- c. 22 November 2012;
- d. 21 February 2013;

4. By her actions as set out at paragraph 3 above, she created a situation whereby pupils could be at risk.

The teacher admits the facts of Allegations 1 and 2 but does not admit that they amount to conviction of a relevant offence. The teacher admits the facts of Allegation 3 but does not admit that it amounts to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

## **C. Preliminary applications**

The panel considered an application by the Presenting Officer pursuant to Paragraph 4.56 of the Procedures to amend Allegation 3 to read: "You were found to be under the influence of alcohol and/or under the influence of inappropriately applied [redacted] medication whilst at School on: a. 3 October 2012, b. 15 November 2012, c. 22 November 2012, d. 21 February 2013.

The Teachers representative has confirmed that the teacher has no objection and consents to the application. The panel considered the interests of justice and the nature of the change to the allegation and, given the teachers representative's confirmation that Mrs Bradbury would not have presented her case differently and that she has no objection, the panel allowed the amendment to the allegation.

## **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 and Response to Notice of Proceedings Pages 5-9c

Section 3: Statement of Agreed Facts Pages 11-17

Section 4: NCTL Documents Pages 26-120

Section 5 : Teacher Documents Pages 122-154

Section 6 : Additional Teacher Documents Pages 155-300

Section 7 : Supplemental witness statement of Mrs Bradbury Pages 301-303

Section 8 : Addendum bundle Pages 304-328

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 teacher, Mrs Caroline Bradbury and from Witness A.

## 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 provided during the hearing.

### Summary of Evidence

Mrs Bradbury was employed as an Art/Photography teacher at Northampton School for Girls between September 2004 and August 2013.

On 25 January 2011 Mrs Bradbury was convicted at Northampton Magistrates Court for the offence of driving a motor vehicle with excess alcohol on 9 January 2011. The breath analyser showed her to be more than three times over the legal limit for alcohol consumption. Mrs Bradbury was sentenced to a supervision requirement, imprisonment for 12 months to be suspended for 24 months; disqualification for 36 months, later reduced to 27 months on completion of a course.

During October and November 2012 and in February 2013, there were 4 occasions during school time, that Mrs Bradbury appeared to be intoxicated.

Mrs Bradbury was suspended from duties on 11 March 2013 and subsequently resigned with effect from 31 August 2013.

## Findings of Fact

Our findings of fact are as follows:

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

**1. On 25 January 2011, at the Northampton Magistrates Court, you were convicted for the offence of driving a motor vehicle with excess alcohol on 9 January 2011, contrary to section 5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and was subsequently sentenced on 16 February 2011 with:**

**a. supervision requirement;**

**b. imprisonment for a period of 12 months to be suspended for 24 months;**

- c. disqualification from driving obligatory for 36 months from 25 January 2011;**
- d. disqualification from driving to be reduced if the course is completed; and**
- e. programme requirement for a period of 20 days;**

**2. Your sentence for the offence described at paragraph 1 above was subsequently varied on 19 August 2011 to record that:**

- a. you had completed the rehab course;**
- b. your disqualification from driving was reduced to 27 months**

The facts of allegations 1 and 2 are admitted by Mrs Bradbury.

The panel have also had sight of the Certificate of Conviction dated 25 January 2011 and therefore find the facts of these allegations to have been proved.

**That you are guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that:**

**3. You were found to be under the influence of alcohol and/or under the influence of inappropriately applied [redacted] medication whilst at the School on:**

- b. 15 November 2012;**
- c. 22 November 2012;**
- d. 21 February 2013;**

In relation to the 3 incidents at allegation 3b, 3c and 3d, the panel did not find Mrs Bradbury to be a credible witness. The panel found her to be, at times, confused during her oral evidence and the panel were not persuaded that she gave truthful recollections of the events back in late 2012 and early 2013. Mrs Bradbury repeatedly said during her evidence that she believed her medical records and the GP's notes were inaccurate in relation to the reporting of her [redacted] issues. Indeed, Mrs Bradbury disagreed with the GPs' diagnosis of [redacted]. The panel find it highly unlikely that a number of doctors would have made mistakes on so many occasions (when making contemporaneous notes) in relation to matters such as [redacted]. The panel found Mrs Bradbury to have shown a pattern of behaviour whilst at the School (which is supported by her medical records) which clearly demonstrated to the panel that Mrs Bradbury has had ongoing difficulties [redacted] for many years. Her evidence to the panel demonstrated an element of denial of her history [redacted] which is a real cause for concern to the Panel, albeit she did accept that she and alcohol were "not friends".

In relation to the 15 November 2012 incident, Mrs Bradbury's evidence to the panel was that she had taken too many of her tablets [redacted] which she was prescribed for

[redacted]. She confirmed that she did not realise the correct dosage and had been taking too many at this point and had been doing so for a few days. Mrs Bradbury accepted that her appearance whilst at School was of someone who was intoxicated (Statement of Agreed Facts at Page 13 of the Bundle). The panel considered the evidence of Individual B (Page 57 of the Bundle) who confirmed that Mrs Bradbury told her that she had taken too many tablets. Individual C (Page 58 of the Bundle) confirmed that she smelt alcohol and Mrs Bradbury was behaving oddly. The panel noted Mrs Bradbury's evidence (which was supported by her medical records) was that, despite having been taking more tablets than prescribed, she did not at any point contact her GP for advice.

In relation to the incident on 22 November 2012, the panel considered the evidence of Mrs Bradbury which was that, on the morning of 22 November 2012, she had taken 6 of the [redacted] tablets at the same time rather than 2 as prescribed. Witness A confirmed to the panel that whilst he did not see Mrs Bradbury taking all of the 6 tablets, he did recall her drinking lots of water. Mrs Bradbury confirmed that she had drunk a number of glasses of water to attempt to dilute the effects of the tablets. Mrs Bradbury said that she did not feel the effects of the overdose of her medication until she was at School although she accepted (Page 13 of the Bundle – Agreed Statement of Facts) that she appeared intoxicated whilst at School on that day. Mrs Bradbury confirmed to the panel that, again, she did not telephone her GP or seek any advice in relation to her having taken excessive amounts of her medication. The panel considered the evidence of Individual D (Page 59 of the Bundle) which is that Mrs Bradbury was unsteady on her feet and almost fell over when trying to sit down and that her breath smelled of alcohol. Individual E also confirmed (Page 60 of the Bundle) that Mrs Bradbury appeared dazed, stumbled and rested her head on his shoulders when she was in the staff room. Whilst both accounts were hearsay evidence, the panel felt on the balance of probabilities that these were truthful accounts.

Insofar as the 21 February 2013 incident is concerned, Mrs Bradbury gave evidence to the panel that she had taken some [redacted] tablets during the night after feeling unwell, had woken in the morning still feeling unwell but had thought she was well enough to go into School. Despite Witness A having fallen on the drive that morning as they were leaving to go to School, Mrs Bradbury had nevertheless gone into School. This was confirmed by Witness A's oral evidence to the panel. On reflection, Mrs Bradbury confirmed that she perhaps ought not to have done so. The panel also considered the evidence, at Page 75 of the Bundle, of Individual F (a student), dated 22 February 2013, the day after the incident in question, when she confirmed that Mrs Bradbury's appearance on this day was that her eyes appeared bloodshot and she smelled of alcohol. She also confirmed that Mrs Bradbury seemed "really scatty" and was talking loudly. The panel also noted the evidence of several other students (including those at Pages 72 and 73 of the Bundle) when they confirmed their belief that Mrs Bradbury was intoxicated. Mrs Bradbury confirmed during her evidence that it was her belief that some students had said this to avoid doing work. The panel did not find that to be credible, not



least because of the nature of the students' statements which certainly did not appear to be statements of students doing anything other than reporting concerns for a member of staff. Indeed some of those statements were supportive of Mrs Bradbury as a teacher and were therefore persuasive to the panel. Mrs Bradbury herself also agreed (Page 14 of the Bundle – Statement of Agreed Facts) that she would have appeared intoxicated on this day whilst at School.

Insofar as the smell of alcohol was concerned generally in relation to these 3 incidents, which several individuals noted and reported on (as set out above), Mrs Bradbury explained in her witness statement (Paragraph 43) and during oral evidence that it could have been as a result of a mouthwash she used regularly which contained alcohol and which she would often take with her to School because of a gum problem she had. The panel find it highly improbable that the smell of alcohol on many occasions on Mrs Bradbury's breath was caused by use of mouthwash. The panel find, on the balance of probabilities, that the smell of alcohol was the result of Mrs Bradbury having consumed alcohol. The panel noted that each of these 3 incidences took place on a Thursday and Mrs Bradbury gave evidence that she always attended a social quiz at a local club on Wednesday evenings, albeit she says on these evenings after 5 November she would have had a non-alcoholic drink. Witness A, in his evidence, confirmed that he would have picked the teacher up from the club on these occasions. Witness A was not at the quiz. He also gave evidence that he could not differentiate between the teacher's behaviour when she had been drinking alcohol or when she had not. The panel was not persuaded by Witness A's evidence and found, on a number of occasions, that he was simply repeating what he had been told by the teacher.

The panel finds, on the balance of probabilities, that on these 3 occasions (15 November 2012, 22 November 2012 and 21 February 2013) Mrs Bradbury was under the influence of alcohol whilst at the School. Whilst the panel took into account that the evidence of colleagues and students was hearsay and attached less weight to it accordingly, there was sufficient hearsay evidence from different individuals to make it compelling. The panel find it cumulatively unlikely that she was under the influence of her [redacted] medication on the 3 occasions, given that she was reported as smelling of alcohol and in view of her behaviour and demeanour, which she herself accepted was of someone who was intoxicated. The panel also found it highly unlikely that Mrs Bradbury would have taken excess amounts of her [redacted] medication on more than one occasion and not sought advice or mentioned it to her GP, either at the time or at a later date.

The panel therefore finds Allegation 3 (b) (c) and (d) to be proved.

#### **4. By your actions as set out at Paragraph 3 above, you created a situation whereby pupils could be at risk.**

Mrs Bradbury accepted during her oral evidence to the panel that as a result of her having inappropriately applied her [redacted] medication, she created a situation whereby pupils could be at risk. Mrs Bradbury did, however, qualify it in her oral evidence by

saying that she thought she “was safe”. The panel noted that other members of staff believed she was not capable of taking care of pupils and safeguarding pupils because of her demeanour on these occasions. The panel believed that these members of staff, whilst their evidence is hearsay and the panel did not hear from them in person, were giving truthful accounts and there was no reason for them to exaggerate these incidents. Students also gave written evidence about Mrs Bradbury’s behaviour and her appearing intoxicated.

Even on Mrs Bradbury’s own evidence, she demonstrated to the panel seriously impaired judgment on several occasions - for example, her belief that she was safe with children when she was feeling unwell as a result of an overdose. In fact, as set out above, the panel found her to be intoxicated on several occasions whilst in school and believe that her judgment was seriously impaired for that reason and therefore, pupils were at risk.

In light of the panel’s findings above in relation to Allegation 2 (b) (c) and (d), the panel also finds, on the balance of probabilities, that Mrs Bradbury did create a situation whereby pupils could be at risk.

We have found the following particulars of the allegation against you not proven, for these reasons:

**3. You were found to be under the influence of alcohol and/or under the influence of inappropriately applied [redacted] medication whilst at the School on:**

**a. 3 October 2012;**

In relation to the incident on 3 October 2012, the panel considered the oral evidence of both Mrs Bradbury and Witness A. Mrs Bradbury confirmed that, on this occasion, she had taken medication given to her by her husband on the morning of 3 October 2012 because she had been feeling unwell. The medication was AlkaSeltzer which, apparently unbeknown to her husband at the time, contained aspirin to which Mrs Bradbury is allergic and has a reaction to. Mrs Bradbury’s medical evidence supported and confirmed her allergy to aspirin.

The panel also considered the evidence in the bundle which included statements from Individual G and Individual H at the School. The panel noted that in her first statement (Page 76 of the Bundle), Individual H indicated that did not smell alcohol on that occasion albeit Mrs Bradbury’s speech was “slurry”, whilst in her second statement written some time later, she indicated that she could not remember if she could or could not smell alcohol. The panel also heard that the School did not raise the incident on 3 October 2012 with Mrs Bradbury at the time and it was only much later that she was asked about it and was told of the concerns. The panel noted Mrs Bradbury’s text messages from 3 October 2012 (at Page 130 of the Bundle) which did appear to be consistent with Mrs Bradbury’s account of the events on that day.

Whilst the panel did not, on the whole, find Mrs Bradbury to be a credible witness for the reasons explained, the panel do not find, on the balance of probabilities that it has been proven that on 3 October 2012, Mrs Bradbury was either under the influence of alcohol whilst at the School or that she was under the influence of [redacted] medication. The panel do not therefore find the particulars of Allegation 3a to have been proved.

## **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’.

The panel is satisfied that the conduct of Mrs Bradbury in relation to the facts found proven, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considers that by reference to Part Two, Mrs Bradbury 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
  - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher’s professional position;
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils’ well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions;
- 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;
- 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 Bradbury fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel has also considered whether Mrs Bradbury’s conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on page 8 and 9 of the Guidance and we have found that her conduct is associated with (1) a serious driving offence, involving alcohol and (2) serious offences involving alcohol. 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 Mrs Bradbury 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 therefore finds that Mrs Bradbury's actions constitute conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In relation to the conviction, the panel noted that Mrs Bradbury's actions were not relevant to teaching, working with children and/ or working in an education setting. The conviction for drink driving took place outside of the education setting. The panel noted, however, that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety and security of members of the public.

The panel has also taken account of how the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mrs Bradbury'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 Mrs Bradbury's behaviour has ultimately led to her receiving a sentence of imprisonment (albeit that it was suspended) which is indicative of the seriousness of the offence committed. The panel noted that Mrs Bradbury was over three times the legal limit at the time of the offence.

This is a case involving an offence which is a serious driving offence involving alcohol which the Guidance states is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel has taken into account the evidence that has been adduced attesting to Mrs Bradbury's previous good record as a teacher and that, until the matters before the panel, she has had no previous disciplinary issues at any School where she has worked to the panel's knowledge. The panel has also taken into consideration Mrs Bradbury's medical history [redacted].

Although the panel finds the evidence of Mrs Bradbury's teaching proficiency to be of note, the panel has found the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction is relevant to her 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. This is also very much the case when it is also considered, in context, and alongside the panel's other findings in relation to Allegations 2 and 3 and, in particular, the findings of the panel that Mrs Bradbury was under the influence of alcohol whilst at the School on 3 separate occasions.

## Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional 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 a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely the protection of pupils, 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 Bradbury, which involved findings that she was under the influence of alcohol whilst at School on 3 occasions and that she was convicted of a relevant offence related to alcohol, there is a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils and the welfare of pupils. Similarly, the panel considers that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mrs Bradbury was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

The panel considered that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Mrs Bradbury was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

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 Mrs Bradbury.

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 Bradbury. The panel took further account of the Guidance, 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, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;

- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour;
- sustained or serious bullying, or other deliberate behaviour that undermines pupils, the profession, the school or colleagues;
- 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.”

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. It was clear to the panel that Mrs Bradbury had a previously good record and the evidence before it was that she was a well-liked teacher by staff and pupils alike. However, there was no evidence that Mrs Bradbury’s actions were not deliberate and the panel felt there was evidence that she was in denial as to the extent of her problem with alcohol and the effect that it had on her and others. This was of great concern to the panel. Whilst in mitigation, it was suggested that Mrs Bradbury does not propose to teach children again, the panel nevertheless consider there to be a continuing risk if Mrs Bradbury were to teach children. The risk in this situation is the repetition of her behaviour which is encapsulated in the allegations.

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 Mrs Bradbury. The protection of pupils and maintaining public confidence in the profession was a significant factor in forming that opinion. 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 considered. 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.

As indicated above, the panel has serious concerns as to Mrs Bradbury’s insight into her behaviour and her relationship with alcohol [redacted] Mrs Bradbury has shown, however, a degree of remorse and regret about the manner in which her teaching career came to an end and the panel is of the view that she should be afforded an opportunity to address her issues and overcome her problems with alcohol. The panel felt the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and as such decided that it would be proportionate in all the circumstances for the prohibition order to be recommended with provision for a review period.

The panel considered that the prohibition order should be reviewed after a period of 3 years and that this period will, in the panel's view, be sufficient to allow Mrs Bradbury the opportunity to address her issues and seek the ongoing support [redacted] which she needs. Only through developing complete insight into her condition will this be achieved.

## 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 proven a range of allegations all in respect of behaviours whilst under the influence of alcohol. They have judged that those behaviours and conviction amount to unacceptable professional conduct, conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and conviction of a relevant offence.

In considering whether to recommend that a prohibition order is an appropriate and proportionate sanction, the panel have found a number of public interest considerations to be relevant, namely:

- the protection of pupils;
- maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

Nevertheless it was clear to the panel that Mrs Bradbury had a previous good history. However there was no evidence to suggest her actions were anything other than deliberate and there was evidence that she remained in denial as to the extent of her problem with alcohol. The panel have judged there to be a continuing risk if she were allowed to continue teaching. I agree with the panel's recommendation that prohibition is an appropriate and proportionate sanction.

Mrs Bradbury has shown a degree of remorse and regret. The panel have recommended that a period of three years would afford Mrs Bradbury with sufficient time address her issues and seek ongoing support [redacted] as well as developing complete insight into her condition. I agree with their recommendation.

**This means that Mrs Caroline Bradbury is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England.** She may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 31 March 2018, 3 years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If she does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Mrs Caroline Bradbury remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mrs Caroline Bradbury 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**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'P Heathcote', with a large, sweeping flourish extending to the right.

**Date: 23 March 2015**

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