



National College for
Teaching & Leadership

Mr Graham Angell: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

July 2017

Contents

A. Introduction	3
B. Allegations	4
C. Preliminary applications	5
D. Summary of evidence	6
Documents	6
Witnesses	7
E. Decision and reasons	7
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	22
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	24

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

Teacher: Mr Graham Angell
Teacher ref number: 6845558
Teacher date of birth: 21 April 1948
NCTL case reference: 15364
Date of determination: 13 July 2017
Former employer: Sandwell Community School

A. Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the National College for Teaching and Leadership (“the National College”) convened on 6 to 13 July 2017 at 53 to 55 Butts Road, Earlsdon Park, Coventry CV1 3BH to consider the case of Mr Graham Angell.

The panel members were Mr Brian Hawkins (teacher panellist – in the chair), Dr Angela Brown (lay panellist) and Mr Melvyn Kershaw (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Tom Walker, employed barrister of Blake Morgan LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the National College was Ms Laura Hackney employed barrister of Browne Jacobson solicitors.

Mr Graham Angell 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 1 February 2017.

It was alleged that Mr Graham Angell was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that whilst employed as the Executive Head Teacher of Sandwell Community School (“the School”) he:

1. Used his position as Executive Headteacher to treat Individual A more favourably than other members of staff in that he:-
 - a) Appointed Individual A to an ‘acting-up’ role as a Pupil Engagement Manager between September 2013 until August 2014, this role having not been advertised or offered to other members of staff
 - b) Increased the pay Band for the Pupil Engagement Manager to Pay Band F when he was advised by the School’s business manager that the role was commensurate to Pay Band E
 - c) Increased the salary for the role of Pupil Engagement Manager, by increasing the scale point and/or the annual days of employment, when Individual A was appointed to the role in September 2014
 - d) Provided funding, via the School, for Individual A to undertake her QTLS qualification
 - e) Permitted Individual A to bring her dog onto school premises, in school hours
2. Failed to follow the School’s policies and procedures in the recruitment of staff, including:
 - a) Individual B when appointed in September 2015
3. Allowed Individual A to bring a dog onto school premises without an appropriate risk assessment being conducted
4. Falsified a lesson observation of Individual A dated 20.01.09
5. Made, for the benefit of Individual A, false or misleading representations to the relevant professional body for awarding the QTLS qualification
6. In doing 4-5 above, he acted dishonestly in that he deliberately provided false or misleading information to assist Individual A in obtaining her QTLS qualification.

Before the start of the hearing, the panel was provided with a Statement of Agreed and Disputed Facts signed by the NCTL and Mr Angell ("the Agreed Statement"). The Agreed Statement did not include any allegation admitted in full and the allegations in this case were not taken to be admitted.

C. Preliminary applications

Further evidence

The panel considered an application by the NCTL to submit additional documents not forming part of the bundle, namely the Statement of Agreed and Disputed Facts, a pupil observation report, an OFSTED Report dated 2014 and an email chain dated 6 July 2017 between the NCTL and Mr Angell.

The panel has received and accepted legal advice in relation to the admissibility of evidence at hearings. The panel was directed to the following document: 'Teacher Misconduct - Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession' (hereafter referred to as "the Rules"). The relevant sections of the Rules are 4.18 to 4.20.

Mr Angell and the NCTL agree to the admission of these documents. The documents are clearly relevant and there is no unfairness in their admission. The panel notes that the documents in question may require some clarification in the course of the hearing to enable consideration of the weight to attach to these documents. However, for present purposes, the panel admits these documents.

Proceeding in Absence

The presenting officer applied to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Mr Angell.

After hearing submissions from the presenting officer, and receiving legal advice, the panel announced the decision as follows.

The panel is satisfied that the Notice of Proceedings has been served in accordance with Rule 4.11.

The panel is satisfied that Mr Angell is aware of the proceedings. Mr Angell has responded to the Notice of Proceedings and has had a number of communications with the NCTL. Indeed, Mr Angell has signed a Statement of Facts in which he confirms that he does not wish to attend the hearing.

However, the panel also notes that Mr Angell some three weeks before the hearing, became aware that his legal representative was unable to represent him due to ill health. The panel also notes the email of Mr Angell dated 6 July 2017 in which Mr Angell describes being 'worn down' by these proceedings. In view of this, the panel decided to hear further detailed submissions from the presenting officer and her colleague, Mr Cullen of Browne Jacobson Solicitors, as to whether they were aware of any

circumstances in which it might be said that Mr Angell was acting under any duress or pressure in either agreeing the Statement of Agreed Facts which expresses his intention not to attend the hearing, or in absenting himself today, such that it could be said that Mr Angell's stance in relation to his intention to attend could be described as equivocal. The panel also wanted to be satisfied that Mr Angell had been offered an opportunity to adjourn this case had he wanted to attend and/or seek alternative representation.

Mr Cullen gave evidence that Mr Angell attended a meeting with him and the Presenting Officer on 6 July 2017 in which the Statement of Agreed Facts was signed. Mr Cullen stated that Mr Angell expressed his intention not to attend the hearing.

Mr Cullen confirmed that there was no indication that Mr Angell was under any pressure to agree to any Statement of Agreed Facts, or to the hearing proceeding without him. Mr Cullen also indicated that Mr Angell had availed himself of the opportunity to have further legal advice, albeit he attended the meeting alone. Mr Angell was also offered an opportunity to apply to adjourn this case if he so wished for any reason, but did not avail himself of that offer. The panel accepts this evidence.

The panel notes that the NCTL witnesses are ready to attend and there is a strong public interest in continuing. Having heard submissions and evidence, the panel was satisfied having regard to all the circumstances, that Mr Angell has voluntarily absented himself from the proceedings today and it is in the public interest to proceed.

Amend the charges

The NCTL made an application to amend the charges in the case by deleting two of the allegations, and substituting the words 'Pupil Well-being Support Worker' with 'Pupil Engagement Manager' in Allegation 1. Mr Angell agreed to this proposed amendment. The panel received legal advice and accepted that advice. The panel was of the view that amending the charges in accordance with Rule 4.56 caused no unfairness, was in the interests of justice and agreed to the application.

D. Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology and anonymised pupil list – pages 2 to 3

Section 2: Notice of Proceedings and response – pages 7 to 10

Section 3: NCTL witness statements – pages 16 to 21

Section 4: NCTL documents – pages 22 to 895

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 896 to 919

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

1. Statement of Agreed and Disputed Facts;
2. A pupil observation report;
3. OFSTED Report dated 2014;
4. Email chain dated 6 July 2017 between the NCTL and Mr Angell.

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

Witnesses

The panel heard oral evidence from:

Mr Andrew Cullen, Browne Jacobson Solicitors

Witness A, HR Consultant at SIPS Education

Witness B, School Business Manager, Sandwell Community School

Witness C, HLTA, Sandwell Community School 2007-2016

Witness D, Art Teacher, Sandwell Community School

Witness E, Deputy Headteacher, Sandwell Community School.

Mr Angell was not present and did not give oral evidence.

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.

Mr Angell was the Executive Head Teacher of Sandwell Community School, which was formed in April 2013 following the amalgamation of 5 Pupil Referral Units. The separate units formed 5 different campuses, as follows (previous names in brackets): Wednesbury (Woden's Rise); Tividale (Oakham), West Bromwich (the Bridge), Tipton (Batman's Hill) and Smethwick (Ruskin). Mr Angell had previously acted as Head Teacher for West Bromwich (from 2012), and before that Wednesbury.

This case relates to allegations that Mr Angell acted in breach of relevant policies and procedures and the Teachers' Standards in relation to the appointment of Individuals A and B to roles within Sandwell Community School.

In particular, Mr Angell is alleged to have treated Individual A more favourably than other members of staff by appointing her without giving other members of staff the opportunity to apply for the role, and thereafter assisted Individual A to improve her pay rates without justification.

It is also alleged that Mr Angell provided funding to Individual A to complete her QTLS qualification when equivalent benefits were not conferred on other members of staff. It is also alleged that Mr Angell allowed Individual A to bring her dog onto school premises, that demonstrated favourable treatment to that individual, and was also done without any appropriate assessment of risk. Finally, Mr Angell is alleged to have dishonestly falsified documents and made false statements to support Individual A's QTLS qualification process.

Findings of fact

Our findings of fact are as follows:

Allegations proven

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

That whilst employed as the Executive Headteacher of Sandwell Community School ("the School") you:

1. Used your position as Executive Headteacher to treat Individual A more favourably than other members of staff in that you:-

- a) Appointed Individual A to an 'acting-up' role as a Pupil Engagement Manager between September 2013 until August 2014, this role having not been advertised or offered to other members of staff.**

Mr Angell accepts in the Statement of Agreed Facts that Individual A was appointed to an 'acting up' role as a Pupil Engagement Manager without the role being advertised or offered to other members of staff, but does not accept that this amounted to using his position as Executive Headteacher to treat Individual A more favourably than other members of staff.

The panel accepts that the role was not advertised or offered to other members of staff, and the admission of Mr Angell is consistent with the other evidence in the case.

The panel has to determine whether such an action resulted in favourable treatment to Individual A. In approaching this issue, the panel has assessed the extent to which Individual A was treated differently from other individuals without any objective justification.

In consequence, the panel has considered whether such roles were advertised or offered to members of staff generally.

Mr Angell states that such roles were normally not advertised and Individual A was employed by him on an experimental basis.

The panel heard conflicting evidence from the NCTL witnesses as to whether such posts were normally advertised or offered to other members of staff. The panel heard oral evidence from Witness E, Deputy Head, who stated that such roles were not always advertised and gave an example of another post which had not been offered to other members of staff or advertised. The panel accepted her evidence and found her to be a credible witness with many years of experience in mainstream schools and Pupil Referral Units.

However, the panel also heard credible evidence from Witness E that three other candidates were much better placed to take up the Pupil Engagement Manager position. Witness E stated that each of the other three individuals were more experienced, and indeed, had in her view, demonstrated greater aptitude than Individual A for the post in question and would have been better candidates. The panel did not find it necessary to reach a finding as to the veracity of Witness E's views on Individual A's aptitude but accepted that there were other candidates who were more experienced and thus objectively would have been at the very least potential recruitment options for the Pupil Engagement Manager post.

Mr Angell states in his written statement that his focus in recruiting for the post was on attitude rather than simply qualifications. Mr Angell states in the Statement of Agreed Facts that the appointment of Individual A was experimental. It is not clear to the panel whether Mr Angell was referring to the creation of the post as experimental, or whether he was referring to the appointment of Individual A as experimental.

However, in any event, and in circumstances where there are other candidates who have greater experience, this heightens the need for proper transparent processes in the event of experimental appointments to experimental posts. If a post or appointment is experimental, in the panel's view, this increases the need to ensure that the individual appointed has proper experience and attitude. In turn, this heightens the need for a transparent recruitment process in which posts are advertised and/or offered to other members of staff who may be suitable for the post. If Mr Angell was going to seek to appoint for this post on the basis of attitude, then this should have been absolutely plain to all staff who may have been eligible to apply.

Mr Angell failed to offer the post in question to such candidates, or advertise the post more generally. Similarly, there is no evidence that the appointment of Individual A was ever discussed at Senior Management Meetings. Furthermore, there is no evidence that Mr Angell did at any point justify his appointment of Individual A on the basis of any objective criteria.

In consequence the panel is satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that this treatment has resulted in Mr Angell treating Individual A more favourably than other members of staff.

1. Used your position as Executive Head Teacher to treat Individual A more favourably than other members of staff in that you:-

- c) Increased the salary for the role of Pupil Engagement Manager, by increasing the scale point and/or the annual days of employment, when Individual A was appointed to the role in September 2014**

Mr Angell admits in the Statement of Agreed Facts that he increased the scale point and the annual days of employment for Individual A following her appointment to the role. The appointment particulars were dated 28 August 2014 (page 245 of the bundle) and these provided a Spinal Point of 33 with a 47.4 week contract. Mr Angell accepts that he emailed the Local Authority on 2 September 2014 at 10:53 and requested that the salary be amended to a Spinal Point of 34 (page 247). Mr Angell then at 11:53 on the same day emailed the Local Authority to ask that the contract be amended to a 52 week contract.

Mr Angell's position is that the increase in the Spinal Point was to take account of the fact that Individual A had been acting up for some time, and also to reflect the fact that she would lose her SEN allowance.

Similarly, the panel is not satisfied that there was a proper assessment by Mr Angell as to what recompense, if any, would be due to Individual A in the event of her losing her SEN allowance or for acting up. Indeed, certainly in the case of recompense for 'acting up', the panel is of the view that an increase in the Spinal Point representing an increase in perpetuity would not be appropriate.

The panel rejects both of Mr Angell's explanations for increasing the Spinal Point as invalid. Furthermore, if there were such justifications, then they should have been expressly considered by the Senior Management Team or the Governing Body at the School. There was no evidence that such justifications were ever brought to the attention of the Senior Management Team, Governors or the Local Authority.

Mr Angell states that he had given an instruction to Witness B that all Pay Band E staff should be employed in full time roles and that this amendment was not limited to Individual A. Witness B gave evidence that this was not the case, and that Mr Angell had never directed this. Furthermore, Witness B stated in oral evidence that the only full time contracts were historic, with the majority of contracts being below 52 weeks (see also written statement at page 153). This position is supported by a matrix of staff costings at page 255 of the bundle (dated 15 October 2015) which confirms that the majority of education support staff were on under 52 week annual contracts.

Witness B also gave very clear oral evidence that she had not been consulted, or indeed involved at all by Mr Angell in the process of writing to the Local Authority to request amendments to Individual A's contract.

The panel accepted Witness B's evidence that there was no policy at the School to move staff to full time contracts, and nor had Mr Angell ever communicated such an intention to her. The panel also accepted that Mr Angell had failed to involve her, the School Business Manager, in the process of amending the pay rates and terms of Individual A's contract. Clearly, such amendments would have an impact on the School budget and Mr Angell should have involved Witness B in this process.

Indeed, the panel also found that Mr Angell has failed to provide an adequate justification not just for the amendments themselves, but also for why he personally chose to intervene in making an application to the Local Authority to amend Individual A's pay and contract terms without involving the very person that should have been central to such a process, namely the School Business Manager. The unavailability of the School Business Manager on a particular day is not adequate justification for such a course of action, because the amendments themselves, even if justified, did not require immediate and urgent attention.

The panel is satisfied that Mr Angell's actions in amending Individual A's pay and contract terms were not objectively justified. Furthermore, the panel is satisfied that there was no adequate justification for Mr Angell intervening personally in this scenario in the way that he did.

In consequence, the panel is satisfied on the balance of probabilities, that this allegation is proved. The panel is satisfied that Mr Angell treated Individual A more favourably than other members of staff in taking action which increased the salary of Individual A without objective justification.

1. Used your position as Executive Headteacher to treat Individual A more favourably than other members of staff in that you:-

d) Provided funding, via the School, for Individual A to undertake her QTLS qualification

Mr Angell accepts that Individual A's QTLS qualification was funded by the School, and that this was authorised by him. Mr Angell further accepts that other members of staff did not have their QTLS qualifications paid for, but states that he was not responsible for rejecting any funding applications made by other members of staff and would have given serious consideration to any requests made to him.

Mr Angell states that he offered to pay for three members of staff to complete a degree, to be followed by the QTLS. Individual A and one of the members of staff (Witness C) completed the degree, but only Individual A wished to continue to pursue the QTLS.

The panel heard oral evidence from Witness C that she had intended to pursue the QTLS but there were personal reasons which had prevented her from continuing with this course at that time. Witness C stated that she had subsequently enquired about funding to enable her to continue with her QTLS qualification but was told by her line manager that funding was not available.

There was through no direct evidence from Witness C that Mr Angell himself had personally refused to fund her QTLS. Witness C stated that she had been informed by her line manager that Mr Angell had told her that he had made the decision that there would be no funding available for her QTLS. However, that line manager did not give evidence, oral or written, and the panel was unable to place any weight on such a statement.

The panel also heard evidence from Witness D, an Art Teacher, that she had pursued the QTLS qualification, but that she had funded this herself. Witness D stated that she had asked Witness E about funding by the School, but Witness E had informed her that no such funding was available.

However, Witness E stated in oral evidence that she did not discuss this with Mr Angell personally, and the panel is thus not satisfied that any decision in relation to funding Witness D's QTLS qualification was made personally by Mr Angell.

Witness D stated that she had told Mr Angell that she was pursuing the QTLS qualification and that Mr Angell responded by saying "about time too". The panel accepted Witness D's evidence. The panel takes the view that Mr Angell had knowledge that another member of staff, Witness D, additional to those he named in the Statement of Agreed Facts, was undertaking the QTLS qualification.

The panel accepts that there is no evidence that Mr Angell was personally asked by Witness C or Witness D for funding, or that he personally refused any additional relevant funding requests by other members of staff.

The panel appreciates Mr Angell's position as set out in the Statement of Agreed Facts that in funding Individual A he may have been honouring an agreement that had been made in respect of her. However, there was no evidence of any contractual agreement between the School and Individual A to provide funding.

However, Mr Angell was the Executive Head of the School. The panel is of the view that Mr Angell was aware that staff for whom he was responsible, namely Witness C, Witness D, and indeed Individual A, intended to undertake further professional development such as the QTLS course. In those circumstances, it was incumbent upon him to take a proactive role in ensuring that he had a clear picture of the current intentions of his staff, what those plans were, whether funding would be available and, if so, on what basis.

In the event that agreements, personal or otherwise, had been made with the three members of staff to fund their degree and QTLS courses, any attempt to honour an agreement with Individual A, even assuming that was the case, should have been accompanied by equivalent action in respect of the other two individuals. For example, Mr Angell should, at the very least, have discussed staff intentions and funding directly with them. There was no evidence of any such enquiry made by Mr Angell.

In the circumstances, Mr Angell has failed to address this issue in an effective and proactive manner. Whilst there is no evidence that Mr Angell directly caused other members of staff not to have their courses funded, there is clear evidence that he did not take any action to assess what their intentions were and to take action to ensure that funding of staff courses was dealt with on an equitable and transparent basis. This inaction is to be contrasted with the very clear steps taken by Mr Angell to ensure that the QTLS of Individual A was funded by the School (as confirmed in the oral and written evidence of Witness B that Mr Angell specifically directed this School to fund this QTLS).

The panel is satisfied on the balance of probabilities that this charge is proven and that Mr Angell has treated Individual A more favourably than other members of staff by facilitating the provision of funding, and thus providing the funding, for Individual A to undertake her QTLS qualification and not ensuring that other members of staff had access to the same opportunities.

2. Failed to follow the School's policies and procedures in the recruitment of staff, including:

a) Individual B when appointed in September 2015

Mr Angell accepts in the Statement of Agreed Facts that the School's Policies and Procedures were not followed when Individual B was appointed to the position of Mentor in September 2015 in that: "two references were not obtained and a written reference was not received from Individual B".

However, Mr Angell does not accept that he interviewed Individual B alone, stating that he was accompanied by Witness B and Individual C. Mr Angell also states that it was the responsibility of the School Business Manager, Witness B, to obtain the references, and that she had been asked to do so but failed.

Individual C's written statement does not address whether he was in fact involved in the interview process.

Witness B gave clear oral evidence that she was not aware of the proposed interview and possible recruitment of Individual B, was not present during the interview of Individual B and, furthermore, that she had not been asked to obtain references by Mr Angell.

Individual B gave a written statement which was admitted in evidence. Individual B states that Mr Angell interviewed him alone. Whilst the panel did not have the opportunity to cross-examine Individual B, they could apprehend no reason why Individual B may have been mistaken about this, or why he would not give an accurate account in relation to this narrow issue. The panel prefers the evidence of Individual B and Witness B in concluding that it is more likely than not that Mr Angell interviewed Individual B alone. However, this finding is not determinative of the allegation, but simply established in the panel's view that the interview process was not conducted in a formal manner by Mr Angell.

The panel accepts the evidence of Witness B that she was not aware of the intended recruitment of Individual B, and that she was not asked to obtain references. However, even had Witness B been asked to obtain references, it was incumbent upon Mr Angell to ensure that written references for Individual B were obtained in advance of the interview (wherever possible) and in any event prior to any decision relating to appointment. Mr Angell did not ensure that this was done.

The Equality Policy applied by the School refers to the need to ensure 'equality of opportunity' (pages 300 to 301). The Safeguarding and Child Protection Policy and Guidance refers to 'safer recruitment' principles and to the need to ensure two references are obtained (page 320). Although not expressly stated, the panel is of the view that the references required are written and not verbal.

The Safer Recruitment Principles also set out the need to ensure that potential candidates are subject to a robust recruitment process and that references are obtained before the interview "wherever possible" (page 383). In the recruitment of Individual B no advert or job description was given, no formal application was made, there was no formal interview and no written references were secured before the interview or at all. The panel notes Mr Angell states that he obtained a positive verbal reference from Individual B. The panel is of the view that this alone is insufficient to satisfy the applicable policies.

The panel is satisfied on the balance of probabilities that this allegation is proved, and that Mr Angell failed to follow the School's Policies and Procedures in the recruitment of Individual B.

3. Allowed Individual A to bring a dog onto school premises without an appropriate risk assessment being conducted

Mr Angell denies this allegation and states his view that the risk assessment (page 265) was appropriate and was accepted by the School's Business Manager who was "responsible for maintaining copies of the risk assessment".

The panel has had sight of the School Health and Safety Policy dated March 2015. The School Business Manager is not designated as having any particular role in respect of risk assessments (pages 344 to 345) and thus whether this was or was not 'accepted' by

the School Business Manager is not something that Mr Angell could necessarily pray in aid as a full answer to this allegation.

However, the panel heard evidence from Witness B that she regarded the risk assessment as inadequate on the basis that it did not identify allergies to dogs as a potential risk to pupils or staff. Witness B also explained that at least one member of staff did have an allergy to dogs, and was thus exposed to a potential risk which had clearly not been appropriately assessed or controlled. The panel finds that the risk assessment was not in fact accepted by the School Business Manager.

The panel notes that the School Health and Safety Policy provides guidance on assessing risks, and that hazards and categories of individuals who may be exposed to such hazards should be identified. The risks posed to pupils or employees by possible allergic reactions to dogs was an obvious risk and it should have been identified as such on the risk assessment. Similarly, the panel is of the view that other risks posed by dogs, for example, diseases and parasitic infections, were not identified or assessed. These risks were absent from the risk assessment and this represents a fundamental flaw.

The panel is thus satisfied on the balance of probabilities that this allegation is proven, and that Mr Angell allowed Individual A to bring her dog onto school premises without an appropriate risk assessment being conducted.

4. Falsified a lesson observation of Individual A dated 20.01.09

Mr Angell denies this allegation and states that he did observe Individual A on 20 January 2009. However, Mr Angell states that he transposed the contents of the original observation on to the form at page 209 and removed any comments that "would not have been" relevant for QTLS qualification. The caveats expressed by Mr Angell do not feature on this form by way of commentary or explanation.

The original notes that Mr Angell states he took have not been retained. The document has been signed on the basis that in 2009, Individual A was a teacher employed by Sandwell Community School, an organisation that did not exist until April 2013. Furthermore the document has been signed and dated by Mr Angell and Individual A on the basis that the signatures were made on 20 January 2009. Even on Mr Angell's account then, the lesson observation (page 209) had been falsified in as far as it purported to be a composite document completed, and signed, on 20 January 2009 in relation to a lesson at Sandwell Community School, when this was not the case.

However, the panel has doubts as to the credibility of Mr Angell's account. For example the panel does not understand how it can be said that any notes of a lesson observation relating to a QTLS candidate could properly be said to be not relevant to a QTLS qualification. The panel notes that Mr Angell provides no further explanation as to what these edited comments were, or why they were not relevant.

The panel heard oral evidence from Witness E and found her to be a measured and credible witness, who responded to questions in a considered and balanced manner. Witness E, when questioned by the panel, identified a number of issues relevant to the veracity of the observation recorded at page 205.

Witness E stated that Individual A was not actually teaching or performing the role described in 2009 on her own. On the contrary, Witness E stated that Individual A had repeatedly stated her reluctance at that time to involve herself in teaching activities.

Witness E also stated that the terminology used on the form was "strange". For example, Home Economics (the subject referred to on the form) was not a term used in 2009 in that school. Witness E stated that the term 'cooking' would have been used, and also stated that even had Individual A been involved in such lessons, the assessment of objectives would not in practice have been as formal as is suggested by the form. For example, the form refers to "expectations in learning" and "clear differentiation through planning and delivery". Witness E stated that such comments would not have been applicable for cooking classes concerning the small groups of pupils who would have participated in such activities at that time.

Witness E also stated that the form itself was not used in 2009 as the School did not exist by the name endorsed on the form used by Mr Angell, and nor in fact would any observation have occurred at the campus referred to.

Witness C also gave evidence that she never saw Mr Angell conducting lesson observations at that time.

In all the circumstances, the panel is satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the lesson observation form was false and is so satisfied even on the basis that Mr Angell's account is to be accepted.

However, the panel does not accept Mr Angell's account. The panel accepts the evidence of Witness E that the form contains a number of irregularities. In consequence, the panel is satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the lesson observation form was false, first and foremost because it purported to refer to an observation which never in fact took place. This allegation is found proved on the basis that the lesson observation never took place and that Mr Angell falsified the lesson observation of Individual A dated 20 January 2009.

5. Made, for the benefit of Individual A, false or misleading representations to the relevant professional body for awarding the QTLS qualification

Mr Angell does not accept this allegation and contends that his statement in a reference provided as part of the portfolio for Individual A's QTLS qualification was accurate.

The relevant statement is within the bundle at pages 208 to 209 and pages 549 to 550 (QTLS portfolio):

"[Since joining in April 2007 .. Individual A] has assumed the role of mentor, LSP and a full member of the teaching staff and has coped very well with a full teaching timetable".

The timetable set for September 2012, the academic year prior to the year when the application was made, makes it clear that Individual A did not have a full teaching timetable (page 213). Witness E also gave oral evidence, which the panel accepted, that Individual A had not been involved as a full member of the teaching staff in terms of having full responsibilities "for lesson planning, delivery, assessment and outcomes" in the 5 years up to 2013 when the application was made.

The statement made by Mr Angell was both false and misleading in that it significantly overstated the actual position, and exaggerated the true extent of Individual A's involvement in teaching. This statement was also submitted to the relevant professional body which awarded the QTLS qualification on behalf of Individual A.

The panel is satisfied that this allegation is proved on the balance of probabilities, and that Mr Angell made, for the benefit of Individual A, false or misleading representations to the relevant professional body for awarding the QTLS qualification.

6. In doing 4-5 above, you acted dishonestly in that you deliberately provided false or misleading information to assist Individual A in obtaining her QTLS qualification

The panel found allegation 4 proved and turned to consider this first. The panel found that Mr Angell created a false record of a lesson observation which never took place and, furthermore, did so intending that others may rely on it as a true document to assess the skills and experience of Individual A.

The panel is satisfied that these actions would be regarded as dishonest by the standards of ordinary reasonable people, and indeed by the standards of a teaching professional in Mr Angell's position. The panel is satisfied that the conduct of Mr Angell was objectively dishonest.

The panel then turned to consider the subjective element of the dishonesty test. The failures of Mr Angell were obvious and clear. Mr Angell completed a document for a lesson observation which did not take place. The panel is satisfied that Mr Angell was aware that his conduct was dishonest by the standards of ordinary reasonable people, and therefore was subjectively dishonest.

The panel found allegation 5 proved and so turned to consider that. The panel found that Mr Angell provided a statement to a relevant professional body which awarded the QTLS qualification which was both false and misleading in that it did not give an accurate account of Individual A's actual teaching experience.

The panel is satisfied that these actions would be regarded as dishonest by the standards of ordinary reasonable people, and indeed by the standards of a teaching

professional in Mr Angell's position. The panel is satisfied that the conduct of Mr Angell was objectively dishonest.

The panel then turned to consider the subjective element of the dishonesty test. Mr Angell was an experienced teacher and would have recognised the importance of accuracy in such statements, and the potential consequences of inaccuracy. The panel is satisfied that Mr Angell, by giving a false and misleading statement, was aware that his conduct was dishonest by the standards of ordinary reasonable people, and therefore was subjectively dishonest.

The panel finds this allegation proven on the balance of probabilities in relation to the conduct described at both allegations 4 and 5, and the conduct in respect of both allegations was dishonest.

Allegations not proven

The panel has found the following particulars of the allegations against you not proven, for these reasons:

1. Used your position as Executive Headteacher to treat Individual A more favourably than other members of staff in that you:-

b) Increased the Pay Band for the Pupil Engagement Manager to Pay Band F when you were advised by the School's Business Manager that the role was commensurate to Pay Band E

The panel notes that the Pay Band was determined by the Local Authority upon receipt of a job description, and that it would be the Local Authority, as opposed to Mr Angell, who actually 'increased' the Pay Band. However, the panel is satisfied that making an application to the Local Authority to re-evaluate an amended job description in circumstances where one is dissatisfied with the initial Pay Band, is inevitably conducted with the intention to facilitate an increase in the Pay Band.

Indeed, Mr Angell accepts in the Statement of Agreed Facts that he had a role in making an application to the Local Authority for a job evaluation, the purpose of which was to fix the pay banding for the role.

Mr Angell accepts that the initial job description that was submitted was graded at Pay Band E, but this job description was subsequently amended by Mr Angell and re-submitted, whereupon it was designated by the Local Authority as Pay Band F. Mr Angell states that he wanted the role to be Pay Band F as opposed to E, and indeed that was obviously the intention of his re-submission.

However, Mr Angell does not accept that he was advised by the School Business Manager that the Pupil Engagement Manager role was commensurate with Pay Band E.

The panel heard oral evidence from Witness B, the School Business Manager, that she informed Mr Angell of her views that the Pupil Engagement Manager role was commensurate with Pay Band E based on her assessment of other similar roles. The panel heard evidence that after an initial job description was submitted, it was returned by the

Local Authority having been assessed as Pay Band E. Witness B states that Mr Angell had already expressed his view that the post should be Pay Band F before this process. Following the initial response of the Local Authority, the job description was amended by Mr Angell and re-submitted.

The panel found the evidence of Witness B to be credible and preferred her evidence to that of Mr Angell, namely that she did inform Mr Angell of her view that the role was commensurate with Pay Band E, and that Mr Angell had a fixed idea that the post should be Pay Band F as opposed to E.

However, the views of the School Business Manager as to the appropriate banding are not necessarily determinative of the matter, nor indeed does the fact that she communicated these views to Mr Angell necessarily make any difference to the allegation which Mr Angell faces.

For example, there may be differing views as to an appropriate Pay Band for a particular role. The panel received no other detailed evidence to suggest that the amended Job Description produced by Mr Angell was flawed or inaccurate, or did not actually reflect the role being performed by Individual A. In sum, there was nothing to satisfy the panel that re-submitting an amended job description with a view to increasing the Pay Band from E to F was without any objective justification.

The panel is of the view that Mr Angell did not work collaboratively with colleagues, to include Witness B, in the course of this application process, nor did he raise this issue with Senior Management in meetings. Indeed, in doing so, Mr Angell has exposed himself to a justifiable inference that his actions may have been with a view to avoiding proper process and scrutiny. However, this does not assist in the resolution of the charge. The panel is not satisfied on the balance of probabilities that Mr Angell's actions were not without some objective justification, and thus cannot be satisfied that he has demonstrated favouritism to Individual A.

1. Used your position as Executive Headteacher to treat Individual A more favourably than other members of staff in that you:-

e) Permitted Individual A to bring her dog onto school premises, in school hours

The panel was satisfied that Mr Angell permitted Individual A to bring her dog onto school premises in school hours. Indeed, Mr Angell signed a risk assessment form (page 265) which confirms that he was aware of Individual A's intentions in this respect. Whilst the panel take the view that it was inappropriate to allow Individual A to bring a dog onto school premises, it was not satisfied that this represented Individual A receiving more favourable treatment than other members of staff. There was no evidence that other members of staff had asked to bring dogs onto school premises and been refused such permission by Mr Angell himself. In consequence, the panel finds this allegation not proved.

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 Mr Angell in relation to the facts found proven, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considers that by reference to Part Two, Mr Angell 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
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils’ well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions;
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others;
- 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 Mr Angell fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession in relation to the facts found proven.

Allegation 1

In relation to allegations 1 a., 1 c., and 1 d., the panel has found that Mr Angell has breached the expectations set out in Part Two of the Teachers' Standards to a significant extent. By demonstrating favouritism towards Individual A in relation to appointments, applications for salary increases and funding opportunities, Mr Angell failed to ensure equality of opportunity at the School. Furthermore, his actions undermined staff morale and had a negative impact on the teaching environment.

The panel has also had regard to Part One of the Teachers' Standards, paragraph 8 which sets out the responsibilities of teachers to fulfil wider professional responsibilities:

- make a positive contribution to the wider life and ethos of the school;
- develop effective professional relationships with colleagues, knowing how and when to draw on advice and specialist support.

The panel is satisfied that Mr Angell has seriously breached these standards in relation to allegation 1.

The panel regards Mr Angell's actions at allegation 1 to be serious, and to amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel notes that this conduct took place within an education setting, and involved specific management actions and omissions within this context. However, the panel is of

the view that these actions would be likely to seriously impact the public perception of the profession and thus finds that the conduct at allegation 1, whilst unacceptable professional conduct, also amounts to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Allegation 2

In relation to allegation 2, the panel has found that, by failing to follow School Policies and Procedures in relation to the recruitment of Individual B, Mr Angell has breached the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - 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 ...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel notes that there is no evidence that the failures in the case of allegation 2 resulted in any actual risk to pupils. However, the panel is of the view that the failures to follow policies, in particular safer recruitment principles, had the potential to put pupils at risk and amounts to unacceptable professional conduct.

The findings of misconduct in relation to allegation 2 are serious and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public perception. In consequence the panel finds that the actions amount to conduct which may bring the profession into disrepute.

Allegation 3

In relation to allegation 3, the panel has found that, by failing to prepare an appropriate risk assessment in relation to Individual A bringing her dog onto school premises, Mr Angell has breached the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - 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 ...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel heard evidence that another member of staff brought her dog onto school premises on a single occasion. However, this was on an isolated occasion after the end of a school day, and was distinct in nature and degree from the actions of Individual A, who brought her dog onto school premises routinely.

Indeed, the purported intention of the risk assessment which was produced was to identify and control the risks posed by Individual A bringing her dog onto school premises routinely. The panel has found that the risk assessment was inappropriate and neither identified all the risks in question, nor identified all adequate control measures. The panel is of the view that Mr Angell's conduct gave rise to a situation in which pupils and employees were exposed to a potential risk to their health and safety. The panel regards the conduct at allegation 3 as so serious as to amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

The findings of misconduct in relation to allegation 3 are serious and the conduct displayed would likely have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public perception. In consequence the panel finds that the actions amount to conduct which may bring the profession into disrepute.

Allegations 4 to 6

The panel has also considered whether Mr Angell's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 8 and 9 of the Advice. The panel has found that in relation to allegations 4 and 5, Mr Angell has displayed serious dishonesty.

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. The panel is of the view that honesty and integrity are fundamental values of the profession. The panel is satisfied that Mr Angell has acted without honesty or integrity in relation to allegations 4 and 5. Accordingly, the panel is satisfied that Mr Angell is guilty of unacceptable professional conduct in relation to allegations 4, 5 and 6.

As with the matters found proven at allegations 1 to 3, 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 findings of misconduct in relation to allegations 4 to 6 are serious and the conduct displayed would likely have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public perception. In consequence the panel finds that the actions at allegations 4 to 6 amount to conduct which may bring the profession into disrepute.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of both 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 protection of pupils; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

There is a strong public interest consideration in the protection of pupils given the panel's findings in relation to Mr Angell's failures to have regard to accepted School policies in relation to recruitment and safeguarding (allegation 2), and health and safety (allegation 3). There is a strong public interest consideration in the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct for the same reasons.

There is also a strong public interest consideration in declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct in relation to the failures the panel found proved at allegations 1, and 4 to 6.

Similarly, the panel considers that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Angell were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession. The panel considered that the conduct found against Mr Angell was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

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 dishonesty.

The panel also found that Mr Angell's conduct represented the following:

- a serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards.

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.

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 Mr Angell.

The panel has reminded itself of the principle of proportionality and in particular the principle that in certain cases a Prohibition Order may not be proportionate or appropriate and that a finding of unacceptable professional conduct may represent a sufficient sanction in itself (as referred to in the case of *Wallace and Secretary of State for Education* [2017] EWHC 109 (Admin)).

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 Mr Angell. The panel had regard to the fact that Mr Angell was an experienced teacher with a good teaching record. The panel noted that both Individual D (page 141) and Witness C (page 175) had positive things to say about Mr Angell's teaching contributions. The panel accepts that Mr Angell was a well-regarded teacher.

As set out above, the panel notes that Mr Angell was an experienced teacher with a good teaching record. However, his actions were not conducted under any duress. Furthermore, the panel has not been provided with any evidence by Mr Angell that he has demonstrated any insight into his actions.

The panel is of the view that the conduct is so serious that a prohibition order is both proportionate and appropriate.

Mr Angell's conduct at allegation 1 involved mismanaging financial arrangements in a manner favourable to a particular member of staff, Individual A, to the possible detriment of other members of staff. This had a negative impact on those other members of staff and the teaching environment generally, and at the very least represented a failure to manage resources appropriately for the benefit of the school community as a whole.

Mr Angell's conduct at allegations 4 to 6 also involved him dishonestly creating false records and making false statements on behalf of Individual A to a body entrusted with awarding teaching qualifications to applicants. These actions fundamentally undermine the values of the teaching profession, and values of honesty and integrity generally.

The panel has decided that the public interest considerations outweigh the interests of Mr Angell. The severity of the conduct overall, but with particular reference to allegations 1, and 4 to 6, was a significant factor in forming that opinion. The panel is of the view that, notwithstanding Mr Angell's good record, and the impact that the loss of his job will

undoubtedly have had upon him, a public finding of unacceptable professional conduct or conduct which may bring the profession into disrepute would not be sufficient or in the public interest. 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 it to decide to recommend that a review period of the order should be considered. The panel was mindful that the Advice directs 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. These behaviours include serious dishonesty.

The panel has found that Mr Angell has been responsible for serious dishonesty in relation to allegations 4 and 5. However, the panel was also of the view that this misconduct was specific in nature, and in particular related to action performed in relation to Individual A. In sum, the conduct, whilst serious, took place in a specific context, and was committed by a teacher who had a wealth of experience, and was otherwise well-regarded.

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 provisions for a review period of two years.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

In considering this case I have given very careful attention to the advice that is published by the Secretary of State concerning the prohibition of teachers.

In this case the panel has found the majority of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. Where the panel has not found the allegations proven, I have put those matters from my mind.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Angell should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of two years.

In particular the panel has found that Mr Angell 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

- having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions;
- showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others;
- 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 findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of serious dishonesty on the part of a headteacher.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself whether or not a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Mr Angell, and the impact that will have on him, is proportionate.

In this case I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children. The panel has observed in respect of Allegation 3 "Mr Angell's conduct gave rise to a situation in which pupils and employees were exposed to a potential risk to their health and safety." A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present. I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight which the panel sets out as follows, "the panel has not been provided with any evidence by Mr Angell that he has demonstrated any insight into his actions." In my judgement the lack of insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this risks future repetition of behaviour that the panel describes as "involved mismanaging financial arrangements in a manner favourable to a particular member of staff, Individual A, to the possible detriment of other members of staff. This had a negative impact on those other members of staff and the teaching environment generally, and at the very least represented a failure to manage resources appropriately for the benefit of the school community as a whole." In addition there was serious dishonesty found in relation to allegations 4 and 5. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, "These actions fundamentally

undermine the values of the teaching profession, and values of honesty and integrity generally.” The panel also finds that “public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Angell were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of serious dishonesty in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

I have had to consider that the public has a high expectation of professional standards of all teachers and that failure to impose a prohibition order might be regarded by the public as a failure to uphold those high standards. In weighing these considerations I have had to consider the matter from the point of view of an “ordinary intelligent and well-informed citizen.”

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of unacceptable professional conduct, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mr Angell himself. The panel comment that he “was an experienced teacher with a good teaching record.” The panel noted that “both Individual D (page 141) and Witness C (page 175) had positive things to say about Mr Angell's teaching contributions.” The panel “accepts that Mr Angell was a well-regarded teacher.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Angell from continuing that work. A prohibition order would also clearly deprive the public of his contribution to the profession for the period that it is in force.

In this case I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments concerning the lack of insight. The panel has also said that Mr Angell’s, “conduct at allegations 4 to 6 also involved him dishonestly creating false records and making false statements on behalf of Individual A to a body entrusted with awarding teaching qualifications to applicants.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Angell has made and is making to the profession. In my view it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision that is not backed up by insight does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

For these reasons I have concluded that a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest in order to achieve the aims which a prohibition order is intended to achieve.

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case the panel has recommended a 2 year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments, "this misconduct was specific in nature, and in particular related to action performed in relation to Individual A. In sum, the conduct, whilst serious, took place in a specific context, and was committed by a teacher who had a wealth of experience, and was otherwise well-regarded."

I have considered whether a 2 year review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession.

I consider in the circumstances that a two year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

This means that Mr Graham Angell is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. He may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 31 July 2019, 2 years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If he does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Mr Graham Angell remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

This order takes effect from the date on which it is served on the teacher.

Mr Graham Angell 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.



Decision maker: Alan Meyrick

Date: 24 July 2017

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