



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mrs Karen Bates: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

July 2022

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	5
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	9
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	13

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

Teacher:	Mrs Karen Bates
Teacher ref number:	0660852
Teacher date of birth:	6 September 1977
TRA reference:	19522
Date of determination:	18 July 2022
Former employer:	Hellesdon High School, Norfolk

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ('the panel') of the Teaching Regulation Agency ('the TRA') convened on 18 July 2022 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mrs Karen Bates.

The panel members were Mr Jeremy Phillips QC (lay panellist – in the chair), Ms Monique Harlin (teacher panellist) and Ms Shabana Robertson (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mrs Rebecca Utton of Birketts LLP solicitors.

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Mrs Bates that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mrs Bates provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted conviction of a relevant offence. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, Ms Ruth Miller of Fieldfisher, Mrs Bates or her representative Mr Kim Vollerthon of NASUWT.

The meeting took place in private by way of a virtual meeting.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 28 June 2022.

It was alleged that Mrs Bates was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:

1. On or around 13 December 2019, she was convicted of damaging property to the value of unknown but over five thousand pounds, belonging to Business A without lawful excuse, intending to destroy or damage such property or being reckless as to whether such property would be destroyed or damaged on or around 14 November 2019, contrary to sections 1(1) and 4 of the Criminal Damage Act 1971.
2. On or around 13 December 2019, she was convicted of assaulting Police Constable A, a constable in the execution of his duty on or around 14 November 2019, contrary to section 89(1) of the Police Act 1996.
3. On or around 13 December 2019 she was convicted of assaulting Police Constable B, an emergency worker, namely Police Constable, acting in the exercise of his functions as such a worker, by beating him, on or around 5 November 2019, contrary to section 39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988 and section 1 of the Assaults on Emergency Workers (Offences) Act 2018.
4. On or around 13 December 2019 she was convicted of assaulting Police Constable C, an emergency worker, namely Police Sergeant, acting in the exercise of his functions as such a worker, by beating him, on or around 5 November 2019, contrary to section 39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988 and section 1 of the Assaults on Emergency Workers (Offences) Act 2018.
5. On or around 13 December 2019 she was convicted of assaulting Police Constable D, an emergency worker, namely Police Constable, acting in the exercise of his functions as such a worker, by beating him, on or around 17 October 2019, contrary to section 39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988 and section 1 of the Assaults on Emergency Workers (Offences) Act 2018.
6. On or around 13 December 2019, she was convicted of, damaging property including a chest of drawers, blinds, two mirrors, drumkit, ornamental giraffe, lampshades, ornaments, wall, bedroom furniture, DVD player, oven, microwave, sundial to the value of over five thousand pounds, belonging to Person A without lawful excuse, intending to destroy or damage such property or being reckless as to whether such property would be destroyed or damaged, on or around 5 November 2019, contrary to sections 1(1) and 4 of the Criminal Damage Act 1971.

Mrs Bates admitted the facts of allegations 1 to 6 and that her behaviour amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence, as set out in the response to the notice of referral dated 10 November 2021 and in the statement of agreed facts signed by Mrs Bates on 2 February 2022.

Preliminary applications

There were no preliminary applications.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

- Section 1: Chronology, anonymised pupil list and list of key people – pages 1 to 2
- Section 2: Notice of referral, response and notice of meeting – pages 3 to 18
- Section 3: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 19 to 24
- Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 25 to 130
- Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 131 to 169

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the meeting.

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mrs Bates and the presenting officer on 2 February 2022.

Decision and reasons

The panel carefully considered the case and reached the following decision and reasons:

In advance of the meeting, the TRA agreed to a request from Mrs Bates for the allegations to be considered without a hearing. The panel had the ability to direct that the case be considered at a hearing if required in the interests of justice or in the public interest. The panel did not determine that such a direction was necessary or appropriate in this case.

Mrs Bates commenced employment as a teacher of humanities at Hellesdon High School ('the School') on 1 July 2007.

On 17 October 2019, Mrs Bates assaulted Police Constable D while they were attending an incident.

On 5 November 2019, Mrs Bates assaulted Police Constable B and Police Constable C while they were attending an incident in connection to property being damaged which belonged to Person A.

Ms Bates assaulted Police Constable A, on 14 November 2019, while they were attending an incident relating to property being damaged at Business A.

On 13 December, Mrs Bates was convicted and sentenced at Norfolk Magistrates Court of four counts of assaulting a police officer and two counts of property damage.

On 27 February 2020 the School held an internal investigation meeting regarding Mrs Bates' conduct. Mrs Bates and her representative were present during the meeting.

On 21 August 2020, Mrs Bates ceased employment at the School.

On 17 September 2020, the School referred the matter to the TRA.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

1. On or around 13 December 2019, you were convicted of damaging property to the value of unknown but over five thousand pounds, belonging to Business A without lawful excuse, intending to destroy or damage such property or being reckless as to whether such property would be destroyed or damaged on or around 14 November 2019, contrary to sections 1(1) and 4 of the Criminal Damage Act 1971.
2. On or around 13 December 2019, you were convicted of assaulting Police Constable A, a constable in the execution of his duty on or around 14 November 2019, contrary to section 89(1) of the Police Act 1996.
3. On or around 13 December 2019 you were convicted of assaulting Police Constable B, an emergency worker, namely Police Constable, acting in the exercise of his functions as such a worker, by beating him, on or around 5 November 2019, contrary to section 39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988 and section 1 of the Assaults on Emergency Workers (Offences) Act 2018.

4. On or around 13 December 2019 you were convicted of assaulting Police Constable C, an emergency worker, namely Police Sergeant, acting in the exercise of his functions as such a worker, by beating him, on or around 5 November 2019, contrary to section 39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988 and section 1 of the Assaults on Emergency Workers (Offences) Act 2018.
5. On or around 13 December 2019 you were convicted of assaulting Police Constable D, an emergency worker, namely Police Constable, acting in the exercise of his functions as such a worker, by beating him, on or around 17 October 2019, contrary to section 39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988 and section 1 of the Assaults on Emergency Workers (Offences) Act 2018.
6. On or around 13 December 2019, you were convicted of, damaging property including a chest of drawers, blinds, two mirrors, drumkit, ornamental giraffe, lampshades, ornaments, wall, bedroom furniture, DVD player, oven, microwave, sundial to the value of over five thousand pounds, belonging to Person A without lawful excuse, intending to destroy or damage such property or being reckless as to whether such property would be destroyed or damaged, on or around 5 November 2019, contrary to sections 1(1) and 4 of the Criminal Damage Act 1971.

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mrs Bates on 2 February 2022. In that statement of agreed facts, Mrs Bates admitted the particulars of allegations 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. Further, it was admitted by Mrs Bates that the facts of the allegations amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

The panel noted page 8 of the Teacher misconduct: The prohibition of teachers ('the Advice') which states that where there has been a conviction at any time, of a criminal offence, the panel will accept the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction, unless exceptional circumstances apply. The panel did not find that any exceptional circumstances applied in this case.

The panel had been provided with a copy of the certificate of conviction from Norfolk Magistrates Court which detailed that Mrs Bates had been convicted of two counts of unlawful damage to property and four counts of assault on a police officer.

In respect of the allegations, Mrs Bates was sentenced at Norfolk Magistrates Court on 30 January 2020 to a 12 month Community Order. The requirement of this order was to comply with a Rehabilitation Activity Requirement up to a maximum of 15 days. In addition, Mrs Bates was ordered to pay a victim surcharge in the sum of £90.

On examination of the documents before the panel, the panel was satisfied that the facts of allegations 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 were proven.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

Having found the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

In doing so, the panel had regard to the Advice.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mrs Bates, in relation to the facts it found proven, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that by reference to Part 2, Mrs Bates was 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
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy and the rule of law;
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel recognised that the offences had taken place outside of the education setting and had not involved pupils or other members of the School's staff. Nevertheless, for the reasons set out below, having considered all the facts of the case, the panel considered that Mrs Bates' convictions of assault and criminal damage were relevant to her profession as a teacher.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offences could have had an impact on the safety or security of pupils and/or members of the public. Whilst the panel acknowledged that the offences took place whilst Mrs Bates wasn't teaching, they considered the offences to be sustained and violent incidents occurring whilst under the influence of self-administered alcohol. Further, the panel was mindful that her behaviour was not a one off incident, there was a repetition of behaviour with offences being committed on separate dates. The panel considered that Mrs Bates had a duty to act as a role model. In addition, the panel were of the opinion that her actions fell significantly short of the standard of behaviour expected of a teacher.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mrs Bates behaviour in committing the offence could affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community.

The panel identified that the offences involved the use of violence, and noted the Advice states an offence involving violence is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel noted that Mrs Bates behaviour did not lead to a sentence of imprisonment. This was indicative to the panel that the offences were therefore not considered by the court to be at the most serious end of the spectrum.

The panel took into consideration Mrs Bates' submissions, and the corroborating evidence before them, which detailed the emotional difficulties she was suffering at the relevant time due to her [redacted].

The panel further noted that in the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mrs Bates on 2 February 2022, she admitted that the facts amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence. Notwithstanding her admission the panel, having considered all the evidence before them, was satisfied that Mrs Bates had been convicted of a relevant offence.

The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mrs Bates' ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding that these convictions were for relevant offences was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct and therefore maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mrs Bates was convicted of a relevant offence.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of a conviction of a relevant offence, it was 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 had to consider whether it would be an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it would be 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 had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely: the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct; and that prohibition strikes the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest, if they are in conflict.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mrs Bates which involved convictions for two counts of damaging property and four counts of assaulting a police officer, there was a strong public interest consideration in ensuring that public confidence in the profession is not weakened.

The panel decided that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Mrs Bates 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 Bates.

In carrying out the balancing exercise, the panel had regard to the public interest considerations both in favour of, and against, prohibition as well as the interests of Mrs Bates. 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 proved. 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; and
- 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 some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors. Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

The panel considered that Mrs Bates' actions had been deliberate. The panel noted from the documentary evidence provided by Mrs Bates that she had been both intoxicated and [redacted] at the time the offences were committed. The panel did not however consider this to mean that her actions had not been deliberate. The panel noted that Mrs Bates admitted her guilt.

There was no evidence presented to suggest that Mrs Bates was acting under extreme duress.

There was some evidence submitted to attest to Mrs Bates' previous history as a teacher. Otherwise, there was limited independent evidence to demonstrate that Mrs Bates had achieved exceptionally high standards in both her personal and professional conduct or has contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel considered that the following mitigating factors were present in the case:

- Mrs Bates took full responsibility for her behaviour, expressed deep remorse and regret and had insight into the effect of her actions. It was specifically noted that in her mitigation statement, dated 7 February 2022, Mrs Bates stated she "*never*

intended to hurt anyone and has deep empathy for those that have suffered as a result of her actions.”

- The panel was referred to several positive references within the bundle. The panel noted the consistent thread throughout these was Mrs Bates openness and honesty regarding her offences and her personal circumstances which led to their occurrence. Of particular note was the reference from [redacted] dated 27 January 2022, which stated when she successfully applied to [redacted] she disclosed all of her offences and fully engaged with resultant [redacted] DSS risk assessment.
- Mrs Bates had experienced a number of personal issues that had significantly affected her [redacted] which ultimately triggered her behaviour. The panel was impressed with how Mrs Bates had engaged with all help offered to her and as a result had addressed a number of underlying issues. The panel, in particular, took account of the report dated 8 April 2021 from Individual A [redacted] which made reference to [redacted].
- The panel noted a letter from Individual B [redacted] which confirmed that Mrs Bates had been [redacted]. Mrs Bates had been [redacted] and the letter outlined that [redacted].
- When sentencing Mrs Bates the District Judge made reference *“it is clear this spree of offending was a [redacted]. You have obviously had a terrible time of it”*. This corroborated Mrs Bates’ submissions to the panel that her actions were out of character.
- The panel noted the contents of the letter from Norfolk & Suffolk Community Rehabilitation Company, dated 24 March 2021, which stated that Mrs Bates had successfully completed and fully engaged with the requirements of the Community Order. It described how Mrs Bates had *“completed victim empathy work and fully accepted responsibility for offending and was able to identify the triggers that led to events.”*

The panel attributed significant weight to [redacted] Mrs Bates has experienced and the extensive rehabilitation steps that Mrs Bates has undertaken since her offending behaviour. However, the panel considered that the personal factors which triggered her use of alcohol and [redacted] could still be present and/ or reoccur. For example, Mrs Bates [redacted] has not been evidenced as having taken place.

The panel first considered whether it would be proportionate to conclude this case with no recommendation of prohibition, on the basis that the publication of the findings made by the panel would be sufficient.

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings was sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mrs Bates of prohibition.

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mrs Bates. The seriousness of the convictions involving violence and excessive alcohol consumption were significant factors in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made 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 to recommend that a review period of the order should be considered. The panel was mindful that the Advice states that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances, in any given case, that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than two years.

The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. The panel found that Mrs Bates was not responsible for any such behaviours.

The Advice also indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer review period. One of these behaviours include violence. The panel found that Mrs Bates was responsible for assaulting police officers on more than one occasion.

The panel considered that whilst the offences of violence were extremely serious, there had not been any misconduct in school or towards pupils and there was no evidence presented to the panel that any pupils had been put at risk. Based on the evidence which had been presented, the panel concluded that Mrs Bates had been a good teacher and neither her ability nor dedication to the teaching profession was in question. The panel further considered that, if Mrs Bates continued to acknowledge and undertake rehabilitation to apply suitable coping mechanisms to prevent her negative behaviours reoccurring in future, there may be a time when she would be able to positively contribute again to the teaching profession.

The panel decided that 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 two year review period.

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 also given very careful attention to the Advice that the Secretary of State has published concerning the prohibition of teachers.

In this case, the panel has found all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to a relevant conviction.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mrs Bates 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
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy and the rule of law;
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel finds that the conduct of Mrs Bates fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings are particularly serious as they include findings of assault and damage to property.

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 a less intrusive measure, such as the publication of adverse findings, 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 Mrs Bates, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children/safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, "The panel noted that the behaviour

involved in committing the offences could have had an impact on the safety or security of pupils and/or members of the public. Whilst the panel acknowledged that the offences took place whilst Mrs Bates wasn't teaching, they considered the offences to be sustained and violent incidents occurring whilst under the influence of self-administered alcohol. Further, the panel was mindful that her behaviour was not a one off incident, there was a repetition of behaviour with offences being committed on separate dates." A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, "Mrs Bates took full responsibility for her behaviour, expressed deep remorse and regret and had insight into the effect of her actions." I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have also placed considerable weight on the panel's comments in relation to a number of mitigating factors, including:

- "The panel was referred to several positive references within the bundle. The panel noted the consistent thread throughout these was Mrs Bates openness and honesty regarding her offences and her personal circumstances which led to their occurrence. Of particular note was the reference from [redacted] dated 27 January 2022, which stated when she successfully applied to [redacted] she disclosed all of her offences and fully engaged with resultant [redacted] DSS risk assessment."
- "Mrs Bates had experienced a number of personal issues that had significantly affected her [redacted] which ultimately triggered her behaviour. The panel was impressed with how Mrs Bates had engaged with all help offered to her and as a result had addressed a number of underlying issues The panel, in particular, took account of the report dated 8 April 2021 from Individual A, [redacted] which made reference to [redacted].
- "The panel noted a letter from Individual B [redacted] which confirmed that Mrs Bates had been [redacted]. Mrs Bates had been [redacted] and the letter outlined that [redacted]. [redacted].
- "When sentencing Mrs Bates the District Judge made reference "*it is clear this spree of offending was a [redacted]. You have obviously had a terrible time of it*". This corroborated Mrs Bates' submissions to the panel that her actions were out of character. "
- "The panel noted the contents of the letter from Norfolk & Suffolk Community Rehabilitation Company, dated 24 March 2021, which stated that Mrs Bates had successfully completed and fully engaged with the requirements of the Community Order. It described how Mrs Bates had "*completed victim empathy work and fully*

accepted responsibility for offending and was able to identify the triggers that led to events.””

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, “Conduct of this sort has the potential to damage the public's perception of, and trust in, the profession.” I am particularly mindful of the repeated findings of assault in this case and the impact that such findings have 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 the public might regard a failure to impose a prohibition order 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 the adverse findings, 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 Mrs Bates herself. The panel comment “There was some evidence submitted to attest to Mrs Bates’ previous history as a teacher. Otherwise, there was limited independent evidence to demonstrate that Mrs Bates had achieved exceptionally high standards in both her personal and professional conduct or has contributed significantly to the education sector.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mrs Bates from teaching and would also clearly deprive the public of her contribution to the profession for the period that it is in force.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mrs Bates has made 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, in light of the circumstances in this case, 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 intended aims of a prohibition order.

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

I have considered the panel’s comments “The Advice also indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer review period. One of these behaviours include violence. The panel found that Mrs Bates was responsible for assaulting police officers on more than one occasion.” The panel

also considered, “that whilst the offences of violence were extremely serious, there had not been any misconduct in school or towards pupils and there was no evidence presented to the panel that any pupils had been put at risk.”

I have considered whether a two 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. In this case, factors mean that allowing a two year review period is sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are, “The panel noted that Mrs Bates behaviour did not lead to a sentence of imprisonment. This was indicative to the panel that the offences were therefore not considered by the court to be at the most serious end of the spectrum”, and the panel commented that, “there may be a time when she (Mrs Bates) would be able to positively contribute again to the teaching profession”.

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

This means that Mrs Karen Bates 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 25 July 2024, two 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 Bates remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mrs Karen Bates 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.



Decision maker: John Knowles

Date: 19 July 2022

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