



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Ms Maddalena Reina: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

April 2019

Contents

A. Introduction	3
B. Allegations	4
C. Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	5
D. Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Findings as to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute	8
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	9
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	14

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

Teacher: Ms Maddalena Reina

Teacher ref number: 0248906

Teacher date of birth: 20 March 1978

TRA reference: 16686

Date of determination: 4 April 2019

Former employer: [Redacted]

A. Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 4 April 2019 at Cheylesmore House, Quinton Road, Coventry, CV1 2WT to consider the case of Ms Maddalena Reina.

The panel members were Ms Mary Speakman (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Maurice McBride (lay panellist) and Mr Mike Carter (former teacher panellist).

The legal advisor to the panel was Mr Delme Griffiths of Blake Morgan LLP, solicitors.

In advance of the meeting, the TRA agreed to a request from Ms Reina that the allegation be considered without a hearing after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice. Ms Reina provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, Ms Reina or her representative.

The meeting took place in private, save for the announcement of the panel’s decision, which was announced in public and recorded.

B. Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Meeting dated 21 March 2019.

It was alleged that Ms Reina was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that, whilst employed as a principal at the [Redacted] ("the School") from January 2016 until July 2017:

1. She demonstrated a lack of professional judgment in relation to Individual A, whom she knew was a convicted child sex offender, on one or more occasions, including;
 - a. On or around 21st February 2017, by allowing Individual A to be present whilst she engaged in a meeting with colleagues discussing work-related matters;
 - b. On or around 4th May 2017, by allowing Individual A onto the School's premises for approximately 9 hours;
 - c. On or around 4th May 2017, by allowing one or more pupils to be in the presence of Individual A;
 - d. On or around 4th May 2017, by failing to put in place a risk assessment and/or any additional measures to ensure the safety of the pupils when Individual A was present on the School's premises;
 - e. On or around 4th May 2017, by allowing Individual A access to her work iPad which provided open access to confidential material;
2. She was dishonest to the police on or around 26th May 2017, in that she told them and/or implied that Individual A had never been to the School, which was untrue.

Ms Reina admitted all of the allegations and that her conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

C. Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology and Anonymised Person List – pages 1 to 3;

Section 2: Notice of Referral, Response and Notice of Meeting – pages 4 to 23;

Section 3: Statement of Agreed Facts and Presenting Officer representations – pages 24 to 30;

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 31 to 148;

Section 5: Employment documents – pages 149 to 173; and

Section 6: Teacher documents – pages 174 to 183.

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

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Ms Reina on 10 January 2018.

D. Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

In advance of the meeting, the TRA agreed to a request from Ms Reina that the allegations be considered without a hearing.

The panel has 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 consider that such a direction was necessary or appropriate in this case.

The panel proceeded to carefully consider the case, having read all the documents, and reached a decision.

Ms Reina held the role of principal of [Redacted] ("the School") since January 2016. She was also the designated safeguarding lead of the School.

In May 2017, a referral was made by the police to the Waltham Forest Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO) regarding a relationship between Ms Reina and Individual A, a convicted sex offender.

The relationship had come to light following a proposed holiday Ms Reina and Individual A were intending to take. Individual A was required to notify the police if he wished to leave the country and it was identified that Ms Reina was due to accompany him. Ms Reina was subsequently invited to, and attended, a meeting at Edmonton police station on 26th May 2017, following which the LADO referral was made.

Ms Reina was subsequently suspended from her duties at the School and a disciplinary investigation was initiated. Prior to the conclusion of the disciplinary process Ms Reina resigned from her position by letter dated 12th July 2017. The disciplinary process

continued notwithstanding her resignation. Ms Reina was subsequently referred to the TRA.

In considering the allegations, the panel did not rely upon any findings made or opinions expressed in papers which formed part of the documentation for the investigation undertaken by the School. It formed its own, independent view of the allegations based on the evidence presented to it.

Findings of fact

Our findings of fact are as follows:

- 1. You demonstrated a lack of professional judgment in relation to Individual A, whom you knew was a convicted child sex offender, on one or more occasions, including;**
 - a. On or around 21st February 2017, by allowing Individual A to be present whilst you engaged in a meeting with colleagues discussing work-related matters;**
 - b. On or around 4th May 2017, by allowing Individual A onto the School's premises for approximately 9 hours;**
 - c. On or around 4th May 2017, by allowing one or more pupils to be in the presence of Individual A;**
 - d. On or around 4th May 2017, by failing to put in place a risk assessment and/or any additional measures to ensure the safety of the pupils when Individual A was present on the School's premises;**
 - e. On or around 4th May 2017, by allowing Individual A access to your work iPad which provided open access to confidential material;**

Ms Reina admitted the facts of allegations 1(a) to 1(e).

Ms Reina accepts that:

- She knew that Individual A was a convicted child sex offender.
- In relation to allegation 1(a), Individual A was present on 21st February 2017 when two colleagues were in attendance at her home for a planned off-site senior leadership team (SLT) work day and when work-related matters concerning the School were discussed.
- In relation to allegation 1(b), she allowed Individual A to remain on the School's premises for a period of approximately 9 hours on 4th May 2017, which was further evidenced by the School's entry system and CCTV recording.

- In relation to allegation 1(c), she allowed Individual A to come into contact with Pupil A and one other pupil during the course of 4th May 2017.
- In relation to allegation 1(d), she did not implement any risk assessment or any additional measures to ensure the safety of pupils during the time that Individual A was present on the School's premises.
- In relation to allegation 1(e), she allowed Individual A access to her work iPad through which he would have been able to access confidential material. The panel considered that this was a clear breach of the School's Code of Conduct Policy and Procedure.

Ms Reina also accepted that she demonstrated a lack of professional judgement in relation to Individual A.

The panel agreed and concluded that the evidence before it was consistent with Ms Reina's admissions.

It therefore found the facts of allegations 1(a) to 1(e) proved.

2. You were dishonest to the police on or around 26th May 2017, in that you told them and/or implied that Individual A had never been to the School, which was untrue.

Ms Reina admitted the facts of allegation 2.

Ms Reina accepted that, during the course of her meeting with the police on 26th May 2017, she explicitly stated and/or implied that Individual A had never attended the School, despite him having done so on 4th May 2017.

Ms Reina further accepted that this conduct was dishonest.

The panel considered the actual state of knowledge or belief of Ms Reina as to the facts before considering whether her conduct was dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people.

In light of her admissions and the supporting evidence, which was clear, the panel was satisfied that Ms Reina was dishonest by those standards. The panel concluded that her actions were deliberate and were intended to mislead.

Accordingly, the panel found allegation 2 proved.

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

Having found all of the allegations to have been proven, the panel went 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.

Ms Reina admitted that the facts found proven in relation to all of the allegations amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Whilst the panel took this admission into account, it formed its own judgment.

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

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Ms Reina in relation to the facts found proven, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considered that by reference to Part Two, Ms Reina 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:
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher’s professional position; and
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils’ well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions.
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Ms Reina amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession. Her conduct amounted to a serious safeguarding failure and presented a risk of harm to the pupils in her care. She also lied to the police in response to responsible and necessary enquiries. The public expect, and have a right to expect, that teachers will act with honesty at all times. Her conduct impacted upon the School and had the potential to impact on pupils and the School community.

The panel also considered whether Ms Reina's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 8 and 9 of the Advice.

The panel found that the offence of serious dishonesty is relevant given its findings.

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

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that Ms Reina is guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, which she readily admitted.

In considering whether Ms Reina's conduct may bring the profession into disrepute, the panel took into account the way 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 took 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 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.

The panel therefore found that Ms Reina's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, which she also admitted.

Having found the facts of allegations 1 and 2 proven, the panel further found that Ms Reina's conduct amounted to both unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, it went on to consider whether it was 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 is an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it was 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, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely: the protection of pupils and other members of the public; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and the declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In light of the panel's findings against Ms Reina, which involved serious safeguarding failings and dishonesty, there is a strong public interest consideration in respect of the

protection of pupils and others. Ms Reina had allowed a known sex offender onto the School's premises in circumstances where no steps were taken to manage the safeguarding risks. Ms Reina had demonstrated a concerning lack of professional judgment. She had also lied to the police when specifically asked if Individual A had attended the School.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Reina was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession. In addition to her safeguarding failures she had also acted dishonestly. These are serious matters and there is a strong public interest in maintaining public confidence in the profession in this case.

The panel also considered that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Ms Reina was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated. As principal and safeguarding lead at the School, Ms Reina was a role model and ought to have known what was expected of her. She fell significantly short of the standard of conduct expected of her.

Whilst there was no evidence that Ms Reina was anything other than a good teacher and there was some positive evidence in relation to her teaching practice, the panel did not consider there was a strong public interest in Ms Reina remaining in the teaching profession.

Notwithstanding the clear public interest considerations that were present, the panel considered carefully whether or not it would be proportionate to impose a prohibition order taking into account the effect that this would have on Ms Reina.

In carrying out the balancing exercise, the panel considered the public interest considerations as well as the interests of Ms Reina.

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 relevant in this case are:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- misconduct seriously affecting the well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving vulnerable pupils) or violation of the rights of pupils; and
- dishonesty.

Even though there were behaviours that would point to a prohibition order being appropriate, the panel went on to consider whether or not there were sufficient mitigating factors to militate against a prohibition order being an appropriate and proportionate measure to impose, particularly taking into account the nature and severity of the behaviour in this case.

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

- Ms Reina had a previous good history. She had a long career in education and an otherwise unblemished record. There was no evidence that Ms Reina had been subject to any previous regulatory or disciplinary proceedings. There was no evidence of any prior complaints in relation to her conduct.
- There were no complaints in relation to her teaching practice and there was some positive evidence of her practice.
- Ms Reina had fully engaged in these proceedings and made early admissions.
- Ms Reina has shown regret and remorse. In her statement to the panel Ms Reina stated:

"I failed and I accept that I failed, and I ask the panel to accept that my remorse and regret is sincere and genuine."

- Ms Reina had shown some insight into the effect of her conduct.
- Her actions appear to have been an isolated episode.
- Ms Reina indicated that she had experienced some difficulties in her personal life.

Weighed against these matters, the panel considered there were a number of aggravating factors, including:

- Ms Reina's actions were deliberate and she was not acting under duress.
- Her actions amounted to a clear breach of the Teachers' Standards and the panel had made serious findings, including that she had acted dishonestly.
- Ms Reina was an experienced principal and was safeguarding lead for the School. She ought to have known what was required of her and conducted herself accordingly.
- Whilst her actions may be viewed as a one-off episode, the potential repercussions were grave. Her conduct constituted a serious safeguarding breach that had the potential to cause harm. Given her experience, and as a senior leader with specific responsibility for safeguarding, Ms Reina should have set the highest standards and been an exemplary role model.

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

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

The panel was of the view that prohibition is both proportionate and appropriate and that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Ms Reina.

In particular, Ms Reina had allowed a known sex offender onto the School premises for an entire school day, during which time he came into contact with pupils and had access to a school iPad which contained sensitive and confidential data.

This was a serious safeguarding matter and was a matter of grave concern to the panel.

Prior to this, Ms Reina had also allowed Individual A to be present during a meeting at her home when work-related matters were discussed with her senior colleagues.

Ms Reina's actions presented a risk of harm to the pupils in her care. In the absence of any form of risk assessment, it was clear that Ms Reina had taken no steps to ensure the safety of her pupils. Whilst there was no evidence that Individual A had been left unsupervised for a prolonged period, Ms Reina could have been called away urgently at any moment and her behaviour presented clear and obvious risks.

Ms Reina's actions could also have impacted on the reputation of the School.

Further, Ms Reina had lied to the police, during a formal meeting at the police station, which the panel considered to be a particularly serious matter.

Ms Reina's failings were exacerbated by her extensive experience and her role as principal and safeguarding lead.

Accordingly, the panel recommends 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 advises that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances in any given case that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 2 years.

The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proven, would militate against a review period being recommended. These behaviours include serious dishonesty, which was present in this case.

In considering whether to recommend a review period, the panel took account of the mitigating circumstances present in this case.

In particular, there was evidence of insight and there was clear evidence of regret and remorse. Ms Reina clearly understood that she had let herself down.

Further, the conduct, whilst serious, could be properly characterised as a one-off episode in the context of an otherwise unblemished career. Whilst she had lied to the police in response to reasonable enquiries, the panel was prepared to accept, on balance, that she may have panicked and her conduct was not necessarily reflective of her character having regard to her prior good history. She had subsequently admitted her actions and the dishonesty was not maintained.

However, the panel considered that these matters were outweighed by the aggravating features in this case.

In particular, Ms Reina had allowed a known sex offender into the School, which was described as a special academy, and her conduct was at the more serious end of the spectrum.

It was also a matter of concern that her relationship with Individual A and his status as a sex offender only came to light following the police becoming involved.

Whilst the full extent of Individual A's criminal record and restrictions may not have been known to Ms Reina, it was not apparent that she made any enquiries in relation to his conviction or what restrictions may have been in place. At the very least she was aware that the offence was committed against a minor and the fact that Ms Reina allowed such an individual into the School was inexcusable. The associated risks should have been clear and obvious.

Further, when specifically asked by the police if Individual A had been to the School, Ms Reina lied.

On balance, the panel therefore concluded that its findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate and decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended without provision for a review period.

The panel concluded that the public interest considerations present in this case, for the reasons set out above, pointed heavily in favour of such an outcome.

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

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Ms Maddalena Reina should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Ms Reina is in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by:
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position; and
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions.
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of dishonesty related to a safeguarding issue. It involved dishonesty with the police.

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 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 Ms Reina, and the impact that will have on her, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children. The panel has observed, “Her conduct amounted to a serious safeguarding failure and presented a risk of harm to the pupils in her care.” 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, “there was evidence of insight and there was clear evidence of regret and remorse. Ms Reina clearly understood that she had let herself down.” The panel however go on to say that it, “considered that these matters were outweighed by the aggravating features in this case.” I have therefore given this view 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, “The findings of misconduct 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.”

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 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 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 Ms Reina herself. The panel comment “Ms Reina had a previous good history. She had a long career in education and an otherwise unblemished record. There was no evidence that Ms Reina had been subject to any previous regulatory or disciplinary proceedings. There was no evidence of any prior complaints in relation to her conduct. There were no complaints in relation to her teaching practice and there was some positive evidence of her practice. Ms Reina had fully engaged in these proceedings and made early admissions.”

A prohibition order would prevent Ms Reina from teaching and would also clearly deprive the public of her 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 serious nature of the behaviour. The panel has said, “Ms Reina had allowed a known sex

offender into the School, which was described as a special academy, and her conduct was at the more serious end of the spectrum.

It was also a matter of concern that her relationship with Individual A and his status as a sex offender only came to light following the police becoming involved.

Whilst the full extent of Individual A's criminal record and restrictions may not have been known to Ms Reina, it was not apparent that she made any enquiries in relation to his conviction or what restrictions may have been in place. At the very least she was aware that the offence was committed against a minor and the fact that Ms Reina allowed such an individual into the School was inexcusable. The associated risks should have been clear and obvious.

Further, when specifically asked by the police if Individual A had been to the School, Ms Reina lied."

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Ms Reina has made and indeed even to the expressed remorse and insight. The panel say, "Ms Reina had lied to the police, during a formal meeting at the police station, which the panel considered to be a particularly serious matter." The panel also say, "Ms Reina's failings were exacerbated by her extensive experience and her role as principal and safeguarding lead."

Having weighed all the factors in this case, I have decided to give significant weight to the seriousness of the behaviour, and in particular to the panel when they say, "Whilst her actions may be viewed as a one-off episode, the potential repercussions were grave. Her conduct constituted a serious safeguarding breach that had the potential to cause harm. Given her experience, and as a senior leader with specific responsibility for safeguarding, Ms Reina should have set the highest standards and been an exemplary role model."

In my view therefore it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession and to protect pupils. In this case, even where there is remorse and insight, the seriousness of the misconduct necessitates a prohibition order in the public interest.

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 that no provision should be made for a review period.

I have considered the panel's comments "On balance, the panel therefore concluded that its findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate and decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended without provision for a review period.

The panel concluded that the public interest considerations present in this case, for the reasons set out above, pointed heavily in favour of such an outcome.”

I have considered whether allowing for no 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, the factors that mean that a no review period is necessary to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession are, the serious safeguarding failures and the deliberate dishonesty to the police.

I consider therefore that allowing for a no review period is necessary to maintain public confidence and is proportionate and in the public interest.

This means that Ms Maddalena Reina is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children’s home in England. Furthermore, in view of the seriousness of the allegations found proved against her, I have decided that Ms Maddalena Reina shall not be entitled to apply for restoration of her eligibility to teach.

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

Ms Maddalena Reina has a right of appeal to the Queen’s Bench Division of the High Court within 28 days from the date she is given notice of this order.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'AL C M' followed by a checkmark-like flourish.

Decision maker : Alan Meyrick

Date: 17 April 2019

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