



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Andrew Grantham: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

July 2018

Contents

A. Introduction	3
B. Allegations	4
C. Preliminary applications	4
D. Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Witnesses	5
E. Decision and reasons	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	10
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:	Mr Andrew Grantham
Teacher ref number:	9247014
Teacher date of birth:	4 July 1970
TRA reference:	16596
Date of determination:	17 July 2018
Former employer:	Irlam and Cadishead College, Manchester (the “College”)

A. Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 16 and 17 July at 53 to 55 Butts Road, Earlsdon Park, Coventry CV1 3BH to consider the case of Mr Andrew Grantham.

The panel members were Ian Carter (teacher panellist – in the chair), John Matharu (lay panellist) and Alison Platts (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Rachael Pye of Eversheds Sutherland International LLP.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Naomh Gibson of Browne Jacobson LLP.

Mr Grantham was not present but was represented at the hearing by Tim Glover of ASCL Solicitors.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded, save for when evidence relating to sensitive personal information was mentioned and the hearing went into private session.

B. Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Proceedings dated 27 April 2018.

It was alleged that Mr Grantham was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that he:

1. Engaged in the maladministration of the 2016/17 BTEC level 1 / 2 Business Studies coursework in particular he:
 - a. Failed to submit one or more pupils' coursework by the required deadline of 15th May 2017;
 - b. Copied the work of one or more pupils to use as the work of another pupil;
 - c. Marked work as being properly completed when he knew or ought to have known parts of it had been copied and/or did not represent the pupils' own work;
 - d. Completed assessment decisions and/or observation records for work pupils had not undertaken;
 - e. Awarded one or more pupils as 'pass' and/or 'merit' without marking their work;
 - f. Asked and/or suggested that Individual A lie and/or provide an inaccurate report to the headteacher.
2. His conduct as alleged at allegation 1 above, if found proven, was dishonest and/or lacked integrity.

Mr Grantham admitted the allegations in their entirety in a signed Statement of Agreed Facts.

C. Preliminary applications

Proceeding in absence

The panel considered an application from the presenting officer to proceed in the absence of Mr Grantham. The panel considered the submissions of the presenting officer and received legal advice.

The panel also considered representations made by Mr Grantham's representative who stated that Mr Grantham did not mean any disrespect or discourtesy by absenting himself from the hearing. Mr Grantham's representative referred the panel to [Redacted].

The panel was satisfied that the TRA had complied with the service requirements of paragraph 19 a) to c) of the Teachers' Disciplinary (England) Regulations 2012, ("the Regulations"). The panel was also satisfied that the Notice of Proceedings complied with paragraphs 4.11 and 4.12 of the Teacher Misconduct: Disciplinary Procedures for the Teaching Profession ("the Procedures"). In making its decision the panel took account of the various factors drawn to its attention from the case of R v Jones [2003] 1 AC1.

The panel also had regard to the completed Notice of Proceedings form in which Mr Grantham stated he did not intend to appear at the hearing. The panel therefore considered that Mr Grantham had waived his right to be present at the hearing in the knowledge of when and where the hearing was taking place.

The panel determined to exercise its discretion under paragraph 4.29 of the Procedures to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Mr Grantham.

D. Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology and list of key people – pages 2 to 3

Section 2: Notice of Proceedings, Response and Statement of Agreed Facts – pages 5 to 19

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 21 to 26

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 28 to 177

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 179 to 205

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

Witnesses

The panel heard oral evidence from the following witness called on behalf of the TRA:

Witness A – [Redacted]

Mr Grantham was not present and called no witnesses.

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 Grantham had been employed at the College as a vice principal between 1 January 2017 and 30 June 2017. On 1 June 2017, the College received an email from the Pearson External Verified raising concerns about the BTEC Business Studies coursework sample that had not been received. On 15 June 2017, [Redacted] pupils informed the principal of the College that they were concerned that their coursework had not been submitted on time and that Mr Grantham had not given them feedback on their coursework. As a result, the College and the Pearson Exam Board carried out an investigation. This revealed a number of issues, including: students' work had been identified as achieving Pass or Merit without having been marked; photocopied work had been submitted and a number of students had identical photocopied assignments. Additionally, not all students had completed their coursework and at this point, the students had left the College for study leave. No arrangements had been put in place for the students to complete their work. The investigation also found that several work folders were missing. As a result, Mr Grantham was suspended from the College on the 22 June 2017 and resigned on 30 June 2017.

Findings of fact

Our findings of fact are as follows:

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

- 1. Engaged in the maladministration of the 2016/17 BTEC level 1 / 2 Business Studies coursework in particular you:**
 - a. Failed to submit one or more pupil's coursework by the required deadline of 15th May 2017;**

The panel had regard to the signed Statement of Agreed Facts in which Mr Grantham admitted the facts of the allegation in its entirety.

The panel also considered the evidence contained in the bundle, namely the witness statement of Witness A which stated that Mr Grantham had failed to submit the coursework by the required deadline. The panel also took into account notes taken by the College principal during a meeting with students on the 16 June 2017. The notes describe how [Redacted] students had looked online and had seen that the BTEC

business course timetable showed that all coursework should have been marked, moderated and submitted by the 15 May 2017 whereas they had not completed the course and were still completing work.

The panel was therefore satisfied that there was sufficient evidence to find this allegation proven.

b. Copied the work of one or more pupils to use as the work of another pupil;

The panel had regard to the signed Statement of Agreed Facts in which Mr Grantham admitted the facts of the allegation in its entirety.

The panel also considered the evidence contained in the bundle, namely the witness statement and oral evidence of Witness A who had conducted a review of the students' course folders and found that seven students had the same piece of work submitted for an assignment. The panel also took into consideration the examples of duplicated coursework contained in the bundle. These were accompanied by notes taken during interviews with students in which they were shown work submitted on their behalf. Students stated they had not produced that work.

The panel was therefore satisfied that there was sufficient evidence to find this allegation proven.

c. Marked work as being properly completed when you knew or ought to have known parts of it had been copied and/or did not represent pupils' own work;

The panel had regard to the signed Statement of Agreed Facts in which Mr Grantham admitted the facts of the allegation in its entirety.

The panel also considered the evidence contained in the bundle, namely the witness statement of Witness A who carried out a review of the students' course folders and found that 'the original work had not been marked but the photocopied work had been marked and annotated in the same places and modified.'

The panel was therefore satisfied that there was sufficient evidence to find this allegation proven.

d. Completed assessment decisions and/or observation records for work pupils had not undertaken;

The panel had regard to the signed Statement of Agreed Facts in which Mr Grantham admitted the facts of the allegation in its entirety.

The panel also considered the evidence contained in the bundle, namely multiple examples of assessment/observation records, which had been completed by Mr

Grantham together with notes taken from interviews with the relevant students in which the students explain that they had not completed such work.

The panel was therefore satisfied that there was sufficient evidence to find this allegation proven.

e. Awarded one or more pupils as ‘pass’ and/or ‘merit’ without marking their work;

The panel had regard to the signed Statement of Agreed Facts in which Mr Grantham admitted the facts of the allegation in its entirety.

The panel also considered the evidence contained in the bundle, namely the witness statement from Witness A which states that ‘students’ work had been identified as achieving either Pass or Merit criteria but the work had not been marked.’ The panel also had regard to the report of Witness A contained in the bundle following their review of the students’ course folders which stated that *“I have found that students had been identified as achieving either Pass or Merit criteria but the work had not been marked- if there is no evidence of marking the criteria cannot be awarded.”*

The panel was therefore satisfied that there was sufficient evidence to find this allegation proven.

f. Asked and/or suggested that Individual A lie and/or provide an inaccurate report to the headteacher.

The panel had regard to the signed Statement of Agreed Facts in which Mr Grantham admitted the facts of the allegation in its entirety.

The panel also considered the statement of Witness A contained in the bundle in which it describes how Mr Grantham suggested to Witness A that if the principal (headteacher) was only looking at Witness A’s report then the principal should only see ‘what we needed her to’. The panel felt this was evidence of Mr Grantham attempting to influence Witness A to provide an inaccurate report to the principal.

The panel also had regard to the live evidence given by Witness A. Witness A described the conversation with Mr Grantham and his suggestion that Witness A provide an inaccurate report to the principal. The panel felt that Witness A was truthful in their account of the facts and had no reason to lie. The panel was therefore satisfied that there was sufficient evidence to find this allegation proven.

2. Your conduct as alleged at allegation 1 above, if found proven, was dishonest and/or lacked integrity.

Having found allegation 1 proven, the panel went on to consider whether Mr Grantham’s actions were dishonest and/or lacked integrity. The starting point, as with all findings of

fact, was for the panel to ask itself whether it was satisfied that, on the balance of probabilities, the fact of the allegation was proven.

The panel heard and accepted legal advice that the legal test for dishonesty has recently changed following the Supreme Court's decision in the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos* [2017] UKSC 67. The panel heard that it was no longer necessary for it to apply a two stage test when assessing whether Mr Grantham's conduct was dishonest. Therefore, once the panel had established Mr Grantham's state of knowledge and belief, the question of whether his conduct was honest or dishonest was to be determined by applying the objective standards of ordinary decent people. The panel acknowledged that there is no requirement for Mr Grantham to appreciate that what he has done is dishonest by those standards.

The panel had regard to the signed Statement of Agreed Facts in which Mr Grantham admitted that by virtue of his conduct at allegation 1, he had acted in a way which a reasonable person apprised of the facts would consider to be both dishonest and lacking in integrity.

The panel was also mindful that the students themselves knew that there was something not right with the administration of the course, as they had raised their concerns with the principal. The panel felt that Mr Grantham knew that his actions were dishonest and as an experienced teacher of 24 years and now in a senior position as a vice principal, he should have known what procedures should have been followed with regard to public examinations.

The panel also had regard to the fact that Mr Grantham had attempted to conceal his actions by delaying providing the examination board with samples of the students work. He also attempted to evade providing Witness A with copies of the students' work by stating it was at his home.

The panel did however draw a distinction in respect of allegation 1.a. and felt that such conduct, as found proven, was not dishonest and/or lacked integrity.

However, having found allegation 1 proven, the panel found that in applying the test in *Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Limited*, Mr Grantham's actions in respect of allegations 1.b. to 1.f. were dishonest. Having regard also to the Statement of Agreed Facts signed by Mr Grantham, the panel was therefore satisfied that there was sufficient evidence to find this allegation proven.

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

Having found all the allegations proven, the panel has gone on to consider whether the facts of the 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 Grantham involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considers that by reference to Part Two, Mr Grantham is in breach of the following standards:

- 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; and
- 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 Grantham amounts to misconduct of a serious nature, which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel has also considered whether Mr Grantham’s conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 8 and 9 of the Advice and have found none of these offences relevant.

The panel has taken into account how the teaching profession is viewed by others and considered the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel has taken account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils’ lives and that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way they behave. The panel felt that having reviewed the evidence it is satisfied that the allegations found proven amount to 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 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 has found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely:

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

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Grantham, which involved the maladministration of a Year 11 BTEC business studies course, there is a strong public interest consideration in upholding proper standards of conduct in the profession. The panel felt that the public should be able to trust in the proper administration of public examinations and that Mr Grantham's actions had undermined this trust.

In view of the clear public interest considerations that were present, the panel considered carefully whether it would be proportionate to impose a prohibition order taking into account the effect that this would have on Mr Grantham.

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 Grantham. 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, the panel found those of relevance in this case are:

- the serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk; and
- dishonesty especially where there have been serious consequences, and/or it has been repeated and/or covered up.

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 found that there was no evidence to suggest that Mr Grantham was acting under duress, and in fact found Mr Grantham's actions to be calculated.

The panel did however have regard to the evidence provided in mitigation contained in the bundle and that provided during the hearing by Mr Grantham's representative. The panel firstly considered the [Redacted]. The panel noted submissions made by Mr Grantham's representative that this was one of the factors contributing to his behaviour.

The panel also considered evidence that Mr Grantham viewed his actions as 'out of character to anything he had ever done' and that he is 'unable to reconcile the person he thought himself to be and the person that he felt ashamed of'.

The panel's attention was also drawn to the working practices at the College. For example, the panel considered Mr Grantham's perception that basic processes were not in place at the College. The panel also noted the evidence given by Witness A, including that the College was in special measures. The panel felt this could have created challenging circumstances for a new member of staff. The panel heard how this impacted Mr Grantham's self-esteem and he started to believe 'he was the worst teacher in the world'. The panel noted evidence that Mr Grantham felt he could not rely on others at the College for support and that the culture in terms of teamwork was not the same as at his previous school.

The panel also considered a reference provided from the headteacher of his previous school and noted Mr Grantham had an unblemished 24 year teaching career whilst at that school. The panel therefore accepted that Mr Grantham's behaviour was out of character.

However, the panel was concerned that Mr Grantham did not show sufficient insight into his actions and sought to explain and justify his behaviour by reference to [Redacted]. This was of particular concern to the panel given the importance of the proper administration of public exams. Additionally, the panel was concerned that Mr Grantham's behaviour was calculated and that he tried to conceal his actions and had attempted to influence Witness A during the course of the College's investigations.

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

The panel is of the view that prohibition is both proportionate and appropriate and that the public interest considerations outweigh the interests of Mr Grantham. In arriving at this decision the panel had regard to the significant impact that Mr Grantham's actions could have had on the students involved and his colleagues.

The panel found that Mr Grantham had shown limited insight into his actions on others. The panel noted that whilst Mr Grantham feels regret and is ashamed by his actions, he does not acknowledge the impact his actions have had on his students, colleagues and the reputation of the College. Specifically, his statement made no reference to the impact his actions had on the students and the fact that they could have been left with no grade

for their BTEC course. The panel also felt that Mr Grantham did not appreciate the impact his actions had on the College more generally and in particular, those individuals who were required to collate students' work for the examination board during the summer holidays.

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 it would be appropriate for them to decide to recommend that a review period of the order should be considered. The panel were mindful that the Advice advises that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances in any given case that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 2 years.

The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proven, would militate against a review period being recommended. One of these behaviours is serious dishonesty. The panel carefully considered whether Mr Grantham's actions amounted to serious dishonesty. Whilst the panel felt that Mr Grantham's dishonesty was serious in a school setting, the panel made a distinction between this and the type of behaviours listed on pages 8 and 9 of the Advice. The panel went on to note that Mr Grantham's actions were repeated, calculated and affected a large cohort of students.

However, in light of the mitigation, evidence considered above the panel felt the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and as such decided that it would be proportionate in all the circumstances for the prohibition order to be recommended with provision for a review after 3 years. The panel felt this review period would appropriately reflect the seriousness of its findings, particularly given the panel's findings in relation to insight and would allow Mr Grantham opportunity to address his [Redacted].

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 sanction and review period.

In considering this case, I have also 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 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 Mr Grantham should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of three years.

In particular the panel has found that Mr Grantham is in breach of the following standards:

- 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; and
- 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 Mr Grantham fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of dishonesty on the part of a vice principal. Findings also show that Mr Grantham had attempted to influence Witness A during the course of the College's investigations.

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 Grantham, 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, "the significant impact that Mr Grantham's actions could have had on the students involved and his colleagues". A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present. I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse which the panel sets out as follows, "Mr Grantham did not show sufficient insight into his actions and sought to explain and justify his behaviour by reference to [Redacted]" The panel went on to say, "Mr Grantham had shown limited insight into his actions on others. The panel noted that whilst Mr Grantham feels regret and is ashamed by his actions, he does not acknowledge the impact his actions have had on his students, colleagues and the reputation of the College." The panel has also found, "that there was no evidence to suggest that Mr Grantham was acting under duress, and in fact found Mr Grantham's actions to be calculated." In my judgement the lack of full insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this risks future administration of examinations and any impact this may have on pupils. It also has the potential to impact on the public confidence that examinations are carried out professionally. 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, "The panel felt that the public should be able to trust in the proper administration of public examinations and that Mr Grantham's actions had undermined this trust.". The panel also say, "In light of the panel's findings against Mr Grantham, which involved the maladministration of a Year 11 BTEC business studies course, there is a strong public interest consideration in upholding proper standards of conduct in the profession."

I am particularly mindful of the finding of 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 Grantham himself. The panel had sight of, "a reference provided from the headteacher of his previous school and noted Mr Grantham had an unblemished 24 year teaching career whilst at that school."

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Grantham from continuing in the teaching profession. 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 full insight or remorse.

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that Mr Grantham had attempted to influence Witness A during the course of the College's investigations.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Grantham 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 remorse or 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 3 year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments " Whilst the panel felt that Mr Grantham's dishonesty was serious in a school setting, the panel made a distinction between this and the type of behaviours listed on pages 8 and 9 of the Advice. The panel went on to note that Mr Grantham's actions were repeated, calculated and affected a large cohort of students."

I also note the panel's comments on mitigation, "in light of the mitigation, evidence considered" the panel felt, "the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate."

The panel has also said that a 3 year review period would " appropriately reflect the seriousness of its findings, particularly given the panel's findings in relation to insight and would allow Mr Grantham opportunity to address his [Redacted]."

I have considered whether a 3 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, there are three factors that in my view mean that a two year review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the dishonesty found, the lack of either full insight or remorse, and that Mr Grantham had attempted to place pressure on Witness A in relation to the investigation.

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

This means that Mr Andrew Grantham 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 2021, 3 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 Grantham remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr Grantham 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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Dawn Dandy', with a stylized, sweeping flourish at the end.

Decision maker: Dawn Dandy

Date: 18 July 2018

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