



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Ms Michela Hall: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

November 2022

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	5
Summary of evidence	7
Documents	7
Witnesses	7
Decision and reasons	7
Findings of fact	8
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	12
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 Michela Hall
Teacher ref number:	3762838
Teacher date of birth:	26 October 1980
TRA reference:	19569
Date of determination:	10 November 2022
Former employer:	Lincoln House School, Burnley

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 9 November 2022 remotely via Microsoft Teams to consider the case of Ms Hall.

The panel members were Mr Clive Ruddle (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Gemma Hutchinson (teacher panellist) and Mrs Kathleen O’Hare (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Sarah Price of Blake Morgan solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Michael O’Donohoe of Browne Jacobson solicitors.

Ms Hall was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegation(s) set out in the Notice of Proceedings dated 30 August 2022.

It was alleged that Ms Hall was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that:

1. On or about 3 July 2019 she behaved in an inappropriate manner whilst on School premises in that she attended the School;

a. despite not being on duty;

b. in possession of alcohol;

c. and consumed alcohol on school premises;

d. whilst intoxicated;

e. and, notwithstanding 1(a)-(d) above as may be found proven or in any event:

i. sought out and/or made contact with Pupil A and/or Pupil B;

ii. were alone with Pupil A

iii. locked herself in a room with Pupil A on one or more occasions

iv. grabbed or held onto Pupil A's bicycle while alone with Pupil A

v. pulled at Pupil A's clothing;

vi. removed Pupil A's jumper and/or jacket from his person;

vii. wore one or more items of Pupil A's clothing

viii. pulled Pupil A's arm or arms in an attempt to remove him from the room she was in;

f. and refused to leave when asked to do so.

2. Her conduct towards Pupil A as may be found proven at Allegation 1(e)(i)-(viii) was notwithstanding concerns and/or management advice regarding maintaining appropriate professional boundaries with Pupil A.

Ms Hall did not respond to the Notice. The case therefore proceeded as a disputed case.

Preliminary applications

The panel first considered an application from the presenting officer to proceed in the absence of Ms Hall. The panel accepted the legal advice provided in relation to this application and took account of the various factors referred to it, as derived from the guidance set down in the case of *R v Jones* [2003] 1 AC 1 (as considered and applied in subsequent cases including *GMC v Adeogba* [2016] EWCA Civ 162). The panel was satisfied that the Notice of Proceedings ("the Notice") had been sent in accordance with the Teacher Misconduct: Disciplinary Procedures for the Teaching Profession 2020. The panel went on to consider whether to proceed in Ms Hall's absence. The panel determined that it should proceed in the absence of Ms Hall for the following reasons:

- Ms Hall had not sought an adjournment.
- The panel had not been provided with any medical evidence which indicated that Ms Hall was unfit to attend the hearing due to ill-health.
- The panel was satisfied that given Ms Hall has disengaged with the TRA, her absence was voluntary, and she had waived her right to attend.
- There was no indication that Ms Hall might attend at a future date and an adjournment would be unlikely to result in her attendance at a later date.
- The panel was conscious that witnesses had made arrangements and were ready to attend the hearing to provide their oral evidence.
- There is a strong public interest in hearings taking place within a reasonable timeframe.

Next, the panel considered an application from the presenting officer to make some amendments to the allegation, as follows (proposed amendments underlined):

1. On or about 3 July 2019 you behaved in an inappropriate manner whilst on School premises in that you attended the School;

e. and, notwithstanding 1(a)-(d) above as may be found proven or in any event:

vi. removed Pupil A's jumper and/or jacket from his person;

The TRA submitted that the amendment to the stem of allegation 1 was essentially a "tidying-up" exercise and would not change the nature of the TRA's case against Ms Hall. In relation to sub-particular 1e (vi.), it was submitted that this proposed amendment reflected the witness evidence, and the amendment would not change the nature of the case against Ms Hall, as it was alleged that it was an item of clothing that Ms Hall removed from Pupil A.

The panel carefully considered the application and in doing so, it accepted the legal advice. This application was made pursuant to Rule 5.83 which provides that, at any stage before making its decision about whether the facts have been proved, the panel may, in the interests of justice, amend an allegation.

The panel accepted the presenting officer's submissions that the amendments did not alter the nature of the case. The panel determined that the amendments did not alter the substance of the case or result in new factual particulars being alleged. The panel did not consider that the amendments would cause any prejudice to Ms Hall.

The panel decided to accept the TRA's application. In light of the panel's decision, the allegation now reads as follows:

1. On or about 3 July 2019 you behaved in an inappropriate manner whilst on School premises in that you attended the School;

a. despite not being on duty;

b. in possession of alcohol;

c. and consumed alcohol on school premises;

d. whilst intoxicated;

e. and, notwithstanding 1(a)-(d) above as may be found proven or in any event:

i. sought out and/or made contact with Pupil A and/or Pupil B;

ii. were alone with Pupil A

iii. locked yourself in a room with Pupil A on one or more occasions

iv. grabbed or held onto Pupil A's bicycle while alone with Pupil A

v. pulled at Pupil A's clothing;

vi. removed Pupil A's jumper and/or jacket from his person;

vii. wore one or more items of Pupil A's clothing

viii. pulled Pupil A's arm or arms in an attempt to remove him from the room you were in;

f. and refused to leave when asked to do so.

2. Your conduct towards Pupil A as may be found proven at Allegation 1(e)(i)-(viii) was notwithstanding concerns and/or management advice regarding maintaining appropriate professional boundaries with Pupil A.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Anonymised pupil list – page 4

Section 2: Notice of Hearing and Response – pages 6 to 17

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 19 to 49

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 51 to 126

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 128 to 129

The panel was also provided with a separate bundle of papers in support of the TRA's application to proceed in the absence of Ms Hall, consisting of 17 pages.

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

Witnesses

The panel heard oral evidence from the following TRA witnesses:

1. Witness A, [REDACTED]

2. Witness B, [REDACTED]

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

The panel carefully considered the case before it and reached a decision.

Ms Hall had been employed at Lincoln House School ("the School") from 1 May 2019 to 10 September 2019 as a teacher (Lead Tutor). On 3 July 2019, alleged misconduct occurred on the School premises. It is alleged that Ms Hall behaved inappropriately whilst intoxicated on the School premises outside of her working hours.

Prior to this incident, there were concerns regarding professional boundaries between Ms Hall and Pupil A. It is alleged that Ms Hall had ignored those concerns, which had been raised with her.

Ms Hall was dismissed from her position at the School following an internal investigation.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

The panel found the following particulars of the allegation(s) against you proved, for these reasons:

The panel heard oral evidence from Witness A and Witness B. The panel found their evidence clear, consistent and credible.

The panel took into account that the School formed part of Lincoln House, which was a care home for children who had been victims and perpetrators of sexual offences. The two witnesses called by the TRA provided further information regarding the layout of the premises. In particular, Witness A explained that the School was on the same grounds as the home, and it took no more than 10 seconds to walk between the two. During her oral evidence, Witness B stated that she could hear when the pupils were "*kicking off*" when in the School building. The panel found that the alleged conduct occurred both in the School building, just outside of the School building and in the home, which the panel accepted was on the same premises as the School. On balance, the panel was satisfied that the alleged conduct took place on School premises.

The panel noted that during the School's investigation, Ms Hall did not deny her conduct, and stated it was "*one stupid mistake*". Ms Hall also said that she regretted her actions.

1. On or about 3 July 2019 you behaved in an inappropriate manner whilst on School premises in that you attended the School;

a. despite not being on duty;

Witness A told the panel that Ms Hall finished work at 1630, but sometimes she would work a bit later to catch up with work. Witness A stated that on 3 July 2019, she received several calls from Ms Hall. These took place from around 1915 that evening. During those conversations, it transpired that Ms Hall was still on the School premises. Witness A stated that during one of the calls Ms Hall had said that "*the boys were kicking off*". Witness A was not happy that Ms Hall had stayed late working and advised her to go home.

Witness B told the panel that Ms Hall was contracted to work until 1600. Witness B told the panel that when she had returned to the home that evening, she was surprised to see Ms Hall's car in the car park.

The panel was provided with a copy of the investigation interview, during which Ms Hall accepted that she was working late.

The panel noted that there was a slight discrepancy in the times provided by Witness A and Witness B, in regard to what time Ms Hall was contracted to work until. However, on the balance of probabilities, the panel found Ms Hall was not on duty at the time of the incident. Allegation 1a is found proved.

b. in possession of alcohol;

c. and consumed alcohol on school premises;

d. whilst intoxicated;

The panel considered allegations 1b, 1c and 1d together.

Witness A told the panel that when she attended the School premises on 3 July 2019, she saw Ms Hall drinking from a Gregg's coffee cup. Witness A said that it smelled like alcohol. When she asked Ms Hall if she had been drinking, Ms Hall denied this. However, Witness A stated that she could smell alcohol on Ms Hall. Witness A stated that later in the evening, she took a photograph of the Gregg's coffee cup, and she also took a photograph of two empty wine bottles in the bin behind Ms Hall's desk. The panel was provided with copies of the photographs and noted that the Gregg's coffee cup showed the remains of red liquid. One of the photographs showed an empty wine bottle in a bin.

Witness B's evidence was that she did not see Ms Hall consume alcohol during the evening of 3 July 2019, but said it was clear Ms Hall was drunk and that she could smell alcohol on Ms Hall.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel found that it was more likely than not that Ms Hall was in possession of alcohol, consumed alcohol and was intoxicated whilst on School premises. Allegation 1b, 1c and 1d are found proved.

e. and, notwithstanding 1(a)-(d) above as may be found proven or in any event:

i. sought out and/or made contact with Pupil A and/or Pupil B;

ii. were alone with Pupil A

iii. locked yourself in a room with Pupil A on one or more occasions

iv. grabbed or held onto Pupil A's bicycle while alone with Pupil A

v. pulled at Pupil A's clothing;

vi. removed Pupil A's jumper and/or jacket from his person;

vii. wore one or more items of Pupil A's clothing

viii. pulled Pupil A's arm or arms in an attempt to remove him from the room you were in;

Witness B clearly recalled to the panel Ms Hall's actions involving Pupil A. In particular, Witness B witnessed Ms Hall take Pupil A's watch, baseball cap and his hooded jumper. Witness B stated that Ms Hall put on these items of clothing and was strolling around with them on. She said Pupil A was angry as Ms Hall had taken his things. In her statement, Witness B described that she witnessed Ms Hall go *"over to Pupil A, who was riding his bike..."* outside of the School building. Witness B described how she saw Ms Hall get on to Pupil A's bike but was too unsteady to ride it. Witness B also stated that Ms Hall was *"pulling on Pupil A's arm in an attempt to drag him out of the office"*.

Witness A stated that during a call from Witness B in the evening of 3 July 2019, she was informed that Ms Hall had gone into the house with the staff and the boys. Witness A also said that Witness B informed her that Ms Hall had locked herself in a room alone with a child.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel found that it was more likely than not that whilst on School premises, Ms Hall acted as alleged at i-viii above. Allegation 1e is found proved in its entirety.

f. and refused to leave when asked to do so.

Witness B stated that she and her colleagues asked Ms Hall to leave, on a number of occasions throughout the night, but she ignored them. This is supported by the evidence of Witness A who stated that during a telephone conversation with Witness B, she was told that Witness B was *"following Ms Hall around asking her to go home..."*.

The panel also noted that during the School's investigation, when asked why she did not leave the premises that evening, Ms Hall responded *"I should have done. I just was not thinking as clearly as I do normally"*.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel found that it was more likely than not that Ms Hall refused to leave when asked to do so, whilst on School premises. Allegation 1f is found proved.

2. Your conduct towards Pupil A as may be found proven at Allegation 1(e)(i)-(viii) was notwithstanding concerns and/or management advice regarding maintaining appropriate professional boundaries with Pupil A.

Having found allegation 1e proved, the panel went on to consider allegation 2.

Witness A told the panel that she had reminded Ms Hall to be aware and maintain professional boundaries with Pupil A. The attachment between Ms Hall and Pupil A had been discussed at several MDT meetings in June and July 2019. The panel noted that advice had been recorded as being given to Ms Hall.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel found that it was more likely than not that management had concerns about Ms Hall maintaining boundaries with Pupil A. As a result of those concerns, management advice had been communicated to Ms Hall, advising her to ensure she maintained professional boundaries with Pupil A. The panel found that it was more likely than not that this advice was given prior to the events on 3 July 2019. Allegation 2 is found proved.

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

Having found all of the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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 Hall in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Ms Hall 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
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils’ well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Ms Hall amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel also considered whether Ms Hall's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice. The panel found that none of these offences were relevant.

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 also took account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils’ lives and the fact that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way that they behave. The panel therefore found that Ms Hall's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In summary, having found the facts of the allegation proved, the panel further found that Ms Hall'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 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.

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils, given the panel's finding that Ms Hall had acted inappropriately whilst intoxicated on School premises. The panel felt this was particularly important due to the vulnerability of the pupils involved.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Hall were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

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

In view of 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 Hall.

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 Ms Hall. 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 were relevant in this case were:

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

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.

There was no evidence that Ms Hall's actions were not deliberate. There was no evidence that she was acting under duress.

There was no evidence that Ms Hall had previously been subject to any disciplinary or regulatory proceedings.

No evidence has been submitted to attest to Ms Hall's ability as a teacher. The panel noted that Ms Hall had only recently started working at the School, but that she had been working as a teacher for over 20 years. Witness B and Witness A said that Ms Hall was good at engaging the pupils. However, there was no evidence to indicate that Ms Hall had made a significant contribution to the teaching profession.

The panel found that there was a risk of repetition of the misconduct, as Ms Hall had not provided information regarding why she acted as she did. She did not indicate any reason for her misconduct or address any underlying factors that caused her to behave in the way she did. Therefore, the panel could not be satisfied that she would not repeat her conduct.

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 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 would be sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Ms Hall 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 Ms Hall. The position of trust that Ms Hall held, and the vulnerabilities of the children she was teaching at the time of her serious misconduct, 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 for it to decide to recommend a review period of the order. 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 2 years.

The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. The panel found none of these were relevant.

The panel noted that during the School's investigation, Ms Hall had stated her conduct was "*one stupid mistake*" and that she had apologised at the time. However, the panel was mindful that Ms Hall had been given warnings prior to the incident on 3 July 2019, about maintaining boundaries with Pupil A. Ms Hall had not engaged in this hearing, so the panel felt it had not been provided with evidence of sufficient insight or remorse. In particular, the panel was mindful that Ms Hall had not explained what had caused her to act in the way that she did, and whether she had taken steps to address any underlying issues. The panel therefore found that there was a risk of repetition.

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 provisions for a review period, after 2 years.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

In considering this case, I have 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 Michela Hall should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of two years.

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

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

The panel finds that the conduct of Ms Hall fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include findings of inappropriate behaviour and attending school whilst intoxicated.

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 Hall, 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 observed, "that there was a risk of repetition of the misconduct, as Ms Hall had not provided information regarding why she acted as she did. She did not indicate any reason for her misconduct or address any underlying factors that caused her to behave in the way she did. Therefore, the panel could not be satisfied that she would not repeat her conduct." 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, "Ms Hall had not engaged in this hearing, so the panel felt it had not been provided with evidence of sufficient insight or remorse." In my judgement, the lack of insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils'. 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 considered "that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Hall were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession."

I am particularly mindful of the finding that Ms Hall consumed alcohol and was intoxicated whilst on School premises, 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 Hall herself, the panel comment "No evidence has been submitted to attest to Ms Hall's ability as a teacher." The panel also commented, "there was no evidence to indicate that Ms Hall had made a significant contribution to the teaching profession." A prohibition order would prevent Ms Hall from teaching and would 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 Ms Hall 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, 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 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 panel noted that during the School's investigation, Ms Hall had stated her conduct was "one stupid mistake" and that she had apologised at the time. However, the panel was mindful that Ms Hall had been given warnings prior to the incident on 3 July 2019, about maintaining boundaries with Pupil A." The panel has also said that "the panel was mindful that Ms Hall had not explained what had caused her to act in the way that she did, and whether she had taken steps to address any underlying issues." In my view a two year review period reflects the seriousness of the findings, is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession and provides time for Ms Hall to develop insight.

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

This means that Ms Michela Hall 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 21 November 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, Ms Hall remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

Ms Hall has a right of appeal to the King'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: 16 November 2022

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