



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Ms Helena Stanier: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome**

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

**October 2023**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	10
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	15

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

<b>Teacher:</b>	Ms Helena Stanier
<b>Teacher ref number:</b>	1959521
<b>Teacher date of birth:</b>	17 June 1989
<b>TRA reference:</b>	20402
<b>Date of determination:</b>	30 October 2023
<b>Former employer:</b>	Cardinal Griffin Catholic College, Cannock

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel ('the panel') of the Teaching Regulation Agency ('the TRA') convened on 30 October 2023 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Ms Helena Stanier.

The panel members were Mr Jeremy Philips (lay panellist – in the chair), Ms Hannah Fellows (lay panellist) and Ms Michelle Chappell (teacher panellist)

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Sam Haldane of Birketts LLP solicitors.

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Ms Helena Stanier that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Ms Helena Stanier provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted conviction of a relevant offence. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, Ms Claire Hastie of Kingsley Napley LLP, Ms Stanier or any representative for Ms Stanier.

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

## **Allegations**

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 15 August 2023.

It was alleged that Ms Helena Stanier was guilty of having been convicted of relevant offences, between 2018 and 2021 in that:

1. On 15 June 2018, she was convicted at Staffordshire Magistrates Court of the following offences:
  - a) Driving a mechanically propelled vehicle on a road/in a public place without due care and attention on 10 March 2018;
  - b) Failing to give name and address after an accident on 10 March 2018; and
  - c) Failing to report an accident on 10 March 2018.
  
2. On 21 July 2021, she was convicted at Staffordshire Magistrates Court of the following offences:
  - a) 3 counts of assault by beating of an emergency worker on 5 July 2021;
  - b) Driving a motor vehicle with excess alcohol on 5 July 2021; and
  - c) 2 counts of Battery on 5 July 2021.

Ms Stanier admitted the facts of allegations 1(a), 1(b), 1(c), 2(a), 2(b) and 2(c), and that her behaviour amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence as set out in the response to the notice of referral dated 11 February 2023, and in the statement of agreed facts signed by Ms Stanier on 15 June 2023.

## **Preliminary applications**

There were no preliminary applications.

## **Documents**

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

- Section 1: Chronology and anonymised individual list – page 3
- Section 2: Notice of Referral, response and notice of meeting – pages 4 to 18a
- Section 3: Statement of Agreed Facts and Presenting Officer Representations – pages 19 to 23

- Section 4: TRA documents – pages 24 to 91
- Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 92 to 97

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

## **Statement of agreed facts**

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Ms Stanier on 15 June 2023 and subsequently signed by the presenting officer on 20 June 2023.

## **Decision and reasons**

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

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

Ms Stanier was employed as a PE Teacher at Cardinal Griffin Catholic College ('the School') between 1 January 2021 and 31 August 2021.

Prior to her employment at the School, on 10 March 2018, whilst driving, Ms Stanier had collided with an unattended, parked car. Following this collision, she failed to stop at the scene and subsequently failed to report the collision to the police. The car that Ms Stanier collided with sustained extensive damage resulting in total loss of the vehicle.

On 15 June 2018, Ms Stanier pleaded guilty to the offences as set out in allegations 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c), at Staffordshire Magistrates Court. Ms Stanier was convicted of these offences which relate to events that occurred on 10 March 2018.

In respect of her conviction, on 15 June 2018, Mrs Stanier received a fine of £533, her driving licence endorsed 7 penalty points, and she was ordered to pay costs and a victim surcharge.

Subsequently, on 5 July 2021, during the period of her employment at the School, Ms Stanier was driving around a sharp corner of Blithbury Road. Ms Stanier was driving with excessive speed and on the wrong side of the road, which resulted in her colliding with the front nearside bumper of another car. Following this traffic collision, police were called to attend the scene.

Whilst waiting for the police to arrive on 5 July 2021, Ms Stanier started to reverse her vehicle in an attempt to leave the scene. When members of the public attempted to remove her car keys to prevent her leaving the scene, Ms Stanier assaulted one or more of these individuals.

Following the assault, Ms Stanier left the scene of the collision on foot. When the police arrived at the scene, they found 2 empty bottles of wine and 1 full bottle of wine in Ms Stanier's car.

Following the arrival of the police, Ms Stanier was located a short distance from the scene and was arrested by the police.

Ms Stanier was over the legal driving limit for alcohol; she was found to have 75 microgrammes of alcohol in 100 millilitres of breath. This was more than double the legal limit of 35 microgrammes.

During the course of her arrest, Ms Stanier assaulted police officers who were acting in the exercise of their functions.

On 6 July 2021, Ms Stanier was interviewed by the police.

On 21 July 2021, Ms Stanier pleaded guilty at Staffordshire Magistrates Court to the offences as set out in allegations 2(a), 2(b) and 2(c), which relate to the events that occurred on 5 July 2021.

In respect of her conviction on 21 July 2021, Ms Stanier was sentenced to: disqualification from driving for a period of 22 months, a community order comprising of an alcohol treatment requirement, a rehabilitation activity requirement, compensation and victim surcharge.

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

**1. On 15 June 2018, you were convicted at Staffordshire Magistrates Court of the following offences**

- a) Driving a mechanically propelled vehicle on a road/in a public place without due care and attention on 10 March 2018;**
- b) Failing to give name and address after an accident on 10 March 2018;**

**c) Failing to report an accident on 10 March 2018.**

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts, signed by Ms Stanier on 15 June 2023. In the statement of agreed facts, Ms Stanier admitted the particulars of allegations 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c). Ms Stanier further admitted that the facts of the allegations amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

The panel noted page 8 of The Teacher Misconduct: The Prohibition of Teachers (October 2018) ('the Advice') which states that where there has been a conviction at any time, of a criminal offence, the panel will accept the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction, unless exceptional circumstances apply.

The panel had been provided with a copy of the memorandum of conviction from Staffordshire Magistrates' Court dated 15 June 2018. The memorandum detailed that Ms Stanier had been convicted of being the driver of a mechanically propelled vehicle on a road or other public place on 10 March 2018, and following the occurrence of an accident she failed to give her name and address to a person who had reasonable grounds for requiring her to do so. Ms Stanier was also convicted of failing to report the accident at a police station or to a constable as soon as was reasonably practicable, and in any case within 24 hours.

In respect of the allegations, Ms Stanier was sentenced to a fine of £533, to pay a surcharge and fund victim services of £53, to pay costs of £85, and she had her driving record endorsed with 7 points.

On examination of the documents before the panel and the admissions in the statement of agreed facts, the panel was satisfied that the facts of allegations 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c) were proven.

**2. On 21 July 2021, you were convicted at Staffordshire Magistrates Court of the following offences;**

- a) 3 counts of assault by beating of an emergency worker on 5 July 2021;**
- b) Driving a motor vehicle with excess alcohol on 5 July 2021;**
- c) 2 counts of Battery on 5 July 2021.**

In the statement of agreed facts, Ms Stanier also admitted the particulars of allegations 2(a), 2(b) and 2(c). Ms Stanier further admitted that the facts of the allegations amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

The panel considered page 8 of the Advice and accepted the certificates as conclusive proof that established the relevant convictions.

The panel had also been provided with a copy of the memorandum of conviction from Staffordshire Magistrates' Court dated 19 August 2021. The memorandum detailed that Ms Stanier had been convicted of the following offences after events on the 5 July 2021: 3 counts of assaulting an emergency worker, namely a police officer; driving a motor vehicle after consuming so much alcohol that the proportion of it in her breath exceeded the prescribed limit, namely 75 microgrammes of alcohol in 100 millilitres of breath, and 2 counts of battery towards members of the public. The panel noted that the level of alcohol was more than twice the legal limit.

In respect of the allegations, Ms Stanier was sentenced to a community order, to pay compensation of up to £100, to pay costs of £135, to pay a victim surcharge of £95, the imposition of an alcohol treatment requirement and rehabilitation requirement and disqualification from driving for 22 months.

On examination of the documents before the panel and the admissions in the statement of agreed facts, the panel was satisfied that the facts of allegations 2(a), 2(b) and 2(c) were proven.

## **Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence**

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

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

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Ms Stanier in relation to the facts it found proved involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that by reference to Part 2, Ms Stanier was in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
  - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
  - not undermining fundamental British values, including the rule of law and mutual respect.
- 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 Stanier fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel noted that the offences had taken place outside of the education setting and had not involved pupils or other members of the School's staff. Nevertheless, having considered all the facts of the case the panel decided that Ms Stanier's convictions of driving a mechanically propelled vehicle on a road/ in a public place without due care and attention, failing to provide details and failing to report an accident, assault, battery and driving a motor vehicle with excess alcohol, were relevant to her profession as a teacher.

The panel was particularly concerned with the offences of assaulting emergency workers given the often-close working relationship they have with schools and with the level of violence that was involved in these offences. There was also concern surrounding the impression this type of behaviour could give to pupils.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety of pupils and members of the public.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Ms Stanier's behaviour in committing these offences could undoubtedly affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. Her conduct ran counter to what should have been at the very core of her practice as a teacher with a duty of care towards children.

This was a case involving an offence of violence and serious driving offences, particularly those involving alcohol which the Advice states is more likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel noted that Ms Stanier's behaviour did not lead to a sentence of imprisonment, which was indicative that the offence was not considered by the court to be at the most serious end of the spectrum.

The panel took into account Ms Stanier's submissions which detailed that she was taking medication [REDACTED] which made her tired and confused in March 2018. The panel also noted that Ms Stanier stated that she was "[REDACTED]" during July 2021 [REDACTED].

The panel further noted that in the statement of agreed facts, signed by Ms Stanier on 15 June 2023, she admitted the facts amounted to the conviction of a relevant offence.

Notwithstanding her admission, the panel, having considered all the evidence before it, was satisfied on the evidence before it that Ms Stanier had been convicted of a relevant offence.

The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Ms Stanier's ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that due to Ms Stanier's conviction of a relevant offence it was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

## **Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State**

Given the panel's findings in respect of conviction of a relevant offence, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be made, the panel had to consider whether it would be an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it would be in the public interest to do so. Prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely: the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct; and that a decision to prohibit should strike the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest.

In the light of the panel's findings against Ms Stanier, which involved driving without due care and attention, failing to provide details and reporting an accident, 3 counts of assault, driving with excess alcohol and 2 counts of battery, there was a strong public interest consideration in the protection of pupils.

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

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

Notwithstanding the clear public interest considerations that were present, the panel considered carefully whether or not it would be proportionate to impose a prohibition order, taking into account the effect that this would have on Ms Stanier. The panel was mindful of the need to strike the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest.

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 Stanier. The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours of a teacher have been proved. In the list of such behaviours, those that are relevant in this case are:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of The Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures.
- actions or behaviours that undermine fundamental British values of democracy, the rule of law.

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 Stanier's actions were not deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Ms Stanier was acting under extreme duress.

The panel took into account Ms Stanier's letter of mitigation that stated just prior to March 2018 she was diagnosed with [REDACTED]. Ms Stanier stated that she was put [REDACTED] which can lead to delayed reactions and withdrawal symptoms such as poor concentration and confusion if tablets are missed.

Ms Stanier submitted that leading up to the accident of 10 March 2018, she had had an unusual week as she had been on an [REDACTED] for 5 days including long commutes each day to the venue. She stated that during this change of routine she missed some of her [REDACTED] which led to tiredness and poor concentration. Ms Stanier stated that the night before the accident she stayed at a friend's house and did not fall asleep until the early hours; she recognised that she should have reported to her work that she was not fit to attend that day.

Ms Stanier stated that after she reached work, damage to her car at the front of the passenger side was noticed during the day but her car was still driveable. She submitted that later that day her father took her back to the area to look for signs that might indicate what she had hit but she did not find any other damaged vehicles on nearby roads. She stated that she reported to her insurance company that she had hit something but was not sure what.

Ms Stanier explained that she did not realise another vehicle was involved until she was contacted by the police and, following being provided with the road name, she returned to the area and saw the other damaged vehicle. She stated that she realised the seriousness of the incident but had no recollection of it. Ms Stanier stated that she admitted the fault at court and paid the fine. She stated that she had been open and honest about the March 2018 offences to all relevant parties when starting her teaching career path.

In regards to the July 2021 convictions, Ms Stanier stated that she expresses remorse and regret for her irresponsible and dangerous actions. She stated that she has sincerely apologised to everyone involved and that she apologises for the embarrassment to the School, teaching agency and to her parents. The panel was concerned however at the level of violence and aggression displayed by Ms Stanier and noted she was described as being 'out of control'. The panel did however consider that the assault offences were part of the alcohol related driving offence and were not committed as a separate pattern of offending.

Key passages from the various statements from the driver of the other vehicle, passers by and the police officers who attended the scene considered by the panel included;

" ..the female to display hostile behaviours towards me as she began spitting toward my face. She also attempted to punch and bite me"

".. the female approached the taxi driver and with a huge amount of aggression leapt towards him and was hitting and kicking him shouting and screaming"

"I have never in my life witnessed anybody acting with so much aggression, she was completely out of control with the level of violence"

"I am going to find out where you live and I am going to come and find you" (said by Stanier to member of public and the taxi driver)

" Stanier was screaming and shouting and although in rigid handcuffs, was thrashing about on the back seat in a rage"

" once the spit hood was applied, Stanier continued to resist and again made attempts to assault ..... by biting him"

Ms Stanier submitted that in the years before July 2021, she had been alcohol free and achieved positivity in her life. She stated that at the time of the incident she was suffering from [REDACTED]. Ms Stanier submitted this was due to reasons including: she was struggling to cope with the amount of marking and after school clubs she was expected to deliver, the school department set unachievable GCSE targets, her work experience was cut short due to Covid-19 so she had little practical experience in dealing with behavioural aspects from teenage pupils, she had poor mentors throughout her training, she was stressed with applying for permanent teaching posts, her high workload left her with little time to access support groups and manage her usual personal care and [REDACTED].

Ms Stanier stated that regrettably she chose not to speak about her struggles as she did not want to seem an incapable teacher. She stated that she felt mentally drained during the immediate period before the accident and so she chose to drink alcohol on 5 July 2021.

Ms Stanier submitted that her aggressive behaviour after the accident was out of character and that she is usually a shy and passive person. She stated that she did not intend to cause harm, but she had an intoxicated and panicked reaction to being restrained under force. However the panel noted Ms Stanier had instigated the violence towards the members of the public. The panel noted that in her interview under caution she had said she panicked and knew she would be in trouble with her School. Ms Stanier submitted that [REDACTED] may have led her to “*lash out*” in order to protect her personal space.

Ms Stanier stated that immediately after the event she signed off sick from her school placement and has not returned to working within a school environment. She accepted that the way she reacted was totally unacceptable and said that she has taken full responsibility for her actions.

Ms Stanier stated that she has a [REDACTED] to care for and she needs to continue to manage her [REDACTED]. She stated that she is in on [REDACTED] leave and is [REDACTED] but will be returning to a low stress sports coaching role working with children in a local leisure centre. She stated that the manager has known her for many years and is fully aware that the July 2021 incident was fully out of character for her.

The panel considered the character reference from Individual A [REDACTED], who stated that during his time supervising Ms Stanier’s community order she has admitted to doing wrong and has taken full responsibility for her actions. Individual A submitted that she has engaged with every requirement of her order and has made great progress. He explained that since starting her community order, Ms Stanier has abstained from

alcohol, completed an alcohol awareness course and completed sessions with emotional wellbeing support workers. The panel had received no evidence to suggest this Court order had not been complied with.

Individual A submitted that Ms Stanier has made great improvements in her emotional stability, has shown she has rehabilitated well and is in a positive place in her life.

There was no evidence that Ms Stanier demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both personal and professional conduct or that she had contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel also noted that there was no evidence to suggest that Ms Stanier was not complying with her Court order which the panel felt was positive and showed motivation for her to complete the requirements of it.

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 prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Ms Stanier. The convictions for assault, battery and driving of a motor vehicle with excess alcohol was a significant factor in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate to recommend that a review period of the order should be considered. The panel was mindful that the Advice states that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances, in any given case, that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 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 behaviours to be relevant.

The Advice also indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer review period. One of these behaviours include violence. The panel found that Ms Stanier was responsible for 3 counts of assault on an emergency worker and 2 counts of battery towards 2 members of the public.

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 4 years. In arriving at this period the panel had regard to the severity of offending and felt that a minimum review period could not be justified.

## **Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State**

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

In considering this case, I have also given very careful attention to the Advice that the Secretary of State has published concerning the prohibition of teachers.

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

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Ms Helena Stanier should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of four years.

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
  - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
  - not undermining fundamental British values, including the rule of law and mutual respect.
- 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 Stanier fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include convictions for driving without due care, assault, battery and driving of a motor vehicle with excess alcohol.

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 a relevant conviction, 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 Stanier 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 and/or safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, "In the light of the panel's findings against Ms Stanier, which involved driving without due care and attention, failing to provide details and reporting an accident, 3 counts of assault, driving with excess alcohol and 2 counts of battery, there was a strong public interest consideration in the protection of pupils." 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, "In regards to the July 2021 convictions, Ms Stanier stated that she expresses remorse and regret for her irresponsible and dangerous actions. She stated that she has sincerely apologised to everyone involved and that she apologises for the embarrassment to the School, teaching agency and to her parents."

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 also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Ms Stanier's behaviour in committing these offences could undoubtedly affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. Her conduct ran counter to what should have been at the very core of her practice as a teacher with a duty of care towards children." I am particularly mindful of the finding of convictions involving violence and driving under the influence of alcohol in this case and the impact that such findings have on the reputation of the profession.

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



I have considered whether the publication of a relevant conviction, 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 Stanier herself and the panel comment “The panel considered the character reference from Individual A [REDACTED], who stated that during his time supervising Ms Stanier’s community order she has admitted to doing wrong and has taken full responsibility for her actions. Individual A submitted that she has engaged with every requirement of her order and has made great progress. He explained that since starting her community order, Ms Stanier has abstained from alcohol, completed an alcohol awareness course and completed sessions with emotional wellbeing support workers. The panel had received no evidence to suggest this Court order had not been complied with.”

The panel also said “There was no evidence that Ms Stanier demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both personal and professional conduct or that she had contributed significantly to the education sector.”

A prohibition order would prevent Ms Stanier from teaching. A prohibition order 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 seriousness of the offending behaviour. The panel has said, “The panel noted that the offences had taken place outside of the education setting and had not involved pupils or other members of the School’s staff. Nevertheless, having considered all the facts of the case the panel decided that Ms Stanier’s convictions of driving a mechanically propelled vehicle on a road/ in a public place without due care and attention, failing to provide details and failing to report an accident, assault, battery and driving a motor vehicle with excess alcohol, were relevant to her profession as a teacher.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding “The panel was particularly concerned with the offences of assaulting emergency workers given the often-close working relationship they have with schools and with the level of violence that was involved in these offences. There was also concern surrounding the impression this type of behaviour could give to pupils.”

I have considered the following comment from the panel “Ms Stanier submitted that her aggressive behaviour after the accident was out of character and that she is usually a shy and passive person. She stated that she did not intend to cause harm, but she had an intoxicated and panicked reaction to being restrained under force. However the panel noted Ms Stanier had instigated the violence towards the members of the public. The

panel noted that in her interview under caution she had said she panicked and knew she would be in trouble with her School. Ms Stanier submitted that [REDACTED] may have led her to “*lash out*” in order to protect her personal space.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Ms Stanier has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended a 4year review period.

I have considered the panel’s comments “The Advice also indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer review period. One of these behaviours include violence. The panel found that Ms Stanier was responsible for 3 counts of assault on an emergency worker and 2 counts of battery towards 2 members of the public.” The panel has also said “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 4 years. In arriving at this period the panel had regard to the severity of offending and felt that a minimum review period could not be justified.”

In this case, factors mean that allowing a lesser review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the seriousness of the behaviour involving violence and the relevance of the offences to her role as a teacher.

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

**This means that Ms Helana Stanier 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 2 November 2027, 4 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 Stanier remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Ms Stanier 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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'SABuxcey', with a horizontal line underneath.

**Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey**

**Date: 1 November 2023**

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