



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Lorraine Bradley: Professional conduct panel outcome**

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

**February 2025**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Witnesses	4
Decision and reasons	4
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	7
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	12

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

**Teacher:** Ms Lorraine Bradley  
**TRA reference:** 22937  
**Date of determination:** 17 February 2025  
**Former employer:** Rodillian Academy, Wakefield

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel ('the panel') of the Teaching Regulation Agency ('the TRA') convened on 17 February 2025 at Cheylesmore House, 5 Quinton Road, Coventry, CV1 2WT, to consider the case of Ms Lorraine Bradley.

The panel members were Mr Paul Burton (lay panellist – in the chair), Ms Katie Dent (lay panellist) and Mrs Christine McLintock (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Rebecca Hughes of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Calla Randall of Three Raymond Buildings, instructed by Kingsley Napley LLP.

Ms Bradley was present and was represented by Mr Andrew Faux of The Reflective Practice.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

## **Allegations**

The panel considered the allegation set out in the notice of proceedings dated 22 November 2024.

It was alleged that Ms Bradley was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:

1. On 8 November 2023, she was convicted of driving a motor vehicle with excess alcohol on 20 October 2023, contrary to section 5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988.

During the hearing, Ms Bradley admitted the allegation.

## **Preliminary applications**

There were no preliminary applications.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

- Section 1: Chronology and anonymised pupil list – pages 4 to 5
- Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 6 to 13
- Section 3: TRA documents – pages 14 to 87
- Section 4: Teacher documents – pages 88 to 234.

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

### **Witnesses**

No witnesses were called by the TRA to give evidence at the hearing.

The panel heard oral evidence from Ms Bradley.

## **Decision and reasons**

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

On 1 September 1997, Ms Bradley commenced employment at Rodillian Academy ('the School').

On 1 September 2014, Ms Bradley was appointed headteacher at the School.

On 20 October 2023, Ms Bradley was involved in a road traffic accident. She was breathalysed and found to be over the legal limit for drink driving.

On 30 November 2023, Ms Bradley ceased employment at the School.

On 15 December 2023, the matter was referred to the TRA.

## Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

- 1. On 8 November 2023, you were convicted of driving a motor vehicle with excess alcohol on 20 October 2023, contrary to section 5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988.**

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

The panel had been provided with a copy of the certificate of conviction from Leeds Magistrates' Court, which detailed that Ms Bradley had been convicted of driving a motor vehicle on a road after consuming so much alcohol that the proportion of it in her breath, namely 107 microgrammes of alcohol in 100 millilitres of breath, exceeded the prescribed limit. The panel noted that Ms Bradley pleaded guilty to the offence.

In respect of the conviction, Ms Bradley was disqualified from holding or obtaining a driving licence for 2 years, to be reduced by 24 weeks on satisfactory completion of a course; fined £1000; ordered to pay a surcharge of £400 and ordered to pay costs to the Crown Prosecution Service.

The panel noted that Ms Bradley had admitted this allegation.

On examination of the documents before the panel and the admission, the panel was satisfied that the facts of allegation 1 were proven.

## Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

Having found allegation 1 proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of the proved allegation amounted to conviction of a relevant offence.

The panel noted Ms Bradley's admission that her conviction was for a relevant offence. Notwithstanding this, the panel considered whether the facts amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

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 Bradley, in relation to the facts it found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that by reference to Part 2, Ms Bradley 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:
  - not undermining fundamental British values, including...the rule of law...

The panel was satisfied that Ms Bradley had broken the law, as she had been convicted of driving a motor vehicle with excess alcohol on 20 October 2023, contrary to section 5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988.

The panel noted that Ms Bradley's actions occurred outside of the education setting and did not involve pupils or children. However, Ms Bradley had admitted that she would have gone to school and taught while potentially making poor decisions [REDACTED].

The panel found that although Ms Bradley did not consume alcohol at school, her actions still impacted her credibility and integrity as an educator. The offence did not directly relate to her teaching duties, but it could have affected the safety and security of the public.

The panel noted that on the morning of the offence, Ms Bradley was on her way to work and, had she not been stopped, would have spent the day making decisions under a significant degree of inebriation, as she was three times over the legal limit for driving. This could have impacted the safety and security of the pupils, as she was responsible for their well-being.

The panel noted that Ms Bradley worked in a community school, and her actions could affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence teachers have on pupils, parents, and the community. The panel considered that this conduct could have been witnessed by a parent or a pupil, as recognised by Ms Bradley in her oral evidence.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Ms Bradley's behaviour in committing the offence in these circumstances could affect public confidence in the teaching profession, particularly given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. While teachers are not expected to be paragons of virtue, they are held to high standards. This conduct could therefore lead to a loss of respect from students, parents and colleagues, affecting her credibility and effectiveness as an educator.

The panel found in these circumstances that Ms Bradley's conduct:

- was contrary to the standards of personal and professional conduct expected of a teacher, with reference to the Teachers' Standards;
- was relevant to teaching;
- would be likely to have an impact on the safety or security of pupils or members of the public; and
- would be likely to affect public confidence in the teaching profession if the teacher was allowed to continue teaching.

This was a case of a serious driving offence involving alcohol, which the Advice states is more likely to be considered a relevant offence. The panel also found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Ms Bradley's ongoing suitability to teach.

However, the panel noted that Ms Bradley's behaviour did not lead to a sentence of imprisonment, which was indicative that the offence was not at the most serious end of the possible spectrum.

Accordingly, the panel considered that this conviction was for a relevant offence.

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

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

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be made, the panel had to consider whether it would be an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it would be in the public interest to do so.

The panel was aware that 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 a 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 and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct; that prohibition strikes the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest, if they are in conflict.

In the light of the panel's findings against Ms Bradley, which involved driving a motor vehicle with excess alcohol, there was a public interest consideration in declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Bradley was 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 Bradley was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

The panel decided that there was a strong public interest consideration in retaining the teacher in the profession, since no doubt had been cast upon her abilities as an educator and she is able to make a valuable contribution to the profession. The panel concluded that Ms Bradley had demonstrated significant educational experience and a high level of commitment to teaching throughout her career.

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 Bradley. 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 Bradley. 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;
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution....
- actions or behaviours that ...undermine...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 Bradley's actions were not deliberate.

There was no evidence that Ms Bradley was acting under extreme duress.

There was evidence that Ms Bradley demonstrated significantly high standards in both personal and professional conduct and had contributed significantly to the education sector. Her thirty-year unblemished record, supported by character references, showcased her commitment and ability as an educator. She progressed from classroom teacher to principal of an academy, demonstrating her dedication to the profession. The panel noted that she continued to teach in the classroom while serving as the principal, maintaining her experience and demonstrating her commitment to teaching.

The panel considered Ms Bradley's written statement, in which she stated that becoming headteacher was a proud moment for her and that by 2017, the School had achieved a score placing it amongst the highest-achieving comprehensive schools in the country. Ms Bradley stated that she taught with great success.

[REDACTED]. She stated that she [REDACTED] had a relatively inexperienced team around her. Ms Bradley stated that she accepts what happened in relation to the driving incident on 20 October 2023 was completely unacceptable. She stated that the week commencing the 16 October 2023, she was [REDACTED].

Ms Bradley stated in her written statement that she went to her close friend's house to celebrate the end of the half term and share prosecco. She then returned home and began preparing for her holiday, continuing to drink wine. She stated that she left for school the next morning and did not feel under the influence of alcohol, and did not give it a second thought.

The panel considered whether Ms Bradley had demonstrated insight and remorse.

Ms Bradley stated that since the accident, she had [REDACTED], and the panel noted a reference from her drink-driving rehabilitation course tutor, who said that she stood out as someone who had already rehabilitated and that she recognised her mistake and deeply regretted it. The panel found that Ms Bradley had taken the driving course seriously, with an open mind, and her efforts were consistent with the referee's observations from the organisation.

The panel considered Ms Bradley's oral evidence, where she expressed deep regret for her actions. She spoke about the impact of her actions on her personally and said that she had a sense of "*grief*" and "*loss*" around not being able to teach. She expressed feelings of "*shame*" and a commitment to self-regulation moving forward. In particular, she mentioned that she now has a better understanding of herself and recognises the

importance of delegating, sharing responsibilities, and sometimes admitting when something is too much. She is more aware of monitoring her lifestyle, including alcohol consumption and the importance of her own wellbeing.

The panel found that she had gained insight into where she went wrong and acknowledged that she had learned from her previous lack of seeking help. It concluded that she demonstrated a deep understanding of her actions and their potential impact on others. Therefore, the panel found that she had shown a significant amount of insight and remorse.

The panel considered the character references provided on behalf of Ms Bradley, including from:

- Individual A, [REDACTED].
- Individual B, [REDACTED].
- Individual C, [REDACTED].
- Individual D, [REDACTED].
- Individual E, [REDACTED].
- Individual F, [REDACTED].
- Individual G, [REDACTED].
- Individual H, [REDACTED].

The panel considered in particular the following character references:

- *“Her tenacity in supporting staff well-being and going ‘above and beyond’ for her pupils meant that she built the highest levels of admiration and respect for her school community”*
- *“Her unblemished record and the transformational impact that she has had on the lives of so many young people means that, should she be prohibited, I strongly believe that it would be a huge loss to the profession as a whole”*

Individual A

- *“Although an excellent headteacher, Lorraine never moved out of the classroom”*
- *“Lorraine consistently ‘stepped up’ to teach our GCSE students and achieved excellent outcomes for them”*

Individual C

- *“Lorraine had strong aspirations to achieve good outcomes for all our students and to balance the workload for her staff”*

Individual D

- *“I achieved 2 ‘A’ grades at English GCSE and became very confident when it came to writing essays, thanks to her support and guidance”*
- *“Lorraine was an excellent school leader”*

Individual F

- *“I can confirm that Ms Bradley is a hardworking and caring teacher”*
- *“Ms Bradley has dedicated her life to her career and I believe is an asset to her students”*

Individual G

- *“[REDACTED], but my time here, under your leadership, has helped-me recover and heal.”*

Individual F

- *“I have always drawn a lot of inspiration from the compassion you show to students and staff.”*

Individual E

- *“the school [...] was recognised in 2014 as “the most improved school in the North of England””*
- *“to not allow her to continue to follow her vocation which has changed so many young lives would be devastating for her”*
- *“she still has so much to offer, both as a leader and in the classroom”*

Individual B

The panel considered the thank you cards from the pupils and parents, which were included in the bundle of documents. The panel noted that many of these were undated, were not provided in relation to the allegation and were general feedback provided throughout Ms Bradley’s career. Therefore, the panel placed less weight on this evidence.

The panel 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.

To assist the panel in its decision on whether prohibition would be a proportionate response, the panel considered the behaviours set out in the Advice. 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. The panel found none of these behaviours to be relevant.

The panel considered whether there was a risk of repetition. They noted the reference provided by the drink-driving rehabilitation course tutor, who stated he had "*no doubts about [Ms Bradley's] rehabilitation.*" He believed she would use the tools and knowledge acquired during the course to ensure she does not drink and drive in the future. He further noted that she stood out as someone who was already rehabilitated, having recognised her mistake and deeply regretted it. Given Ms Bradley's significant insight and remorse, the panel found there was a low risk of her repeating her conduct.

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, the recommendation of no prohibition order would be both a proportionate and an appropriate response. Given that the nature and severity of the behaviour were at the less serious end of the possible spectrum and, having considered the significant mitigating factors that were present, the panel determined that a recommendation for a prohibition order would not be appropriate in this case. The panel considered that the publication of the adverse findings it had made was sufficient to send an appropriate message to the teacher as to the standards of behaviour that are not acceptable, and the publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession.

## **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.

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 the allegation 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 Lorraine Bradley should not be the subject of a prohibition order. The panel has recommended

that the findings of a relevant conviction should be published and that such an action is proportionate and in the public interest.

In particular, the panel has found that Ms Bradley 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:
  - not undermining fundamental British values, including...the rule of law...

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

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 Bradley, 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 safeguard pupils. The panel has observed:

“The panel noted that on the morning of the offence, Ms Bradley was on her way to work and, had she not been stopped, would have spent the day making decisions under a significant degree of inebriation, as she was three times over the legal limit for driving. This could have impacted the safety and security of the pupils, as she was responsible for their well-being.”

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 has set out as follows:

“The panel found that she had gained insight into where she went wrong and acknowledged that she had learned from her previous lack of seeking help. It concluded that she demonstrated a deep understanding of her actions and their potential impact on others. Therefore, the panel found that she had shown a significant amount of insight and remorse.”

In my judgement, the insight and remorse shown by Ms Bradley mean that there is a low risk of the repetition of this behaviour. 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 has observed:

“The panel considered that Ms Bradley’s behaviour in committing the offence in these circumstances could affect public confidence in the teaching profession, particularly given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. While teachers are not expected to be paragons of virtue, they are held to high standards. This conduct could therefore lead to a loss of respect from students, parents and colleagues, affecting her credibility and

I am particularly mindful of the finding of a relevant conviction for driving a motor vehicle with excess alcohol in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

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

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of 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 Bradley herself. The panel has commented:

“There was evidence that Ms Bradley demonstrated significantly high standards in both personal and professional conduct and had contributed significantly to the education sector. Her thirty-year unblemished record, supported by character references, showcased her commitment and ability as an educator. She progressed from classroom teacher to principal of an academy, demonstrating her dedication to the profession. The panel noted that she continued to teach in the classroom while serving as the principal, maintaining her experience and demonstrating her commitment to teaching.”

The panel had the benefit of reviewing a number of character references which attested to Ms Bradley’s ability as a headteacher and a teacher.

A prohibition order would prevent Ms Bradley 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 insight and remorse shown by Ms Bradley and the low risk of repetition. The panel has said:

"The panel considered whether there was a risk of repetition. They noted the reference provided by the drink-driving rehabilitation course tutor, who stated he had *"no doubts about [Ms Bradley's] rehabilitation."* He believed she would use the tools and knowledge acquired during the course to ensure she does not drink and drive in the future. He further noted that she stood out as someone who was already rehabilitated, having recognised her mistake and deeply regretted it. Given Ms Bradley's significant insight and remorse, the panel found there was a low risk of her repeating her conduct."

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that:

"Given that the nature and severity of the behaviour were at the less serious end of the possible spectrum and, having considered the significant mitigating factors that were present, the panel determined that a recommendation for a prohibition order would not be appropriate in this case."

For these reasons, I have concluded that a prohibition order is not proportionate or in the public interest. I consider that the publication of the findings made would be sufficient to send an appropriate message to the teacher as to the standards of behaviour that were not acceptable and that the publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D Oatley', with a large, sweeping flourish at the end.

**Decision maker: David Oatley**

**Date: 20 February 2025**

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