



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Miss Preeti Harish: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

March 2025

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	11
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

Teacher:	Miss Preeti Harish
Teacher ref number:	3968073
Teacher date of birth:	28 September 1986
TRA reference:	23488
Date of determination:	13 March 2025
Former employer:	Mayfield School, Dagenham (“the School”)

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 13 March 2025 by virtual means to consider the case of Miss Preeti Harish.

The panel members were Mr Paul Hawkins (lay panellist – in the chair), Ms Gill Lyon (teacher panellist) and Mr Tom Snowdon (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mrs Luisa Gibbons of Eversheds Sutherland (International) 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 Miss Harish that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Miss Harish provided a signed statement of agreed facts on 6 November 2024 and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer Miss Sophie Allen of Kingsley Napley LLP, or Miss Harish.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 19 February 2025.

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

1. On an unknown date, she purchased a certificate purporting she obtained a degree in Early Childhood Studies from the University of East London, that she knew was fake.
2. In relation to the degree certificate at paragraph 1, she used this certificate to:
 - a) enrol on a teacher training programme with the North East Schools Teaching Alliance;
 - b) obtain Qualified Teaching Status
 - c) apply for and/or gain employment as an Early Careers Teacher at Mayfield School;
3. Her conduct at paragraph 1 and/or 2 was:
 - a) dishonesty;
 - b) lacking integrity

Miss Harish admitted the alleged facts and admitted that she was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Preliminary applications

Amendment of allegation

The panel noted that allegation 2.a) referred to the North East Schools Teaching Alliance, yet in the School's interview with Miss Harish she referred to the North East London Teaching Alliance. The panel considered that it was more probable that Miss Harish had trained with the North East London Teaching Alliance since an email within the bundle from NELTA provided an address in Essex. The panel therefore amended allegation 2.a) to refer to the North East London Teaching Alliance. The panel was satisfied that this did not make the allegations any more serious, nor would Miss Harish's case have been presented differently had the amendment been made at an earlier stage.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology and list of key people – pages 4 to 5

Section 2: Notice of referral and response – pages 6 to 14

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts – pages 15 to 28

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 29 to 152

Section 5: Teacher documents – page 153

Section 6: Notice of meeting – page 154 to 155

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

In the consideration of this case, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession 2020, (the “Procedures”).

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Miss Harish on 6 November 2024 and a subsequent version signed by Miss Harish on 25 January 2025.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

In advance of the meeting the TRA agreed to a request from Miss Harish 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.

Between 1 September 2017 and 13 January 2020, Miss Harish was employed as a cover supervisor at the School. On 1 August 2021, Miss Harish commenced employment with the School as early career teacher teaching science in her first year, and health and social care in her second year. The School was informed by London Borough of Redbridge’s chief education officer, who had been contacted by Trading Standards that it was alleged that Miss Harish had purchased a fake degree certificate. A disciplinary hearing took place on 15 February 2024. Miss Harish ceased to be employed by the School on 29 February 2024.

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 an unknown date, you purchased a certificate purporting you obtained a degree in Early Childhood Studies from the University of East London, that you knew was fake.**

Miss Harish admitted this allegation in her response to the notice of referral and in the statement of agreed facts.

The panel has seen an email from Trading Standards for the purpose of the School's investigation stating that sufficient evidence had been gathered to show that "a) the individual bought the fake degree certificate; b) this degree was not achieved (ie the certificate was not bought as a 'replacement'; and c) the certificate was provided as part of an application to enrol onto the teacher training programme".

In the School's investigation interview with Miss Harish on 17 January 2024, Miss Harish stated that she did not have a completed degree, although had started studying towards one. She explained how she had gone about obtaining the fake degree certificate.

The panel therefore found that it was more likely than not that Miss Harish had purchased a certificate purporting that she had obtained a degree in Early Childhood Studies from the University of East London, that she knew was fake.

- 2. In relation to the degree certificate at paragraph 1, you used this certificate to:**

- a. enrol on a teacher training programme with the North East London Teaching Alliance;**

Miss Harish admitted this allegation in her response to the notice of referral and the statement of agreed facts.

The panel saw Miss Harish's application to undertake the School Direct teaching programme. That application form stated that Miss Harish held a degree and stated that she had attended the University of East London between 2005 and 2009.

In the School's investigation interview with Miss Harish on 17 January 2024, she admitted to providing a fake degree certificate to "NELTA [North East London Teaching Alliance] and not Mayfield School." Miss Harish then said that she may have shown it to the School when she began her teacher training.

The panel has seen a witness statement prepared by Individual A – [REDACTED] in relation to an information request received by NELTA from Trading Standards. Individual A confirmed that Miss Harish had presented the original degree certificate and it was copied and verified by a member of staff who checked the University name and student name, classification of degree, quality of paper, watermarks and hologram. Individual A confirmed that Miss Harish was enrolled onto a programme of initial teacher training (biology) subsequent to NELTA being satisfied that she held a UK degree and a standard equivalent to a grade 4 in the GCSE examinations in English and mathematics. He confirmed that in the UK, all applicants to initial teacher training must hold a first degree of a UK higher education institution or equivalent.

In an email from Trading Standards to Individual A, it was confirmed that the certificate held by NELTA matched the one held by Trading Standards.

Since the certificate held by Trading Standards had been assessed as fake, and it matched the certificate held by NELTA, given Miss Harish's admissions and having had sight of Miss Harish's application form, the panel considered that it was more likely than not that Miss Harish had used the fake certificate to enrol on a teacher training programme with NELTA.

b. obtain Qualified Teaching Status;

Miss Harish admitted this allegation in the response to the notice of referral and in the statement of agreed facts.

In the School's investigation interview with Miss Harish on 17 January 2024, Miss Harish admitted that she had been told that she needed a degree to obtain Qualified Teaching Status and confirmed that she had provided the fake degree certificate to obtain Qualified Teaching Status.

Individual A confirmed that NELTA is an accredited provider of initial teacher training leading to the award of Qualified Teacher Status. As such, in using the certificate to enrol in a teacher training programme, it necessarily follows that she also used the certificate to obtain Qualified Teacher Status.

c. apply for and/or gain employment as an Early Careers Teacher at Mayfield School;

Miss Harish admitted this allegation in her response to the notice of referral and in the statement of agreed facts. She admitted that she used the fake degree certificate to obtain a position as an early career's teacher at the School.

In the School's investigation interview with Miss Harish on 17 January 2024, she admitted to providing a fake degree certificate to "NELTA [North East London Teaching Alliance] and not Mayfield School." Miss Harish then said that she may have shown it to the School when she began her teacher training.

In light of the above evidence, the panel considered that it was more likely than not that Miss Harish had used the fake certificate to apply for and/or gain employment as an early career's teacher at the School.

3. Your conduct at paragraph 1 and/or 2 was:

a. dishonest

Miss Harish admitted this allegation in her response to the notice of referral and in the statement of agreed facts. The panel noted that a further statement of agreed facts was sent to Miss Harish providing the legal test as to whether someone has acted dishonestly and Miss Harish again admitted the allegation.

In the School's investigation interview with Miss Harish on 17 January 2024, she agreed that she was not a qualified teacher, however, with the exception of the degree certificate she had done everything else to qualify for Qualified Teacher Status and everything else had been done honestly. She stated that it was only the degree certificate to obtain Qualified Teacher Status that "had been done dishonestly."

The panel considered Miss Harish's explanation that she gave during her investigation interview. Miss Harish stated that she had started a degree and had a part time job at the same time. The notes record that she went on to say that she had been [REDACTED] This meant that she'd never found time to complete the degree and she never went back. [REDACTED] The interview note records that Miss Harish was asked how she went about obtaining the fake degree certificate and she stated that she had asked someone else who she knew did not have a degree and they passed on contact details for the provider.

Although the events Miss Harish described may have interrupted her studies, there was no evidence that her state of mind was impacted such that she could not recognise that it was wrong to obtain a fake degree certificate or use it to further her career. No medical evidence was before the panel.

The panel noted that Miss Harish described the provider of the degree certificate as being "quite forceful and pushing saying it would cost double if she didn't move quickly". Nevertheless it had been Miss Harish who had made the enquiries leading her to that provider. Having acquired the fake certificate, Miss Harish could have seen the error of her ways and chosen not to use it. Instead of that, she chose to use it to advantage her own career, knowing that the degree certificate upon which her eligibility depended was fake.

The panel considered that the ordinary honest person would consider that Miss Harish's conduct as found proven at allegation 1 and 2 was dishonest.

The panel therefore found this allegation proven.

b. lacking integrity.

Miss Harish admitted this allegation in her response to the notice of referral and in the statement of agreed facts. The panel noted that a further statement of agreed facts was sent to Miss Harish providing the legal definition of integrity. Miss Harish again admitted this allegation.

Miss Harish used the fake degree certificate to apply to enrol on the teacher training programme with NELTA. At the time she was a cover supervisor and references referred to her taking on the full-time planning, delivery and marking of a main-scale teacher. As such, she ought to have been upholding the ethical standards of the teaching profession. To obtain Qualified Teacher Status, she would have been required to demonstrate compliance with Teachers' Standards.

The panel noted that Teacher's Standards required Miss Harish to act with honesty and integrity. Miss Harish would or ought to have known that her conduct undermined safer recruitment practices designed to safeguard and promote the welfare of children. Presenting a fake degree certificate to enrol on a teacher training programme, to obtain Qualified Teacher Status and to obtain a position as an early career's teacher undermined the ability to assess Miss Harish's suitability and qualifications.

The panel therefore found this allegation proven.

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

Having found 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 first considered whether the conduct of Miss Harish in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The preamble of Teachers' Standards requires teachers to act with honesty and integrity, and the panel has found that Miss Harish failed to do so.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Miss Harish 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...

- 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 Miss Harish in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education (“KCSIE”). The panel considered that Miss Harish was in breach of the Safer Recruitment principles designed to safeguard and promote the welfare of children.

The panel also considered whether Miss Harish’s conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 and 13 of the Advice.

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

The panel found that the offence of fraud or serious dishonesty was relevant.

Whether the conduct took place within or outside the education setting, the conduct affected the way she fulfilled her teaching role, as it undermined the trust placed in her and the safer recruitment practices put in place to safeguard children.

Although the events Miss Harish described may have interrupted her studies, there was no evidence that her state of mind was impacted such that she could not recognise that it was wrong to obtain a fake degree certificate or use it to further her career.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Miss Harish amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Miss Harish was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Miss Harish’s actions amounted to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, the panel took into account the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. It 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.

In considering the issue of disrepute, the panel also considered whether Miss Harish’s conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 and 13 of the Advice.

As set out above in the panel's findings as to whether Miss Harish was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that the offence of fraud or serious dishonesty was relevant.

The findings of misconduct are serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher. Miss Harish's actions undermined the work ethic required to obtain a valid qualification and the value of achieving such a degree.

The panel considered that Miss Harish's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher.

For these reasons, the panel found that Miss Harish's actions constituted 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; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of obtaining and using a fake degree certificate thereby undermining safer recruitment procedures.

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

In addition to the public interest considerations set out above, the panel went on to consider whether there was a public interest in retaining Miss Harish in the profession. Whilst there is evidence that Miss Harish had ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Miss Harish in the profession, since the qualification upon which she relied to obtain Qualified Teaching Status and a position as an early careers teacher was fake.

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the behaviour, noting that the Advice states that the expectation of both the public and pupils, is that members of the teaching profession maintain an exemplary level of integrity and ethical standards at all times.

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 Miss Harish.

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;
- ...other deliberate behaviour that undermines pupils, the profession, the school or colleagues; and
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity... especially where these behaviours have been repeated or had serious consequences...

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 evidence that Miss Harish's actions were deliberate. She obtained a fake degree certificate and then used it on multiple occasions to advance her career.

There was no evidence to suggest that Miss Harish was acting under extreme duress, eg a physical threat or significant intimidation. The panel noted that Miss Harish told the investigator conducting an investigation on behalf of the School that she had been [REDACTED], which meant that she had not found time to complete the degree for which she had been studying. The panel had no medical evidence before it to assess whether this had any impact on her actions. However, the panel noted that Miss Harish told the investigator that she had [REDACTED].

Miss Harish also referred to the person she had contacted with regard to the fake degree certificate having been “quite forceful and pushing” saying that it could cost double if she didn’t move quickly. Nevertheless, Miss Harish had approached the person to obtain the fake degree certificate and she wilfully used it thereafter in her applications.

Miss Harish did have a previously good history but there was no evidence that she had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both her personal and professional conduct or of having contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel noted that two references were provided in Miss Harish’s application form to undertake the School Direct teaching programme. [REDACTED] where she had worked previously as an intervention assistant and cover supervisor. This described Miss Harish as being the first choice of faculty leaders when looking for a cover solution having shown flexibility in the range of topics she was able to teach and exceeding expectations in the quality of work she was able to support students to achieve. The reference stated that Miss Harish regularly took on full time planning, delivery and marking of a main-scale teacher, having spent two terms covering an English timetable and one academic year teaching a science timetable. The referee stated that Miss Harish had immediate presence in the classroom, that she communicates with students clearly, with authority and compassion so that students respect her, like her and want to learn in her classroom. The referee concluded that he had “absolutely no doubt that Preeti is perfectly suited to a career in teaching.”

The second reference contained within Miss Harish’s application form was from the [REDACTED] This also referred to Miss Harish having undertaken a long term science cover supervisor role which in reality she described as the same as that of a professionally accredited science teacher and involved planning, effective behaviour management, high quality marking and feedback, and frequent parental/guardian contact. She described having been very impressed at the manner in which Miss Harish quickly developed trusting relationships with her students and established a calm and respectful learning environment. The referee stated that she tackled the position with a high level of competency and quickly sought support and training opportunities to strengthen her subject knowledge, whilst teaching a full timetable and also acting as a form tutor.

The panel also noted an email from NELTA informing Miss Harish that she had been assessed as meeting the standards for Qualified Teacher Status. Although she gained entry to the programme dishonestly, her progress during the programme must have been to the required standard.

The panel noted that the School was seeking to extend the second year of Miss Harish’s period as an early careers teacher as she needed further support.

When interviewed as part of the School's investigation, Miss Harish admitted that she had obtained a fake degree certificate. Miss Harish has from the outset of this misconduct case stated that she takes full responsibility for the case against her and stated that if she was required to attend a hearing she would do so "in order to support you". In correspondence regarding the statement of agreed facts, Miss Harish referred to [REDACTED] due to the situation, recognised that my actions have caused this" and stated that she had "been nothing but truthful and honest" with the questions presented to her. She stated that having to "relive what I did, brings shame, [REDACTED] previously mentioned". She stated that she had not made excuses for her actions, and had accepted responsibility.

The panel noted that Miss Harish has not expressed any insight as to the impact that her actions would have had on pupils, the School, the wider community and the teaching profession.

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 Miss Harish 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 Miss Harish. The repeated acts of dishonesty undermining confidence in the teaching profession 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 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 certain types of case where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period.

None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel's findings.

The Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review could be considered appropriate.

These include:

- fraud or serious dishonesty;

Miss Harish admitted the allegations at the earliest opportunity, accepted responsibility and has expressed that she is ashamed of her actions. However, Miss Harish has not expressed insight as to why what she had done was wrong and the conduct found proven was serious. As such, the panel considered that a longer period before a review could be appropriate in this case. The panel also took account that Miss Harish had initially shown promise as a teacher, and that she may, in the future, be able to make a valuable contribution to the teaching profession, and therefore was dissuaded from recommending a prohibition without a review period.

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 after a period of 5 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 Miss Preeti Harish should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of five years.

In particular, the panel has found that Miss Harish 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...
- 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 Miss Harish, involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE) and/or involved breaches of Working Together to Safeguard Children.

The panel finds that the conduct of Miss Harish fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding of using a fake degree to obtain employment as a teacher, conduct found to be dishonest and to lack integrity.

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 or conduct likely to 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 Miss Harish, 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 has observed, "There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of obtaining and using a fake degree certificate thereby undermining safer recruitment procedures." 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, "When interviewed as part of the School's investigation, Miss Harish admitted that she had obtained a fake degree certificate. Miss Harish has from the outset of this misconduct case stated that she takes full responsibility for the case against her and stated that if she was required to attend a hearing she would do so "in order to support you". In correspondence regarding the statement of agreed facts, Miss Harish referred to [REDACTED] due to the situation, recognised that my actions have caused this" and stated that she had "been nothing but truthful and honest" with the questions presented to her. She stated that having to "relive what I did, brings shame, [REDACTED] previously mentioned". She stated that she had not made excuses for her actions, and had accepted responsibility." The panel also noted that "Miss Harish has not expressed any insight as to the impact that her actions would have had on pupils, the School, the wider community and the teaching profession." In my judgement, the lack of full 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 observe, “the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Miss Harish were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of dishonesty in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

I have had to consider that the public has a high expectation of professional standards of all teachers and that 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 or conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, 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 Miss Harish herself and the panel comment “Miss Harish did have a previously good history but there was no evidence that she had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both her personal and professional conduct or of having contributed significantly to the education sector.”

A prohibition order would prevent Miss Harish 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, “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 Miss Harish. The repeated acts of dishonesty undermining confidence in the teaching profession was a significant factor in forming that opinion.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that “There was evidence that Miss Harish’s actions were deliberate. She obtained a fake degree certificate and then used it on multiple occasions to advance her career.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Miss Harish 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 full 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 5 year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments "Miss Harish admitted the allegations at the earliest opportunity, accepted responsibility and has expressed that she is ashamed of her actions. However, Miss Harish has not expressed insight as to why what she had done was wrong and the conduct found proven was serious. As such, the panel considered that a longer period before a review could be appropriate in this case. The panel also took account that Miss Harish had initially shown promise as a teacher, and that she may, in the future, be able to make a valuable contribution to the teaching profession, and therefore was dissuaded from recommending a prohibition without a review period."

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 dishonesty found and the lack of full insight.

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

This means that Miss Preeti Harish 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 20 March 2030, 5 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, Miss Harish remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Miss Harish has a right of appeal to the Kings 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 stylized, cursive script.

Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey

Date: 17 March 2025

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