



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Ms Michelle Stant: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

October 2025

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	15
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	18

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

Teacher:	Ms Michelle Stant
Teacher ref number:	9645400
Teacher date of birth:	3 July 1974
TRA reference:	19774
Date of determination:	9 October 2025
Former employer:	Friars Academy, The Better Together Learning Trust, Northants

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 6 to 9 October 2025 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Ms Michelle Stant.

The panel members were Mr Peter Ward (lay panellist – in the chair), Ms Olivia Kong (lay panellist) and Mr Philip Thompson (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Harry Taylor of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Lee Bridges of Kingsley Napley solicitors.

Ms Stant was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public save that portions of the hearing were heard in private and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of hearing dated 10 June 2025.

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

Whilst employed as a teacher at Oakwood Community School, she:

1. On or around 25 November 2020, attended Oakwood Community School under the influence of alcohol and/or when she knew, or she should reasonably have known, that she was unfit to drive in that she;
 - a) Drove her car into a gate; and/or
 - b) Drove her car into a bollard;
2. On or around 25 November 2020, brought alcohol onto school premises;

Whilst employed as a teacher at Friars Academy she:

3. On or around 1 May 2024, she:
 - a) Attended Friars Academy under the influence and/or smelling of alcohol;
 - b) Brought alcohol onto the Friars Academy premises;
 - c) Consumed alcohol on the Friars Academy premises.
4. During the employment process and/or during her employment at Friars Academy, she did not inform Friars Academy of:
 - a) Her employment at Oakwood Community School and/or the reason for leaving;
 - b) A Teaching Regulation Agency investigation into the conduct referred to at paragraph 1 and/or 2.
5. Her conduct at paragraph 4a) and/or 4b) was dishonest and/or lacked integrity.

In her response to the notice of hearing, Ms Stant confirmed that she admitted the allegations and that such conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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 3 to 5

Section 2: Notice of hearing and response to notice of hearing – pages 6 to 13

Section 3A: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements and documents – pages 14 to 60

Section 3B: Witness statements – pages 61 to 71

Section 4: Teacher Regulation Agency documents – pages 72 to 131

Section 5: Teacher's documents – pages 132 to 148

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

Interview notes dated 14 May 2024 – pages 149 to 154

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the hearing and the additional document that the panel decided to admit.

In the consideration of this case, the panel had regard to the document Procedures.

Witnesses

The panel heard oral evidence from the following witnesses called by the presenting officer:

- Witness A – [REDACTED]; and
- Witness B – [REDACTED]
- Witness C – [REDACTED]
- Witness D – [REDACTED]
- Witness E – [REDACTED]
- Witness F – [REDACTED]

The teacher did not call any witnesses.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

Ms Stant began employment at Oakwood Community School on 29 October 2020. On 25 November 2020 Ms Stant allegedly hit the entrance gate and a lighting bollard in Oakwood Community School's car park with her car. On the same day, Ms Stant was allegedly observed to be hyperventilating, unsteady on her feet and smelling of alcohol. She was also found to have a small, unopened bottle of wine in her coat pocket. Later that same day, Ms Stant resigned from Oakwood Community School. The matter was initially referred to the TRA and the investigation was deferred due to [REDACTED].

On 4 January 2024 Ms Stant began employment at Friars Academy ("the Academy"), part of the Better Together Learning Trust. As part of the recruitment process, Ms Stant completed an application form detailing her employment history. On 1 May 2024, Ms Stant was allegedly observed to be stumbling, unsteady on her feet, and smelling of alcohol. It was alleged that the water bottle Ms Stant had been drinking from contained alcohol. Later the same day, Ms Stant resigned from the Academy. On 17 June 2024, the allegations were referred to the TRA.

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:

Whilst employed as a teacher at Oakwood Community School, you:

- 1. On or around 25 November 2020, attended Oakwood Community School under the influence of alcohol and/or when you knew, or you should reasonably have known, that you were unfit to drive in that you;**
 - a) Drove your car into a gate; and/or**
 - b) Drove your car into a bollard;**

Ms Stant admitted this allegation in the Statement of Agreed Facts. The panel also had sight of two photographs taken of damage to a security gate and, separately, a bollard. Additionally, the panel heard the oral evidence of Witness C who confirmed that on 25 November 2020 they had witnessed a lady driving a car, who clipped the front gate of the Oakwood Community School. Witness C described the front gate as being green, which is consistent with the colour of the damaged gate in the photograph before the panel. Witness C described that following this incident, the car continued to be driven into the car park.

Based on the evidence available, the panel found that it was Ms Stant who was driving a car onto Oakwood Community School's premises and that, in doing so, she had hit a gate and a bollard. The panel then went on to consider whether Ms Stant was under the influence of alcohol and/or knew, or should reasonably have known, that she was unfit to drive. In deliberating this allegation, the panel had careful regard to the evidence before it.

In Witness F's written witness statement, they confirmed that Ms Stant contacted them by telephone a number of times on the morning of 25 November 2020. Witness F recalled in oral evidence that Ms Stant had explained that on at least two occasions she had been sick and was not feeling well and, on a separate call, that she had collided with a taxi on the way to work. Witness F did not see Ms Stant arrive at Oakwood Community School. Witness F stated that two other colleagues assisted Ms Stant in getting from her car to the school building. Those two individuals were not called as witnesses by the TRA but the panel was provided with written accounts that appear to have been drafted by them contemporaneously ("the Individuals' Accounts").

Neither of the individuals who were the direct source of the Individuals' Accounts were before the panel, and therefore the panel was not given the opportunity to question or assess their credibility. Equally, the evidence could not be tested by cross-examination, and therefore the panel has not had the opportunity to see how it withstood that form of challenge. The panel was mindful that if such evidence is admitted, the absence of the respective witness can be reflected in the weight to be attached to their evidence. Additionally, the panel considered that the Individuals' Accounts were not the sole and decisive evidence in relation to this allegation, which had already been admitted by Ms Stant. Finally, the panel bore in mind that it had decided to proceed with this hearing in Ms Stant's absence, but it considered that it could adequately protect the teacher's interests by testing the evidence if necessary and allocating appropriate weight to it. For those reasons, the panel decided to admit the Individuals' Accounts.

In respect of the weight to be attached to that evidence, the panel noted that the Individuals' Accounts both stated that Ms Stant was severely confused and/or stressed, to the extent that she was unsure who the individuals were, despite them both being her colleagues. One of the accounts stated that Ms Stant had said she had pulled over on the way to work to catch her breath. [REDACTED].

The panel was also provided with an email from Ms Stant to the TRA dated 23 June 2021, in which Ms Stant seeks to provide clarity on the events of 25 November 2020. In the email, Ms Stant describes a number of personal circumstances including [REDACTED]. Ms Stant admitted that she recalled driving to work on 25 November 2020 and feeling lost and extremely light-headed and unsafe to drive. The panel has attached significant weight to Ms Stant's email. There appears to be no dispute that Ms Stant ought reasonably to have known that she was not fit to drive on or around 25 November 2020. Ms Stant's email states that she was not drunk (i.e. under the influence of alcohol)

on 25 November 2020. [REDACTED]. Ms Stant also gave her view in her email of 23 June 2021, that her actions were irresponsible and dangerous, putting herself and the public at risk of harm.

In oral evidence Witness F told the panel that, later that morning when they were sat in an enclosed room with Ms Stant, they could smell alcohol coming from Ms Stant. However, neither of the Individuals' Accounts mention this. The evidence on this point is therefore inconsistent and, on the balance of probabilities, the panel do not find that the Ms Stant was under the influence of alcohol. Notwithstanding this, the panel is satisfied that Ms Stant knew she was unfit to drive on the day in question and that she drove into a gate and a bollard.

For the reasons outlined, the panel find that this allegation is proved.

2. On or around 25 November 2020, brought alcohol onto school premises;

In respect of this allegation, the panel attached weight to the fact that Ms Stant had admitted this allegation on numerous occasions, most notably in the Statement of Agreed Facts and in her email of 23 June 2021. This was also corroborated by Witness F, who confirmed in written and oral evidence that the bottle of wine was in Ms Stant's coat pocket. There is no dispute that Ms Stant brought a small, unopened bottle of red wine onto School premises.

For the reasons outlined, the panel find that this allegation is proved.

Whilst employed as a teacher at Friars Academy you:

3. On or around 1 May 2024, you:

- a) Attended Friars Academy under the influence and/or smelling of alcohol;**
- b) Brought alcohol onto the Friars Academy premises;**
- c) Consumed alcohol on the Friars Academy premises.**

For the reasons that are explained below, the panel considered it appropriate to assess these allegations collectively. This allegation relates to Ms Stant's employment at the Academy.

The panel heard oral evidence from Witness A, who stated that they witnessed Ms Stant drive her car into a bollard when entering the Academy car park. Witness A then told the panel that at approximately 11:00am, Witness B contacted them with concerns that Ms Stant might possibly be under the influence of alcohol. Witness B had this concern because of the way she had seen Ms Stant being unsteady on her feet. This was repeated to the panel by Witness B in their oral evidence. At around 11.20am Witness A met with Ms Stant to discuss the concerns. Also in attendance was Witness E. Witness A

explained to the panel that Ms Stant had confirmed she had not been drinking alcohol. [REDACTED]. Witness A concluded that Ms Stant was fit to return to teaching students and the meeting ended.

Witness A told the panel that later that morning, they were contacted by a member of the senior leadership team, who had been kept updated with the aforementioned concerns. It was brought to Witness A's attention that Ms Stant was believed to have been drinking alcohol at the Academy. Witness A was provided with a bottle containing a clear liquid, that Ms Stant had allegedly been drinking from. Witness A told the panel in evidence that they smelt the liquid in the bottle, and it smelt highly alcoholic. Witness A was unable to confirm what kind of alcohol they believed it was.

The panel also heard oral evidence from Witness D, who referred the panel to a contemporaneous account they had written on 1 May 2024 of their involvement with Ms Stant that day. This was contained within the bundle of evidence before the panel. For context, Witness D had previously been a state registered paramedic and was the first aider on duty at the Academy on 1 May 2024. Witness D explained that they were asked to attend to Ms Stant at approximately 12.40pm on 1 May 2024, as Ms Stant had reported feeling unwell. Ms Stant was accompanied by another colleague, who had reported that Ms Stant had "not appeared to be with it" and was "very dazed and acting differently". Witness D told the panel that upon an initial assessment, they were concerned that Ms Stant was showing symptoms of low blood sugar. [REDACTED].

Witness D gave evidence that Ms Stant had a water bottle that was approximately one quarter full. Witness D said that they smelt the liquid in the bottle and in their view it smelt of alcohol. They then took a sip and confirmed it tasted like neat alcohol. Witness D also told that panel that Ms Stant denied to them that she had been consuming alcohol.

The panel was also provided with a contemporaneous note written by the colleague who had accompanied Ms Stant to the medical office, where Witness D met her.

The panel considered that the individual who was the direct source of the note was not before it, and therefore the panel has not had the opportunity to question or assess their credibility. Equally, the evidence was not tested by cross-examination, and therefore, the panel has not had the opportunity to see how it withstood that form of challenge. The panel was mindful that if such evidence is admitted, the absence of the respective witness can be reflected in the weight to be attached to their evidence. Additionally, the panel considered that the note was not the sole and decisive evidence in relation to this allegation, which had already been admitted by Ms Stant. Finally, the panel bore in mind that it had decided to proceed with this hearing in Ms Stant's absence but it considered that it could adequately protect the teacher's interests by testing the evidence if necessary and allocating appropriate weight to it. For those reasons, the panel decided to admit the contemporaneous note.

The note is dated 2 May 2024 and was evidently drafted in response to a request from a senior member of the Academy's leadership team. The note explains that during a lesson, Ms Stant's behaviour changed to become unstable. The individual witnessed Ms Stant drinking from her water bottle. The panel understands from this note that this is the water bottle from which Witness D sipped later on and tasted the alcohol present in it. This account corroborates the evidence provided by Witness D and also the admission made by Ms Stant in response to these allegations against her.

The panel have attributed some weight to the contemporaneous note. However, even in the absence of this note, the panel is of the view that it would have reached the same conclusion. At some point during the morning of 1 May 2024, Witness A had spoken to Ms Stant and had assessed that she was fit to teach. Later that day, Ms Stant presented in such a condition that raised concerns with colleagues. While trying to assist Ms Stant, colleagues realised that the water bottle she had been drinking from contained some type of strong alcoholic liquid. At no point did Ms Stant dispute that the bottle was hers. Ms Stant has commented in her response to the notice of hearing, that she believed the contents of the bottle had been spiked by [REDACTED]. This is also reflected in an earlier explanation Ms Stant gave to the Academy that she believed [REDACTED] did this in an attempt to jeopardise her employment. The panel has been presented with no evidence on this allegation from Ms Stant and it is not relevant to the allegations before the panel in this hearing. It is reasonable to deduce from the chronology of events, which is not disputed, that Ms Stant arrived at the Academy to work and throughout the course of the morning she consumed alcohol from the water bottle that she had with her. In doing so, she must have brought the alcohol onto the Academy's premises.

For completeness, the panel notes that there is no evidence to confirm that Ms Stant arrived at the Academy on 1 May 2024 under the influence of alcohol and/or smelling of alcohol. However, a reasonable interpretation of the evidence explains that Ms Stant brought alcohol onto the Academy premises, consumed that alcohol, and then became under the influence of alcohol, all whilst in attendance at the Academy.

For the reasons outlined, the panel finds this allegation proven.

4. During the employment process and/or during your employment at Friars Academy, you did not inform Friars Academy of:

- a) Your employment at Oakwood Community School and/or the reason for leaving;**
- b) A Teaching Regulation Agency investigation into the conduct referred to at paragraph 1 and/or 2.**

Ms Stant admitted these allegations in her response to the notice of hearing and in the Statement of Agreed Facts. The panel was provided with a copy of Ms Stant's application for the position of Teacher at the Academy. In the section allocated for employment history, Ms Stant had omitted to detail her employment at Oakwood Community School. However, she had included other employment that covered the period during which she was employed at Oakwood Community School. The application form also required Ms Stant to declare that the information she had supplied was correct to the best of her knowledge and belief. The declaration also confirms that if information is deliberately omitted, it could result in her dismissal. The panel views this as a clear indication of the significance that the Academy placed on an applicant needing to complete the form accurately. Ms Stant signed the declaration on 16 December 2023. The panel are of the view that this clearly indicates Ms Stant's deliberate attempt to withhold details relating to her employment at Oakwood Community School and/or the reason for leaving. The panel heard oral evidence from Witness A and Witness E who both confirmed that Ms Stant did not refer to Oakwood Community School during her application process and/or interview, or at all until the allegations came to light.

In respect of allegation 4b), the application does not expressly require the applicant to disclose details of ongoing TRA investigations. There is no box to insert details and there is no explicit mention of this on the form. However, again having regard to the evidence provided by Witness A and Witness E, and Ms Stant's admission to the allegation, the panel does find that Ms Stant did not inform the Academy of her being subject to a TRA investigation (notwithstanding that the panel has not been shown any evidence of an adverse finding in respect of that investigation).

For the reasons outlined, the panel finds this allegation to be proven.

5. Your conduct at paragraph 4a) and/or 4b) was dishonest and/or lacked integrity.

Ms Stant admitted this allegation in her response to the notice of hearing and in the statement of agreed facts. Nonetheless, the panel gave careful consideration to whether Ms Stant's actions at allegation 4a) and 4b) amounted to dishonest conduct and/or lacked integrity.

In respect of allegation 4a), the panel noted the content of her job application form that she submitted to the Academy, when applying for the position of teacher in 2023. It was clear to the panel that Ms Stant had chosen to omit details of her employment with Oakwood Community School. Further, in the supporting statement she provided in the application form, Ms Stant stated that '[REDACTED], I have been working as a supply teacher in special schools, working as an online teacher during school closures as part of the NTP and teaching and caring for a [REDACTED].' Ms Stant then stated that she worked for an unrelated third party in August 2022. The form requires the applicant to provide details of why the individual had left any listed employment. The panel is of the

view that Ms Stant did not want to disclose to the Academy the reason that she left Oakwood Community School's employment. The panel finds that this behaviour is dishonest, and by the very nature of dishonesty, it lacked integrity.

In respect of allegation 4b) the panel noted that the application form did not ask the applicant to confirm whether they were subject to any ongoing or unfinished investigations by the TRA. The panel noted that the most relevant section for this expressly asks the applicant to notify the Academy if they have been subject to any prohibition order, sanction or restriction. Based on the evidence available, the panel's view is that Ms Stant was not subject to any such restriction. Witness E also confirmed to the panel in oral testimony that Ms Stant had been subject to a DBS check in the usual way expected of schools, and that check had returned no adverse findings. The panel is therefore of the view that Ms Stant was not acting dishonestly when choosing not to disclose information around the ongoing TRA investigation. However, the panel also considered whether Ms Stant's actions may demonstrate a lack of integrity. The concepts of dishonesty and integrity are separate and distinct. Integrity is a more nebulous concept than honesty, and it connotes adherence to the ethical standards of one's own profession. In the panel's opinion, given the standards required of those within the teaching profession, Ms Stant ought reasonably to have disclosed to the Academy the existence of the ongoing TRA investigation. The panel considers that it would be reasonable for a teacher to disclose to a prospective employer anything which might affect their ability to teach that is known to them at the time. This would enable the prospective employer to make an informed decision about the individual's suitability to teach, and it is not an unrealistically high expectation to have. Ms Stant failed to notify the Academy of the TRA investigation, which, in the panel's view, is demonstrative of a lack of integrity on her part.

For the reason outlined, the panel finds this allegation proven.

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

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

In doing so, the panel had regard to the document Teacher Misconduct: The Prohibition of Teachers, which is referred to as "the Advice".

The panel first considered whether the conduct of Ms Stant, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Ms Stant 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
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was not satisfied that the conduct of Ms Stant, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education ("KCSIE").

The panel was not satisfied that the conduct of Ms Stant, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Working Together to Safeguard Children.

The panel also considered whether Ms Stant's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 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.

In particular, the panel was concerned about Ms Stant's dishonesty because it was a deliberate attempt to conceal her employment with Oakwood Community School, when applying for a position at the Academy. In the panel's view, this is misconduct of a serious nature, falling significantly short of the standard of behaviour expected of a teacher. Ms Stant was an experienced teacher and would have been well aware of a school's safeguarding obligations, and the need for a job applicant to provide a full employment history. Ms Stant deliberately chose not to do so in an attempt, in the panel's view, to avoid having to disclose the reason for leaving Oakwood Community School's employment.

In respect of allegation 1, the panel noted that these refer to Ms Stant having driven into a gate and/or into a bollard. The panel finds that this relates to behaviour within an education setting. However, the panel was also concerned about Ms Stant's behaviour leading up to those two specific incidents. The panel has seen evidence in which Ms Stant admits that she was unfit to drive at all on 25 November 2020. She described her actions as dangerous. The action of driving to work was outside of the education setting which could have caused serious harm to others, including but not limited to pupils.

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

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Ms Stant was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Ms Stant'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 Ms Stant's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice.

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

The panel noted that the advice is not intended to be exhaustive and there may be other behaviours that panels consider to be "conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute". The panel has not found that Ms Stant was driving whilst under the influence of alcohol. It has, however, found that she drove to work on or around 25 November 2020 whilst she was unfit to drive. She has admitted this and recognised that it created a serious risk of harm to herself and members of the public. Such an error of judgement on her part does, in the panel's view, amount to conduct that could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher. For the same reason, it would likely have a negative impact on the public's perception of the individual as a teacher.

The panel has also found that on or around 1 May 2024 Ms Stant attended the Academy under the influence of alcohol, brought alcohol onto Academy premises, and consumed alcohol on Academy premises. In the context already outlined, the panel considers this to be behaviour that would undoubtedly damage the public's perception of the profession.

In relation to Ms Stant's dishonesty, this, by the very nature of it, could bring the profession into disrepute. Further, Ms Stant's lack of integrity in choosing not to disclose details of the TRA's investigation into her previous conduct could also damage the public's perception of a teacher. The ordinary citizen would expect a teacher to have voluntarily disclosed any information to a prospective employer that may affect their ability to teach in the future, at the time it was known about.

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

For these reasons, the panel found that Ms Stant'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/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 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 protection of other members of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession, and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

The panel found that Ms Stant knowingly drove to work in an unfit condition, consumed alcohol while working at a school, and was dishonest in deliberately omitting to tell a prospective employer about her employment at Oakwood Community School and the reason for leaving. In light of those findings, there was a strong public interest consideration in that her actions could have resulted in serious harm being caused to others and, further, they demonstrated a complete lack of understanding and appreciation for the standards expected of her as a teacher.

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

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Ms Stant 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 Ms Stant in the profession. The panel was not provided with evidence to help it assess Ms Stant's ability as an educator. However, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above

outweigh any interest in retaining Ms Stant in the profession, since her behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.

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 Ms Stant.

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;
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions or purposeful destruction of evidence, especially where these behaviours have been repeated or had serious consequences, or involved the coercion of another person to act in a way contrary to their own interests.

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.

In the light of the panel's findings:

There was evidence that Ms Stant's actions were deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Ms Stant was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation.

Ms Stant did not demonstrate exceptionally high standards in her personal and professional conduct or having contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel did not accept that the incident was out of character. The panel was also not referred to any character statements or other evidence to suggest that Ms Stant was ordinarily of good character.

The panel did, however, note that Ms Stant has indicated a level of insight and remorse. Notwithstanding that Ms Stant did not attend the hearing, she has engaged with the TRA throughout these proceedings. The panel had particular regard to an email Ms Stant sent to the TRA in June 2021, in which she states:

"I wish I could have spoken to someone at Oakwood Community School and I wish I had called in sick that morning rather than attempting to go to work.

It appears to be an extremely irresponsible and dangerous act, putting myself, the public, and everyone at the school, students and staff, at risk of harm"

The email continues to explain that Ms Stant had taken steps to address the causes for her lapses of judgement [REDACTED]. Ms Stant expresses 'how very sorry [she was] that this happened'.

The panel also noted that Ms Stant concludes the email by expressing that her behaviour will never be repeated.

[REDACTED]

The panel has given careful regard to Ms Stant's personal circumstances and note that they may well have contributed to her actions at the material times. In a further email to the TRA dated 22 October 2024, Ms Stant expressed her recognition of the incidents, she stated that they were caused by the combination of medications she was taking at the relevant times and indicated an understanding of how this affected her ability to teach.

With the above in mind the panel first considered whether it would be proportionate to conclude this case with no recommendation of prohibition, considering whether the publication of the findings made by the panel would be sufficient.

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings would be sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Ms Stant of prohibition.

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Ms Stant. The dishonesty that Ms Stant acted with, and the risk of potential harm to pupils that her actions created, 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. However, 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 is considered appropriate.

One of these includes:

- fraud or serious dishonesty.

This example is relevant to the fact that the panel has found that Ms Stant deliberately and dishonestly chose to not tell the Academy about her period of employment with Oakwood Community School. It is reasonable to deduce from the evidence that her rationale for being dishonest was to conceal her reason for leaving and the concerns that Oakwood Community School had had about Ms Stant appearing to be unfit to drive and/or under the influence of alcohol while on school premises. Ms Stant has admitted to the allegation of dishonesty against her and has provided no explanation for her dishonesty, nor has she provided mitigation in respect of that allegation.

As outlined above, the panel noted that Ms Stant has shown some remorse for the behaviours described in the allegations. However, the panel has not been provided with evidence to persuade it that there is no risk of repetition. It is therefore not satisfied that there would not be a future risk to pupils and/or members of the public. In 2021 Ms Stant confirmed that her behaviours would not be repeated and then, in 2024, those behaviours were effectively repeated. Ms Stant has since apologised again.

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 of 3 years.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

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

In this case, the panel has found all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Ms Stant 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
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was not satisfied that the conduct of Ms Stant, involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE) and did not involve breaches of Working Together to Safeguard Children.

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

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding of driving to work in an unfit condition, consuming alcohol while working at a school and dishonesty by deliberately omitting to tell a prospective employer about previous employment and the reason for leaving.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself, whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct 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 Ms Stant 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, "The panel found that Ms Stant knowingly drove to work in an unfit condition, consumed alcohol while working at a school, and was dishonest in deliberately omitting to tell a prospective employer about

her employment at Oakwood Community School and the reason for leaving. In light of those findings, there was a strong public interest consideration in that her actions could have resulted in serious harm being caused to others and, further, they demonstrated a complete lack of understanding and appreciation for the standards expected of her as a teacher.” 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:

“The panel did, however, note that Ms Stant has indicated a level of insight and remorse. Notwithstanding that Ms Stant did not attend the hearing, she has engaged with the TRA throughout these proceedings. The panel had particular regard to an email Ms Stant sent to the TRA in June 2021, in which she states:

“I wish I could have spoken to someone at Oakwood Community School and I wish I had called in sick that morning rather than attempting to go to work.

It appears to be an extremely irresponsible and dangerous act, putting myself, the public, and everyone at the school, students and staff, at risk of harm”

I have therefore given this element some 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 Ms Stant 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 and 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 Ms Stant herself and the panel comment “Ms Stant did not demonstrate exceptionally high standards in her personal and professional conduct or having contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel did not accept that the incident was out of character. The panel was

also not referred to any character statements or other evidence to suggest that Ms Stant was ordinarily of good character.”

A prohibition order would prevent Ms Stant 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 comment, “The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Ms Stant. The dishonesty that Ms Stant acted with, and the risk of potential harm to pupils that her actions created, was a significant factor in forming that opinion.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding that “The panel was not provided with evidence to help it assess Ms Stant’s ability as an educator. However, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Ms Stant in the profession, since her behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Ms Stant has made to the profession. In my view and despite the mitigating factors in this case, 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 3-year review period.

I have considered the panel’s comments;

“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 is considered appropriate.

One of these includes:

- fraud or serious dishonesty.

This example is relevant to the fact that the panel has found that Ms Stant deliberately and dishonestly chose to not tell the Academy about her period of employment with Oakwood Community School.”

The panel has also said “As outlined above, the panel noted that Ms Stant has shown some remorse for the behaviours described in the allegations. However, the panel has not been provided with evidence to persuade it that there is no risk of repetition. It is therefore not satisfied that there would not be a future risk to pupils and/or members of the public. In 2021 Ms Stant confirmed that her behaviours would not be repeated and then, in 2024, those behaviours were effectively repeated. Ms Stant has since apologised again.”

In this case, factors mean that allowing a two-year review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the dishonesty found and lack of evidence that could indicate a limited risk of repetition.

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

This means that Ms Michelle Stant 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 October 2028, 3 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 Stant remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Ms Michelle Stant has a right of appeal to 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: 13 October 2025

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