Teaching Regulation Agency

Mrs Tatiana Wanietikinia: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

November 2025

Contents

Introduction 3

Allegations 4

Summary of evidence 6

- Documents 6
- Statement of agreed facts 6

Decision and reasons 6

- Introduction 7
- Findings of fact 7
- Panel’s recommendation to the Secretary of State 11
- Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State 16

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

Teacher:	Mrs Tatiana Wanietikina
Teacher ref number:	1755533
Teacher date of birth:	18 August 1987
TRA reference:	24639
Date of determination:	21 November 2025
Former employer:	Brampton Manor Academy, London (the "Academy")

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ("the panel") of the Teaching Regulation Agency ("the TRA") convened virtually on 21 November 2025, to consider the case of Mrs Wanietikina.

The panel members were Mrs Michelle Chappell (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Nathan Cole (teacher panellist) and Mrs Kate Charles (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Elizabeth Gilbert of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Kingsley Napley LLP solicitors.

Mrs Wanietikina was not present and was not represented.

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Mrs Wanietikina that the allegation be considered without a hearing. Mrs Wanietikina provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer or Mrs Wanietikina.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Meeting dated 3 September 2025.

It was alleged that Mrs Wanietikina was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst working as a Mathematics Teacher at the Brampton Manor Academy ('the Academy'):

1. On or around 15 October 2024, she:

    a) Made one or more inappropriate comments to pupils as set out in Schedule 1, and/or used words to that effect; and/or

2. Mrs Wanietikina's conduct at paragraph 1(a) above was:

    a) Racist;

    b) Offensive and/or Derogatory; and/or

    c) Misogynistic

Schedule 1

(i) "And we fought and I say we fought it was bad like, we literally went… it not like when you pull hair, we went crazy …"

(ii) "I hated this woman so much to the point we had a fight."

(iii) "Well, let's say [REDACTED] was very scared of me for two years."

(iv) "When you fight you do not fight with pulling hair, pulling hair is stupid. You fight with (does a punching action)…and the police arrived."

(v) "…[REDACTED] was traumatised, he was traumatised, and like yep I'm not being bad, for two years he was very nice."

(vi) "[REDACTED] was drug dealer she had a lot of money, she spent 15 year in prison."

(vii) "Woman, they have to look after the baby, they have to look after the baby, sadly because you're a woman you have to look after the baby. Women are very emotional things like they will look after the baby but men do not care."

(viii) "If you are man you want a lot money, women are attracted to money. But bear in mind if they like money they will also like taking your half in the divorce."

(ix) “If you are a man and you have money, good, be safe about it and very careful is very easy for woman to just grab you (… gestures) and he raped me.”

(x) “…if you are from an African family to be pregnant at 18 is a very bad thing, or even an Asian family, they will kick you out.”

(xi) “Some men are quite nice and they will look after the baby, only some men.”

(xii) “By the way there are not a lot of black people in this room, so I can say it, some men are nice. Not that black men are not nice, [REDACTED] is nice.”

(xiii) “After being told she was pregnant ‘it was not part of my plan but I’m not going to kill my baby.”

(xiv) “[REDACTED] married a prostitute, she was three years older than me… well she had three children they all had different fathers.”

(xv) “If you are a man and you have money, good, be safe about it and very careful is very easy for woman to just grab you and he raped me.”

(xvi) “Men with money need to watch themselves as women will sleep with them and then claim they have been raped.”

(xvii) “Kylian Mbappe, apparently there is a woman who went and said she had been raped…no it was yesterday, they didn’t say his name but the family say he was in the hotel but he did not do anything, they just said oooo Mbappe rape.”

(xviii) “Yes, I’m going to get to the point but I have to do this for four hours today and I’m like ahhh.”

(xix) “this is the end of the session, we have 10 minutes left, one down three to go.”

(xx) “ok fine I couldn’t care less 10 days left and I am going from this school.”

(xxi) “bear in mind, I used to work in a prison, it wasn’t like this. Everything is controlled here…”

(xxii) “Be careful if someone sees you from the office, you don’t want them to take your phone away.”

Mrs Wanietikina admitted the allegations and admitted that her conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology and list of key people – pages 3 to 4

Section 2: Notice of Referral and response – pages 5 to 21

Section 3: Statement of Agreed Facts – pages 22 to 26

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 27 to 233

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 234 to 239

Section 6: Notice of Meeting – pages 240 to 242

Exhibit 8: CCTV footage

Exhibit 9: CCTV footage

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 May 2020 (the "Procedures").

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts dated 17 June 2025, signed by Mrs Wanietikina.

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 Mrs Wanietikina for the allegation 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.

Introduction

Mrs Wanietikina was employed as a Mathematics Teacher at the Academy from 02 September 2024 until 25 October 2024. Mrs Wanietikina resigned from her teaching role on 14 October 2024.

On 29 October 2024, Mrs Wanietikina was referred to the TRA by the Academy.

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 or around 15 October 2024, you:

(a) Made one or more inappropriate comments to pupils as set out in Schedule A, and/or used words to that effect; and/or

In the statement of agreed facts dated 17 June 2025, Mrs Wanietikina admitted the allegation. Specifically, Mrs Wanietikina admitted to making each of the comments listed in Schedule 1 and that one or more of these comments was inappropriate. Mrs Wanietikina also confirmed in the statement of agreed facts that she was "tasked with teaching [REDACTED] students as part of their [REDACTED] programme" and "taught four different groups of students, each for 1 hour" on 15 October 2024 and the CCTV footage provided to the panel in evidence was of her classes.

The panel considered the CCTV footage which showed Mrs Wanietikina in a classroom with pupils on 15 October 2024. The panel was satisfied that one or more inappropriate comments were made by Mrs Wanietikina during this footage, or words to that effect. Not all of the comments could be clearly heard by the panel as the sound was not perfect. However, the panel also considered the transcript in evidence which corresponded to the CCTV footage and documented the comments made to the pupils by Mrs Wanietikina on 15 October 2024. The panel was satisfied that the transcript matched what the panel could see and hear on the CCTV footage. The panel was therefore satisfied based on the CCTV footage, the transcript and Mrs Wanietikina admission, that Mrs Wanietikina made all of the comments set out in Schedule 1 to pupils on 15 October 2024, or words to that effect.

Whilst the panel found that two of the comments made by Mrs Wanietikina, as set out at (xix) and (xx) in Schedule 1, when considered individually, may not by themselves be inappropriate comments to make, the panel determined that the volume of the comments made collectively by Mrs Wanietikina and the manner in which she made them during the

lesson to pupils made them all inappropriate. The panel noted that there were a volume of comments that overshared personal information, normalised and minimised violence, referred to sensitive topics and were offensive to specific groups of people which had the potential to impact on pupil welfare.

In light of the corroborating evidence, the panel found allegation 1(a) proven.

2. Your conduct at paragraph 1(a) above was:

(a) Racist;

(b) Offensive and/or Derogatory; and/or

(c) Misogynistic

Having found allegation 1(a) proven, the panel considered whether this proven conduct was racist, offensive, derogatory and/or misogynistic.

In the statement of agreed facts dated 17 June 2025, Mrs Wanietikina admitted the allegations.

The panel considered the following comments made by Mrs Wanietikina to be racist, on the basis that they show prejudice, discrimination, or antagonism on the basis of someone's membership of a particular racial or ethnic group. This was particularly the case given the context and manner in which the comments were made, during a lesson with pupils who identify with the group that was being referred to.

- "If you are from an African family to be pregnant at 18 is a very bad thing, or even an Asian family, they will kick you out."

- "By the way there are not a lot of black people in this room, so I can say it, some men are nice. Not that black men are not nice, my husband is nice."

The panel considered the following comments made by Mrs Wanietikina to be derogatory, as they show a critical and demeaning attitude, and to be offensive as they could cause someone to feel resentful, upset, or annoyed:

- "Woman, they have to look after the baby, they have to look after the baby, sadly because you're a woman you have to look after the baby. Women are very emotional things like they will look after the baby but men do not care."

- "If you are a man and you have money, good, be safe about it and very careful is very easy for woman to just grab you and he raped me."

- If you are man you want a lot money, women are attracted to money. But bear in mind if they like money they will also like taking your half in the divorce."

- “If you are a man and you have money, good, be safe about it and very careful is very easy for woman to just grab you (… gestures) and he raped me.”
- “…if you are from an African family to be pregnant at 18 is a very bad thing, or even an Asian family, they will kick you out.”
- “Some men are quite nice and they will look after the baby, only some men.”
- “By the way there are not a lot of black people in this room, so I can say it, some men are nice. Not that black men are not nice, [REDACTED] is nice.”
- “After being told she was pregnant ‘it was not part of my plan but I’m not going to kill my baby.”
- “[REDACTED] married a prostitute, she was three years older than me… well she had three children they all had different fathers.”

The panel considered the following comments made by Mrs Wanietikina to be misogynistic as they are strongly prejudiced against women:

- “Men with money need to watch themselves as women will sleep with them and then claim they have been raped.”
- “Woman, they have to look after the baby, they have to look after the baby, sadly because you’re a woman you have to look after the baby. Women are very emotional things like they will look after the baby but men do not care.”

The panel therefore found allegations 2(a), 2(b) and 2(c) 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 Mrs Wanietikina, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mrs Wanietikina was in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
    - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position;
    - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions;
    - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others;
    - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs; and
    - ensuring that personal beliefs are not expressed in ways which exploit pupils' vulnerability or might lead them to break the law.
- 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 satisfied that the conduct of Mrs Wanietikina in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education ("KCSIE"). The panel considered that Mrs Wanietikina was in breach of the following provisions:

- School and college staff are particularly important as they are in a position to identify concerns early, provide help for children, promote children's welfare and prevent concerns from escalating. All staff have a responsibility to provide a safe environment in which children can learn.

The panel also considered whether Mrs Wanietikina'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 intolerance on the grounds of race, religion, sexual orientation or any of the other protected characteristics was relevant.

The panel was satisfied that Mrs Wanietikina's conduct was serious as she made repeated comments to pupils in four different classes that were offensive over a four hour time period, which had the potential to harm the welfare of pupils.

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

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mrs Wanietikina was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Mrs Wanietikina‘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 Mrs Wanietikina’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 Mrs Wanietikina was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found intolerance on the grounds of race, religion, sexual orientation or any of the other protected characteristics was relevant.

The panel considered that Mrs Wanietikina’s conduct could potentially damage the public’s perception of a teacher. The panel was satisfied that members of the public would be concerned by a teacher making repeated inappropriate comments to pupils given that she was in a position of trust and influence.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mrs Wanietikina’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;
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct; and
- the interest of retaining the teacher in the profession.

There was a public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the finding that racist, misogynist, derogatory and offensive comments were made to pupils.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mrs Wanietikina 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 Mrs Wanietikina 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 Mrs Wanietikina in the profession. The panel decided that there was a 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 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 Mrs Wanietikina.

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

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;

- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour; and
- actions or behaviours that promote extremist political or religious views or attitudes, or that undermine fundamental British values of democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty, and mutual respect and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs.

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 Mrs Wanietikina's actions were not deliberate. There was also no evidence to suggest that Mrs Wanietikina was acting under extreme duress, such as a physical threat or significant intimidation. To the contrary, the panel was satisfied that some of Mrs Wanietikina's comments were made deliberately to undermine the authority of the Academy, including monitoring, scrutiny, policy and procedure. Mrs Wanietikina's conduct was repeated over the course of four hours to four different classes of pupils, following her resignation from the Academy. Mrs Wanietikina's inappropriate conduct also paused when another member of staff entered the classroom.

The panel did not see any evidence that showed Mrs Wanietikina was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings or warnings.

The panel saw evidence of Mrs Wanietikina's good character and relied on the following statements in this regard:

- An employer's reference form provided to the Academy prior to Mrs Wanietikina's employment indicated that she was either Good or Outstanding in relation to a number of aspects relevant to teaching, personal qualities and leadership.
- Person A [REDACTED] a current colleague of Mrs Wanietikina, stated in a character reference dated 02 July 2025 that she is "highly committed to the academic and personal development of her students" and her "dedication to student progress, professionalism, and kindness make her an invaluable asset to our school community";
- Person B [REDACTED] a previous colleague of Mrs Wanietikina, stated in an undated character reference that she is "a highly reliable and dedicated colleague, consistently meeting deadlines and demonstrating a strong commitment to both students and staff" and "her skillset, compassion, and commitment to inclusive progress are evident in all aspects of her work"; and

- Person C [REDACTED] a previous colleague of Mrs Wanietikina, stated in an undated character reference that she is “a courageous and compassionate individual” and Person C “would be honoured to work with her again if the opportunity arose”.

The panel noted that the above character references did not refer to the referees having any knowledge of the conduct found proven in this case. Whilst the panel accepted that Mrs Wanietikina’s positive references from colleagues indicated that she was of previously good character, the panel did not see sufficient evidence that Mrs Wanietikina demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both her personal and professional conduct or that she has contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel considered a letter dated 26 June 2025 from NASUWT, the teacher’s union representing Mrs Wanietikina. The letter stated that:

- “Mrs Wanietikina has expressed genuine remorse—not only for the effect on her own career but more importantly for the potential impact on students”;

- “[Mrs Wanietikina] is currently employed as a teacher and her school is fully informed of the matters before the Agency. She continues to uphold the high professional standards expected of her role, as she did prior to and following the incident.”

- “Mrs Wanietikina is a teacher of good character with a previously unblemished professional record. She has fully recognised the nature and seriousness of her conduct, demonstrated remorse, and acted throughout the process with professionalism and respect”; and

- “Mrs Wanietikina accepts her errors of judgment and is committed to ensuring they are not repeated”.

Whilst Mrs Wanietikina’s union representative indicated that Mrs Wanietikina expressed “genuine remorse”, the panel did not have any other evidence before it to demonstrate this, such as a statement from Mrs Wanietikina saying that she was apologetic or explaining why she made the comments.

The panel was satisfied that Mrs Wanietikina had taken accountability for her actions, as she admitted the allegations. However, the panel saw no evidence that insight had been shown by Mrs Wanietikina regarding her conduct. The panel saw no evidence that Mrs Wanietikina understood why her comments were inappropriate or how they may have harmed the welfare of pupils.

In light of the lack of any insight, the panel determined that there was a risk of Mrs Wanietikina repeating her actions.

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 Mrs Wanietikina 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 Mrs Wanietikina. The lack of any insight into the seriousness of the comments made to pupils 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 cases 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 is intolerance and/or hatred on the grounds of race, religion, sexual orientation or protected characteristics, which the panel determined to be engaged by its findings. However, the panel noted that the Advice is not exhaustive and panels should consider each case on its individual merits taking into account all the circumstances involved.

Whilst the panel saw no evidence that Mrs Wanietikina had shown insight into her conduct, the panel was mindful that the nature and severity of the behaviour was, albeit serious at the lower end of the possible spectrum of serious misconduct. Additionally, the panel noted that Mrs Wanietikina could make a valuable contribution to teaching. As such, the panel determined that a short review period was proportionate in all the circumstances to allow Mrs Wanietikina an opportunity to reflect on her misconduct and take steps to mitigate the risk of repetition.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a 2 year review period.

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 Mrs Tatiana Wanietikinia should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a 2-year review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Mrs Wanietikinia is in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
    - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position;
    - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions;
    - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others;
    - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs; and
    - ensuring that personal beliefs are not expressed in ways which exploit pupils' vulnerability or might lead them to break the law.
- 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 satisfied that the conduct of Mrs Wanietikinia involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE).

The panel finds that the conduct of Mrs Wanietikinia 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 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 Mrs Wanietikinia, 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:

> "There was a public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the finding that racist, misogynist, derogatory and offensive comments were made to pupils."

A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which the panel has set out as follows:

> "Whilst Mrs Wanietikina's union representative indicated that Mrs Wanietikina expressed "genuine remorse", the panel did not have any other evidence before it to demonstrate this, such as a statement from Mrs Wanietikina saying that she was apologetic or explaining why she made the comments.
>
> The panel was satisfied that Mrs Wanietikina had taken accountability for her actions, as she admitted the allegations. However, the panel saw no evidence that insight had been shown by Mrs Wanietikina regarding her conduct. The panel saw no evidence that Mrs Wanietikina understood why her comments were inappropriate or how they may have harmed the welfare of pupils.
>
> In light of the lack of any insight, the panel determined that there was a risk of Mrs Wanietikina repeating her actions."

In my judgement, the lack of evidence of insight and remorse 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 has observed:

> "The panel considered that Mrs Wanietikina's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher. The panel was satisfied that members of the public would be concerned by a teacher making repeated inappropriate comments to pupils given that she was in a position of trust and influence."

I am particularly mindful of the finding of conduct that was racist, offensive and misogynistic 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 Mrs Wanietikina herself. The panel has commented:

> "Whilst the panel accepted that Mrs Wanietikina's positive references from colleagues indicated that she was of previously good character, the panel did not see sufficient evidence that Mrs Wanietikina demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both her personal and professional conduct or that she has contributed significantly to the education sector."

A prohibition order would prevent Mrs Wanietikina 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 lack of evidence of insight. The panel has said:

> "The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mrs Wanietikina. The lack of any insight into the seriousness of the comments made to pupils was a significant factor in forming that opinion."

I have also placed considerable weight on the panel's comments concerning the deliberate nature of Mrs Wanietikina's actions:

> "To the contrary, the panel was satisfied that some of Mrs Wanietikina's comments were made deliberately to undermine the authority of the Academy, including monitoring, scrutiny, policy and procedure. Mrs Wanietikina's conduct was repeated over the course of four hours to four different classes of pupils, following her resignation from the Academy. Mrs Wanietikina's inappropriate conduct also paused when another member of staff entered the classroom."

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Mrs Wanietikina 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 evidence of insight and remorse, 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 2-year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments:

> "Whilst the panel saw no evidence that Mrs Wanietikina had shown insight into her conduct, the panel was mindful that the nature and severity of the behaviour was, albeit serious at the lower end of the possible spectrum of serious misconduct. Additionally, the panel noted that Mrs Wanietikina could make a valuable contribution to teaching. As such, the panel determined that a short review period was proportionate in all the circumstances to allow Mrs Wanietikina an opportunity to reflect on her misconduct and take steps to mitigate the risk of repetition."

I have considered whether a 2-year review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that I agree with the panel that allowing a 2-year review period is sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are serious nature of the inappropriate comments made by Mrs Wanietikina, the lack of evidence of insight and remorse and the risk of repetition.

I consider therefore that a 2-year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

This means that Mrs Tatiana Wanietikinia 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 27 November 2027, 2 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, Mrs Wanietikinia remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mrs Tatiana Wanietikinia has a right of appeal to the High Court within 28 days from the date she is given notice of this order.

Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 24 November 2025

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