



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mrs Pamela Arnasalam: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

February 2026

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	13
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	17

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

Teacher:	Mrs Pamela Arnasalam
Teacher ref number:	9144872
Teacher date of birth:	12 December 1968
TRA reference:	20840
Date of determination:	25 February 2026
Former employer:	Kings Leadership Academy, Liverpool

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 23 to 25 February 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mrs Pamela Arnasalam.

The panel members were Mrs Jane Brothwood (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Shabana Robertson (lay panellist) and Mrs Olayinka Oshoko (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Jermel Anderson of Blake Morgan LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Caroline Collins of Capsticks LLP solicitors.

Mrs Pamela Arnasalam was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in private and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Proceedings dated 26 March 2024.

It was alleged that Mrs Pamela Arnasalam was convicted, at any time, of a relevant offence, in that:

- 1(a) She was convicted on 19 November 2019 and sentenced on 12 December 2019 for the following offence:

Being in charge of a motor vehicle with alcohol concentration above the prescribed limit on 25 April 2019, contrary to s.5(1)(b) of the Road Traffic Act 1988.

- 1(b) She was convicted on 31 March 2022 and sentenced on 7 June 2022 for the following offence:

Driving a motor vehicle with alcohol concentration above the prescribed limit on 13 March 2022, contrary to s.5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988

It was also alleged that Mrs Pamela Arnasalam was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that whilst working as a Teacher at the King's Leadership Academy Liverpool, Dingle Vale, Liverpool, L8 ("the School"), in that:

- 2(a) On 19 November 2019 she was convicted of one offence of common assault (battery) on 25 April 2019, contrary to s.39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988;

- 2(b) In relation to the conviction at (a), on 12 December 2019 she was given a 12-month conditional discharge;

- 2(c) On one or more occasions between January 2020 – April 2021 she failed to report her absence to the School when she was required to do so.

No admissions were made in respect of the allegations, or whether they amounted to a relevant offence, unacceptable professional conduct, 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, anonymised person list and list of key people – pages 5 to 7

Section 2: Notice of Proceedings and response – pages 8 to 35

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 36 to 49

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 50 to 590

The panel also considered a service bundle of 60 pages. The panel also had sight of CCTV footage with a runtime of 2 minutes and 52 seconds.

In the consideration of this case, the panel had regard to the document Teacher Misconduct: Disciplinary Procedures for the Teaching Profession 2020, (the “Procedures”).

Witnesses

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

Witness A – [REDACTED]

Witness B – [REDACTED]

Witness C – [REDACTED]

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

Mrs Arnasalam began her employment at Kings Leadership Academy, Liverpool (‘The school’) on 1 June 2002, where she progressed to the position of Head of Modern Foreign Languages.

On 19 November 2019 she was convicted of being in charge of a motor vehicle with alcohol concentration above the prescribed limit. She was also found guilty of an offence of common assault (battery). She was sentenced for these offences on 25 April 2019 and

was given a conditional discharge for the latter offence.

In May 2020 a LADO referral was made in respect of Mrs Arnasalam and [REDACTED]

A professional strategy meeting was convened on 1 May 2020.

A separate LADO referral was made on 10 February 2021 [REDACTED]

A second professional strategy meeting was convened on 22 February 2021.

On 11 February 2022, Mrs Arnasalam resigned from the School.

On 31 March 2022 she was convicted for driving a motor vehicle with alcohol concentration above the prescribed limit.

Following the conclusion of the School's investigation, the School made a referral in respect of Mrs Arnasalam on 25 May 2022.

Findings of fact

The panel's findings of fact are as follows:

You are guilty of having been convicted, at any time, of a relevant offence, in that:

- 1(a) You were convicted on 19 November 2019 and sentenced on 12 December 2019 for the following offence: Being in charge of a motor vehicle with alcohol concentration above the prescribed limit on 25 April 2019, contrary to s.5(1)(b) of the Road Traffic Act 1988.**

The panel noted that it had sight of a memorandum of conviction, dated 26 November 2024, pertaining to this offence. It showed that on 25 April 2019, Mrs Arnasalam had been convicted contrary to s5(1)(b) of the Road Traffic Act 1988. It acknowledged that the memorandum showed that she had been shown to have 134 micrograms of alcohol in 100 milliliters of breath, in excess of the proscribed limit. It also considered that this offence was visible on Mrs Arnasalam's Police National Computer ('PNC') record.

The panel was satisfied it could take the memorandum of conviction as conclusive proof of the commission of the offence.

Accordingly, the panel found Allegation 1(a) proved.

- 1(b) You were convicted on 31 March 2022 and sentenced on 7 June 2022 for the following offence: Driving a motor vehicle with alcohol concentration**

above the prescribed limit on 13 March 2022, contrary to s.5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988.

The panel noted that it had sight of certificate of conviction demonstrated that Mrs Arnasalam was sentenced to a period of 12 weeks' custody, suspended for 12 months, following a conviction on 31 March 2022 which was contrary to s(5)(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988. It also identified that per the certificate, she had 132 micrograms of alcohol in 100 milliliters of her breath, in excess of the prescribed limit. It was also noted that this offence was present within Mrs Arnasalam's PNC record.

The panel was satisfied that it could take the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of the commission of the offence.

The panel noted that this offence took place after Mrs Arnasalam had resigned from her role and was careful to acknowledge the authority of *Zebaida v Secretary of State for Education* [2016] EWHC 118 which made clear that a teacher needs to be engaged in teaching at the time of the conduct arising or coming to light. The panel was however satisfied, that it had seen evidenced that she was still within the effective notice period of her employment following her resignation, at the time of this offence. The panel heard submissions on this point from the TRA and also was satisfied that it had received legal advice in respect of this issue and had no concern that this matter fell outside of the TRA's jurisdiction.

Accordingly, the panel found Allegation 1(b) proved.

You are guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that whilst working as a Teacher at the King's Leadership Academy Liverpool, Dingle Vale, Liverpool, L8 ("the School")

2(a) On 19 November 2019 you were convicted of one offence of `common assault (battery) on 25 April 2019, contrary to s.39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988;

2(b) In relation to the conviction at (a), on 12 December 2019 you were given a 12-month conditional discharge;

Given the inherent connection between the allegations, the panel considered Allegation 2(a) and Allegation 2(b) in tandem. It noted that it had sight of a Memorandum of Conviction, dated 26 November 2024, demonstrating that Mrs Arnasalam had been found guilty of assaulting [REDACTED], contrary to s39 of the Criminal Justice Act, and that she was sentenced for this offence by way of a conditional discharge for a period of

12 months. The panel also noted that this offence was present within Mrs Arnasalam's PNC record. The panel accordingly determined that it could consider the Memorandum of Conviction as conclusive evidence of Allegations 2a and 2b.

The panel also noted that it was provided with a police report of the incident and also CCTV footage which showed Mrs Arnasalam's interaction with the police following the incident, which further substantiated the allegations.

The panel accordingly found Allegation 2a and Allegation 2b proved.

2(c) on one or more occasions between January 2020 – April 2021 you failed to report your absence to the School when you were required to do so.

The panel was cognisant that this allegation referred to the time period of January 2020–April 2021 and was therefore careful to consider what evidence it had been presented with that concerned this period of time. It noted that through his evidence, Witness A had advised that on 12 October 2020, Mrs Arnasalam had not attended work and had not reported her absence as she was required to do so. The panel also saw Mrs Arnasalam's return to work document in respect of this incident which it considered to be a contemporaneous document that supported the assertion that no report was made in respect of Mrs Arnasalam's absence on this incident. It was also noted that within the return to work form there was a note that Mrs Arnasalam had "failed to contact". The form also made reference to a welfare call, which Witness A confirmed that he had undertaken through his oral evidence.

The panel was also careful to consider whether reporting would have been necessary with regard to Mrs Arnasalam's absence on 12 October 2020. It considered that having been presented with the school's absence policy, it was satisfied that such an obligation existed. It further noted that Witness C had stated in her evidence that she understood the relevant policy at the time to mean that in the case of an absence, staff would be expected to contact Witness A; Witness A also confirmed through his oral evidence that this position was correct. Witness C also advised that her understanding was that the absence policy was widely available, being on the School's website.

The panel was accordingly satisfied that in respect of the instance of 12 October 2020, Mrs Arnasalam had failed to report her absence when she was required to do so. The panel made no findings in regard to any other dates where Mrs Arnasalam may have been absent and/or not reported the absence.

The panel therefore found Allegation 2(c) proved.

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

Having found Allegation 2 proved in full, 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 Arnasalam, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mrs Arnasalam 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 ... the rule of 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 Arnasalam, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education (“KCSIE”) October 2019.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

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

The panel also considered whether Mrs Arnasalam'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 offences :

- violence; and,
- [REDACTED]

were relevant.

In relation to Allegation 2a and 2b, the fact that Mrs Arnasalam was reported to be intoxicated in the presence of [REDACTED], was further relevant to the question of the impact and seriousness.

The panel noted that the allegations took place outside the education setting. It considered that Allegation 2a and 2b were relevant to the way that Mrs Arnasalam fulfils her role as a teacher. It noted that members of the public had reported the incident that led to her arrest, and that it took place in a public place. It accordingly determined that was indicative of harmful behaviour that could directly impact upon pupils and members of the public due to the position of trust that members of the teaching profession hold.

[REDACTED]

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mrs Arnasalam amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession, in respect of Allegation 2(a) and Allegation 2(b).

The panel did not consider that the conduct as outlined at Allegation 2(c) met the threshold for unacceptable professional conduct. It considered that based upon the evidence presented by the TRA, it only could determine that there was only one instance where the failure to report an absence took place, which it considered to amount to a singular failing. It also noted that Witness A confirmed through his oral evidence that no disciplinary action was taken in relation to this and considered that this was reflective of the level of seriousness. It noted in particular that within the absence policy, it had seen the following exception:

"6.8 We acknowledge that there may be exceptional circumstances which prevent the member of staff from meeting the reporting and certification requirements, for example, in the case of a severe injury / hospitalisation."

It considered that exception was particularly relevant when considered against the context of Mrs Arnasalam's failure to report and accordingly determined that her actions did not amount to a significant falling short of the standards expected of her. The panel considered that the incident could more properly be construed as a technical breach of policy. It was also noted that through the evidence of Witness C, it was confirmed that none of the disciplinary action taken by the school pertained to Mrs Arnasalam failing to report an absence.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mrs Arnasalam was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct in respect of Allegation 2a and Allegation 2b.

In relation to whether Mrs Arnasalam'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 Arnasalam'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 Arnasalam was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that violence [REDACTED] were relevant, in relation to Allegation 2a and Allegation 2b. The panel also considered that there was an inherent safeguarding element to the behaviour that Mrs Arnasalam engaged in and that this was directly connected to the reputation of the profession [REDACTED]

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.

The panel however did not consider that the conduct as found proved at 2c was capable of having a negative impact on the reputation of the profession or upon Mrs Arnasalam's professional standing. As set out in above in respect of the panel's determination regarding unacceptable professional conduct, the panel did not consider that the requisite threshold of seriousness had been met.

The panel again considered that in relation to Allegation 2(a) and Allegation 2(b), Mrs Arnasalam's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mrs Arnasalam's actions in respect of Allegation 2(a) and Allegation 2(b) constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Findings as to convictions of a relevant offence

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

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mrs Arnasalam 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 ... 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 noted that Mrs Arnasalam's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting. Notably, she had been convicted of two separate offences where she was responsible for a car whilst significantly over the prescribed limit for alcohol [REDACTED]

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety and/or security of pupils and/or members of the public, due to the inherent danger in operating a vehicle whilst intoxicated.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mrs Arnasalam's behaviour in committing the offences could affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community.

The panel noted that Mrs Arnasalam's behaviour in respect of one of the convictions ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, (albeit that it was suspended), which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed.

The panel also considered the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

The panel considered that this was a case concerning offences involving:

- serious driving offences, particularly those involving alcohol; and,
- serious offences involving alcohol.

It was noted by the panel that the Advice states that findings in respect of these offences are likely to be considered relevant offences.

The panel considered that the offending in relation to both incidents was serious. It noted that there was an inherent risk to public safety within the commission of the offences and that on both occasions, Mrs Arnasalam was more than three times over the legal limit with regard to the alcohol in her breath. The panel took into consideration that fact that it had seen some evidence indicating that Mrs Arnasalam had been experiencing difficult personal circumstances at the time of the incidents. It however determined that whilst this may provide limited mitigation, the information provided does not undermine the seriousness of either conviction.

The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the convictions was relevant to Mrs Arnasalam's ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding that these convictions were for relevant offences was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

It accordingly determined that both offences amount to convictions for relevant offences.

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

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

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely:

- the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and other members of the public
- the maintenance of public confidence in the profession
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct within the teaching profession

In the light of the panel's findings against Mrs Arnasalam which involved convictions for pertaining to two separate instances of being intoxicated whilst responsible for a vehicle

and [REDACTED] there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of all of the above.

The panel considered that there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the finding of violence [REDACTED] and also two separate convictions which concerns alcohol and were inherently connected to public safety.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mrs Arnasalam were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession. Notably, members of the public reported the 2019 incident, which the panel considered to be indicative of the potential impact upon 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 Arnasalam 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 Arnasalam in the profession.

The panel noted that Mrs Arnasalam had been a teacher for over two decades, and that per the oral evidence of Witness A she had “presented well” and that there had been no issues about her teaching. It was apparent that no doubt had been cast upon her abilities as an educator. The panel accordingly considered that there was some public interest in retaining her as a teacher in the profession. It however considered that this public interest was outweighed by the adverse public interest consideration above, since her behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.

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 Arnasalam.

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

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

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]

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 Arnasalam's actions were not deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mrs Arnasalam was acting under extreme duress. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Mrs Arnasalam did have a prior good history, having not been subject to any regulatory or disciplinary findings previously. The panel noted that Mrs Arnasalam had an unblemished career prior to these incidents and that Witness A and Witness B had confirmed that no safeguarding concerns had arisen in relation to her and pupils within the school, during their evidence. It was also noted that the school wrote a character reference in support of Mrs Arnasalam in respect of her first conviction, stating within it that "she was both popular and respected...there were no matters of a disciplinary nature brought against her". It also considered the fact that the Court imposed a conditional discharge at the time of the 2019, as indicative of the Court perceiving some prospect of rehabilitation.

The panel noted that there had been some engagement from Mrs Arnasalam through her representatives, whereby it was indicated that she did not wish to participate in the proceedings. It also noted that through the school's investigative report, it had sight of potential rehabilitation on the part of Mrs Arnasalam; notably, reference was made to her undertaking a [REDACTED] in 2021. The panel however did not consider that this could provide significant mitigation, given the limited information that provided in relation to this and also the fact that no update was provided.

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 Mrs Arnasalam 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 Arnasalam. The repeated nature of her conduct 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.

One of these includes:

- [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

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:

- violence.

As above, the panel considered that the 2019 incident, whereby Mrs Arnasalam was found guilty of committing common assault, was an incident of violence. The panel determined that this was a significant factor when making its determination.

The panel considered that there was limited mitigation present within the case. As there had been very little engagement from Mrs Arnasalam, it did not consider that it could properly make a finding that any remorse, insight, reflection or remediation had been shown. It noted as stated above, that in 2021 Mrs Arnasalam was potentially taking rehabilitative steps, it however considered that in the absence of any further detail in relation to this, it could not properly consider it.

In the circumstances, the panel formed the view that there was a high risk of repetition in relation to the case. It noted that Mrs Arnasalam's convictions that related to alcohol consumption whilst responsible for a vehicle were three years apart, showing a repeat in her behaviour, and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, it therefore determined that such behaviour may be likely to continue.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate. It decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended without provisions for a 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. The panel has found that allegations 1(a) and 1(b) amount to a relevant conviction. The panel has also found allegations 2(a) and 2(b) amount to both unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute. In this case, the panel has found that allegation 2(c) does not amount to unacceptable professional conduct or conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute. I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mrs Pamela Arnasalam should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Mrs Arnasalam 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 ... the rule of 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 Arnasalam, 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 Arnasalam fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of [REDACTED]

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, conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, and a relevant conviction, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Mrs Arnasalam, 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. The panel has observed, *“The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety and/or security of pupils and/or members of the public, due to the inherent danger in operating a vehicle whilst intoxicated”*.

The panel further notes, [REDACTED]

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, *“It also noted that through the school’s investigative report, it had sight of potential rehabilitation on the part of Mrs Arnasalam; notably, reference was made to her undertaking a “pathway to recovery” in 2021. The panel however did not consider that this could provide significant mitigation, given the limited information that provided in relation to this and also the fact that no update was provided”*.

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, *“...that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present*

as the conduct found against Mrs Arnasalam was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated". I am particularly mindful "...of the panel's findings against Mrs Arnasalam which involved convictions for pertaining to two separate instances of being intoxicated whilst responsible for a vehicle and [REDACTED]" 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, conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, and a relevant conviction, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mrs Arnasalam herself. The panel comment *"Mrs Arnasalam did have a prior good history, having not been subject to any regulatory or disciplinary findings previously. The panel noted that Mrs Arnasalam had an unblemished career prior to these incidents and that Witness A and Witness B had confirmed that no safeguarding concerns had arisen in relation to her and pupils within the school, during their evidence. It was also noted that the school wrote a character reference in support of Mrs Arnasalam in respect of her first conviction, stating within it that "she was both popular and respected...there were no matters of a disciplinary nature brought against her". It also considered the fact that the Court imposed a conditional discharge at the time of the 2019, as indicative of the Court perceiving some prospect of rehabilitation."*

A prohibition order would prevent Mrs Arnasalam 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 or remorse. The panel has said, *"The panel considered that there was limited mitigation present within the case. As there had been very little engagement from Mrs Arnasalam, it did not consider that it could properly make a finding that any remorse, insight, reflection or remediation had been shown. It noted as stated above, that in 2021 Mrs Arnasalam was potentially taking rehabilitative steps, it however considered that in the absence of any further detail in relation to this, it could not properly consider it"*.

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that Mrs Arnasalam [REDACTED]

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mrs Arnasalam 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.

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 that no provision should be made for a review period.

I have considered the panel's comments *"In the circumstances, the panel formed the view that there was a high risk of repetition in relation to the case. It noted that Mrs Arnasalam's convictions that related to alcohol consumption whilst responsible for a vehicle were three years apart, showing a repeat in her behaviour, and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, it therefore determined that such behaviour may be likely to continue."*

I have considered whether not allowing a 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 allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the seriousness of the conduct which include violence and [REDACTED], and the panel's finding that there was a high risk of repetition in relation to this case.

I consider therefore that allowing for no review period is necessary to maintain public confidence and is proportionate and in the public interest.

This means that Mrs Pamela Arnasalam is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. Furthermore, in view of the seriousness of the allegations found proved against her, I have decided that Mrs Arnasalam shall not be entitled to apply for restoration of her eligibility to teach.

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

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



Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield

Date: 2 March 2026

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