



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Miss Tina Digby: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

July 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
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	19

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

Teacher: Miss Tina Digby

Teacher ref number: 0638480

Teacher date of birth: 3 June 1979

TRA reference: 21982

Date of determination: 16 July 2026

Former employer: Colnbrook Church of England Primary School, Slough

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 13 to 17 July 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Miss Digby.

The panel members were Mrs Melissa West (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Fiona Fowles (teacher panellist) and Mr Tony Coyne (lay panellist).

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

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Charlotte Watts of Browne Jacobson LLP solicitors.

Miss Digby was not present and was not represented.

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

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 16 March 2026.

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

Whilst engaged as a Teacher at Colnbrook Church of England Primary School;

1. She was unfit to teach due to alcohol consumption on or around:
 - i. 4 October 2023;
 - ii. 6 February 2024;
 - iii. 22 February 2024.
2. She failed to disclose relevant information, namely that she had been subject to one of more regulatory proceedings.
3. Her conduct as may be found proven at 2 above lacked integrity and/or was dishonest.

Miss Digby did not admit the allegations.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Notice of Hearing and Response – pages 6 to 48

Section 2: TRA Witness Statements – pages 50 to 109

Section 3: TRA Documents – pages 112 to 230

Section 4: Teacher Documents – pages 232 to 239

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

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]

Witness D – [REDACTED]

Witness E – [REDACTED]

Witness F – [REDACTED]

Witness G – [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.

In or around May 2023, Miss Digby worked for a school not connected with these proceedings, via a supply agency. A concern was raised with the LADO which subsequently resulted in the TRA contacting Miss Digby no later than 24 August 2023, notifying her that it would be investigating the allegation(s).

In September 2023 Miss Digby began working for the School as a Teacher. On or around 4 October 2023 Miss Digby attended the School and was observed as smelling of alcohol, slurring her words, and having a pale and clammy complexion. She was sent home for the day and the School sought advice from the LADO. The School gave Miss Digby informal management advice which they confirmed in a subsequent letter. During ongoing conversations about the incident, the LADO informed the School that Miss Digby was subject to ongoing TRA proceedings.

On or around 6 February 2024 Miss Digby attended a disco at the School for students that took place in the afternoon. She was observed smelling of alcohol and staggering. The School began investigating the allegation against Miss Digby as a possible disciplinary matter.

On or around 22 February 2024 the School received another allegation that Miss Digby had smelt of alcohol in a staff meeting. This was included within the ongoing disciplinary investigation, which concluded on 13 June 2024.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

Whilst engaged as a Teacher at Colnbrook Church of England Primary School;

1. You were unfit to teach due to alcohol consumption on or around:

i. 4 October 2023;

Witness B's evidence is that at approximately 9.25am on or around 4 October 2023 she had a meeting with Miss Digby to go through feedback on her work. Witness B stated that during the meeting Miss Digby was slurring her words, covering her mouth, smelled strongly of alcohol, and her eyes were glazed. In oral evidence, Witness B explained that she was not sat very far away from Miss Digby in the meeting and the alcohol smell on Miss Digby was "pungent". Witness B also clarified what she had meant by "glazed eyes". She described Miss Digby to have appeared to be concentrating hard on listening to Witness B, in a manner that could be described as being fixated on Witness B whilst she was speaking. Witness B clarified that Miss Digby's slurring was not consistent but that she would miss some sounds from words and was getting muddled up with what she was saying. Witness B told the panel that at the end of the meeting with Miss Digby, she addressed the smell and Miss Digby 'was not aware of the smell and began to panic'. Miss Digby had told Witness B that 'she had 2 large glasses of wine around midnight' and that 'the smell may be from those drinks'. Witness B then reported her concern to Witness A.

Witness A's evidence is that at around 10am he went to speak with Miss Digby about the concern he had received from Witness B. Miss Digby also told Witness A that she had been drinking alcohol the night before. Witness A described Miss Digby as having an 'unsteady gaze', 'slurring her words', and smelling 'strongly of alcohol'. Witness A said that the smell of alcohol was strong and he did not believe that it was only from drinks consumed the previous evening. The panel heard evidence that [REDACTED] she was walking more unsteadily than usual. Witness A explained that, in his view, Miss Digby was unfit to work and sent her home. In oral evidence Witness A was clear that he did not consider Miss Digby fit to remain in work. Witness A also told the panel that after the meeting with Miss Digby he sought advice from the School's HR staff and the LADO.

The panel was provided with a contemporaneous document, namely the summary of the conversation between Witness A and Miss Digby that Witness A had made on or around 4 October 2023. In the note, it states that Witness A 'offered [Miss Digby] the opportunity to go home for the rest of the day' and '[Witness A] stated that [Miss Digby] could work from home if she wanted to, or to go home and rest'. This was inconsistent to Witness A's evidence provided for these proceedings, which was that he sent Miss Digby home because she was unfit to remain at work. However, when questioned about this inconsistency Witness A's answer was credible. Witness A confirmed that the note of the conversation that Witness A created at the time was an accurate record of what was said in that conversation. Witness A's position was that during the conversation with Miss Digby on or around 4 October 2023, Miss Digby had disclosed information to him about difficult personal circumstances. [REDACTED].

Witness A's firm position was that Miss Digby would not have been allowed to remain at School that day but he wanted to approach the matter more gently, mindful of the delicate situation. The panel found this to be a credible explanation for the inconsistency, which is also supported by the report to the LADO that Witness A made. The key factor in the panel's mind was that Witness A considered Miss Digby to be unfit to remain at School, and she did not remain at School that day.

Witness A's evidence was that he was concerned about the safety of the pupils and Miss Digby, and Miss Digby's ability to safeguard pupils. The panel accepted that this was a genuine concern of Witness A.

The panel was not provided with any evidence to rebut the School's opinion that Miss Digby smelt of alcohol on or around 4 October 2023. As part of these TRA proceedings, Miss Digby provided a written response that the panel considered in its deliberations. In the written response, Miss Digby stated that she does not 'have any alcohol issues and [has] never had alcohol in a teaching environment'. She also stated that she 'may have slurred, though do not recall. [REDACTED]'. The panel considered that explanation but found the available witness evidence before it, which distinguished between Miss Digby's normal presentation and the unsteadiness with which she presented herself on or around 4 October 2023, more credible.

Miss Digby provided no evidence to dispute, either at the time or for the purpose of these proceedings, the School's opinion that she smelt of alcohol whilst at School on or around 4 October 2023.

On balance, the panel found that Miss Digby did smell of alcohol on or around 4 October 2023 which was more likely than not a result of her having consumed alcohol. The panel was not charged with making a finding of whether Miss Digby consumed alcohol on School premises and so it has not assessed the likelihood of that. However, it is evident that Miss Digby at the very least had been drinking alcohol late in the evening before she

attended School on or around 4 October 2023 and that she smelt of alcohol on or around 4 October 2023. In relation to the issue of whether Miss Digby was unfit to teach on or around 4 October 2023, the panel found that she was. Witness B had raised concerns with Witness A, and Witness A had then met with Miss Digby. Witness A, by his own account, was concerned for the safeguarding of pupils based on the observations he had made of Miss Digby.

The panel concluded that although there was no explicit mention in the contemporaneous evidence of Miss Digby not being fit to *teach*, it is evident that Witness A's concern was for the safety of pupils. The panel's view was that *teaching* should not be interpreted in the narrow sense, and included being in the presence of and looking after children at School. On that basis, the panel concluded that Miss Digby had been unfit to teach on or around 4 October 2023.

For the reasons above, this allegation was proved.

2. You failed to disclose relevant information, namely that you had been subject to one of more regulatory proceedings.

3. Your conduct as may be found proven at 2 above lacked integrity and/or was dishonest

The panel was provided with evidence demonstrating the existence of TRA proceedings against Miss Digby that predate her employment with the School. The panel was not provided with the details of those allegations, save for limited information Miss Digby provided in various correspondence with the TRA.

On 16 May 2023 the LADO held a telephone consultation with Miss Digby's former supply agency. The panel was provided with a redacted copy of that consultation record.

On 24 August 2023 the TRA wrote to Miss Digby to notify her that they were investigating allegations against her and invited her to respond.

On 29 August 2023 Miss Digby replied to the TRA by email and stated her belief that the allegations were false and she referred to a school she worked at in May 2023.

On 4 September 2023 Miss Digby's former supply agency responded to the TRA in relation to the ongoing allegations. The panel was provided with a redacted copy of that email but was not provided with information about the substance of the TRA's initial questions of the former supply agency.

On 22 September 2023 the TRA wrote to Miss Digby to provide her with further evidence relating to the ongoing proceedings and invited her to respond.

On 5 January 2024 the TRA wrote to Miss Digby to provide her with further evidence relating to the ongoing proceedings and to notify her that the previous allegations had been amended. These were redacted in the copy provided to the panel.

The panel also considered other evidence it was provided with. On 6 March 2024 Miss Digby emailed the TRA and stated that she 'did not see of a reason to talk about when I was on supply so was in no way dishonest'. Further, in a fact-finding meeting with Witness D on 18 April 2024, which was part of the School's investigation into the School's allegations against Miss Digby, Miss Digby stated that she did not mention the TRA investigation to Witness A. She also stated that 'the allegations were only about smell, it wasn't a big issue that [Witness A] needed to know about'.

Based on the evidence provided to it, the panel was satisfied that Miss Digby was aware that there were ongoing regulatory proceedings into her conduct by the time she had commenced employment with the School.

Witness A told the panel in evidence that he was only informed of the TRA's ongoing investigation into Miss Digby after he had referred concerns to LADO in around October/November 2023. In oral evidence, Witness A stated that he had asked Miss Digby about the ongoing investigation and she had told him that it was closed. In the absence of Miss Digby, the panel considered the evidence before it carefully. It was not satisfied that Miss Digby would have genuinely believed the ongoing TRA proceedings were closed. She was not sent any correspondence to confirm that they had been closed and, to the contrary, the correspondence she had received had explained that the TRA was continuing to investigate.

In addition, the panel was provided with a copy of the School's Code of Conduct. Section 7.1 of that Code of Conduct required staff to notify the School of any ongoing investigation and if staff were in any doubt as to the position they should still notify the School. The panel noted that Miss Digby did not proactively notify the School of the TRA proceedings. It was only when questioned by the School that Miss Digby admitted there were regulatory proceedings involving her; firstly to Witness A in around October/November 2023, and secondly in the School's investigation interview in April 2024 – both of which have already been referred to by the panel.

For the avoidance of doubt, the allegation(s) that pre-date Miss Digby's employment at the School are no longer included in these proceedings and the panel was not told what they were.

For the above reasons, the panel found allegation 2 proved. As there was a factual link between allegations 2 and 3, the panel considered it appropriate to determine these allegations together in its findings.

Given that the panel found Miss Digby did fail to disclose the existence of proceedings to the School, the panel then went on to assess whether or not Miss Digby's actions amounted to dishonesty and/or a lack of integrity.

In relation to dishonesty, the panel first sought to ascertain the actual state of Miss Digby's knowledge or belief as to the facts. For the reasons above, the panel concluded that Miss Digby was aware of ongoing TRA proceedings. In evidence, Witness A, Witness B and Witness D confirmed that as part of the staff induction, staff are given a copy of the School's Code of Conduct. The panel was not provided with documentary evidence that Miss Digby had received the Code of Conduct but, on the balance of probabilities, the panel found that it was likely she had received it. The panel also found that it was the responsibility of employees to ensure they are familiar with the School's Code of Conduct. As such, Miss Digby would have been aware that she was obliged to notify the School of the TRA proceedings. The panel then considered whether Miss Digby's conduct was honest or dishonest by applying the standards of ordinary decent people. In the panel's view, Miss Digby's actions were contrary to those standards. The panel had in mind that dishonesty was not the only explanation for such conduct and that there could have been other explanations, such as mistake or carelessness.

In Miss Digby's email to the TRA of 6 March 2024, she stated explicitly that she did not see a reason to talk about the ongoing TRA proceedings and that she 'did not deny or discuss the ridiculous allegations'. She also described to Witness D on 18 April 2024 that she did not believe the proceedings were important. Based on this evidence, the panel's view was that Miss Digby made a deliberate decision not to tell the School about the ongoing proceedings.

Further, the panel's view is that Miss Digby deliberately withheld information from the School to try and conceal the allegations against her. When Witness A had been told about the proceedings by the LADO, Miss Digby again acted dishonestly by telling Witness A that those proceedings were closed. These were not the actions of someone that was mistaken or careless.

For completeness, the panel also considered the question of integrity. Integrity connotes adherence to the ethical standards of one's own profession that involves more than mere honesty. Notwithstanding that, professional people are not expected to be paragons of virtue. The question of integrity is linked to the manner in which the profession professes to serve the public. Given the panel found that Miss Digby had been dishonest in her actions, it followed that she had not acted in a manner in which the profession professes to serve the public. Her decision not to disclose the ongoing proceedings was disingenuous at best (notwithstanding that the panel found it to be dishonest), and as such Miss Digby lacked integrity.

For the reasons above, allegation 3 is proved.

The panel found the following particulars of the allegations against you not proved, for these reasons:

Whilst engaged as a Teacher at Colnbrook Church of England Primary School;

1. You were unfit to teach due to alcohol consumption on or around:

ii. 6 February 2024;

On or around 6 February 2024 there was a disco for the pupils at the School. Based on the evidence available, the panel was satisfied that Miss Digby was present at the disco, which had been organised by the Parent Teacher Association ("PTA"). There were a number of staff and PTA members present to supervise the children.

The panel noted that 6 February 2024 was a school day. The disco took place at the end of the school day, during which it appears that Miss Digby was working. There is no evidence to dispute that.

Witness E's evidence was that she was assisting as a [REDACTED]. She was actively going to the [REDACTED] to say hello and have conversations with them. This included Miss Digby. Witness E described Miss Digby as smelling of alcohol and dancing with others at the disco. She also described how, when she went to speak with Miss Digby, she noticed that Miss Digby smelt of alcohol, which Witness E considered to be inappropriate. Witness E told the panel that she then went to find Witness A to notify him of her concern about Miss Digby. She was unable to find Witness A, but she did find Witness C and notified Witness C that she thought Miss Digby smelt of alcohol.

Witness C's evidence was that she was not at the disco as she was in a classroom marking pupils' work. She confirmed to the panel that Witness E did notify her of a concern about Miss Digby smelling of alcohol and "not seeming herself". Witness E had told Witness C that she was unable to tell Witness A because he was in a meeting, Witness C emailed Witness A to relay the concern.

Witness A's evidence was that when he was notified of Witness E's concern, it was at the end of the school day. As Witness A was occupied in a meeting, he asked Witness B to go and investigate the allegation against Miss Digby.

Witness B's evidence to the panel was that she went to see Miss Digby, who by that point was back in her classroom with her class. Witness B described Miss Digby dismissing her class and then speaking with her. Witness B recalled that Miss Digby smelt of alcohol but was not unsteady and there was no real change in her presentation.

Witness A explained that he spoke with Miss Digby and considered that there was a smell of alcohol coming from her but that it was not as strong as he had found it to be on

or around 4 October 2023. Witness A also confirmed that Miss Digby was not sent home because it was the end of the School day.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel concluded that if Miss Digby had been deemed unfit to teach by the School, the concern from Witness E would have been reacted to quicker by the School and Miss Digby would have been removed from the vicinity of children. The panel also concluded that if, upon having spoken to Miss Digby, Witness A or Witness B had concluded that Miss Digby was unfit to be supervising children at School, she would have been removed from the classroom. Further, it was approximately 45 minutes between Witness E having concerns around Miss Digby and Witness B observing her with children in the classroom. The panel's view was that there was no evidence to show that the matter was treated urgently by the School. The panel therefore concluded that Miss Digby was not unfit to teach on or around 6 February 2024.

For the reasons above, this allegation is not proved.

iii. 22 February 2024.

The panel heard evidence from Witness G, who stated that in a weekly staff meeting on 22 February 2024 she smelt alcohol part way through the meeting. The meeting was held at approximately 8.15am. Witness G stated that she asked a colleague, Witness F, whether they could smell the alcohol too. Witness G's evidence was that Witness F said she could not smell alcohol but indicated that there was someone behind them; that someone was Miss Digby, who was leaving the room as the meeting was ending. Witness G explained that she recognised the smell as fresh, or recently consumed, alcohol. [REDACTED]. The panel found Witness G to be credible.

Witness F's evidence contradicted Witness G's evidence. Witness F stated that she, too, had smelt the alcohol. However, the panel was not provided with any evidence to dispute the fact that Miss Digby smelt of alcohol and so it did not consider the inconsistency in evidence between Witness F and Witness G to have a significant consequence on its findings. The account Miss Digby gave during the School's investigation was that it could have been the smell of her perfume/lotion and/or the smell of alcohol from drinks she had consumed the night before.

The important consideration for the panel was whether Miss Digby was deemed as unfit to teach by the School. Witness G told the panel that Witness F had suggested she should tell Witness D about the concern regarding the smell of alcohol. Witness G also told the panel that she returned to her class at the end of the staff briefing to help the children settle in, as they had started to arrive at School by that point. Witness G also confirmed that it was Witness D who had come to find her first, and she believed that it was because Witness F had told Witness D about her conversation with Witness G. According to Witness G, Witness D spoke to Witness G at around lunchtime.

The panel accepted the witnesses' accounts that the staff meeting was most likely led by Witness A, as that was what usually happened. The panel considered the fact that none of the relevant witnesses reported Miss Digby as behaving in a manner that might give rise to concerns about her fitness to teach. The only concern raised was about the smell of alcohol. The panel heard evidence that the staff briefing was held in a relatively small room, considering the number of people that were present (which the panel understands to be approximately 25). It was therefore reasonable to conclude that if Miss Digby had been behaving in a manner that might have been considered unfit to teach, someone in the room, including Witness A, would have noticed. The allegation was not then followed up by Witness D until around lunchtime that day, some hours later, and the panel had no evidence that any further immediate action was taken. Further, based on the evidence available, Miss Digby was not sent home by the School after Witness D had spoken with Witness G. In the panel's view, these factors were indicative of the School having considered Miss Digby as being fit to teach. On that basis, the panel concluded the same.

For the reasons above, this allegation is not proved.

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

Having found a number 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 Miss Digby, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Miss Digby 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....
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Miss Digby, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education 2023 (“KCSIE”).

The panel considered that Miss Digby was in breach of the following provisions:

- Paragraph 12 – teachers should safeguard children’s wellbeing and maintain public trust in the teaching profession as part of their professional duties.
- Paragraph 13 - all staff should be aware of systems within their school or college which support safeguarding, and these should be explained to them as part of staff induction. This should include the staff behaviour policy (sometimes called a code of conduct) should amongst other things, include low-level concerns, allegations against staff and whistleblowing.

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

The panel also considered whether Miss Digby’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 serious dishonesty was relevant.

In addition, the panel found that Miss Digby had been unfit to teach due to alcohol consumption. The panel was concerned by this and although it was not attributable to an offence listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice, it was still a material factor that needed to be considered. Miss Digby was responsible for teaching primary school children. She therefore had responsibility for the safeguarding of their wellbeing during the school day. By being unfit to teach due to alcohol consumption, Miss Digby potentially jeopardised the wellbeing and safety of the children and others at the School.

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

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

In relation to whether Miss Digby’s actions amounted to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, the panel took into account the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. It considered the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel also took account of the uniquely influential role

that teachers can hold in pupils' lives and the fact that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way that they behave.

In considering the issue of disrepute, the panel also considered whether Miss Digby'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 Miss Digby was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found that the offence of serious dishonesty was relevant.

In addition, the panel found that Miss Digby had been unfit to teach due to alcohol consumption. The panel was concerned by this and although it was not attributable to an offence listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice, it was still a material factor that needed to be considered. Miss Digby was responsible for teaching primary school children. She therefore had responsibility for the safeguarding of their wellbeing during the school day. By being unfit to teach due to alcohol consumption, Miss Digby potentially jeopardised the wellbeing and safety of the children and others at the School. The panel's view was that such behaviour would undermine the trust and confidence that parents place in teaching staff, in respect of caring for their children.

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

For these reasons, the panel found that Miss Digby'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 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 made findings that Miss Digby had been seriously dishonest and that on one occasion she had been unfit to teach because of consumption of alcohol, and was sent home from School.

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils.

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

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Miss Digby was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

In addition to the public interest considerations set out above, the panel went on to consider whether there was a public interest in retaining Miss Digby in the profession. The panel was provided with limited evidence about Miss Digby's ability as an educator. It heard oral witness evidence from Witness B, in which she confirmed Miss Digby was an enthusiastic teacher but it also heard witness evidence from Witness B and Witness D that Miss Digby was being provided with informal support to help her performance. There was no other evidence to give the panel an insight into Miss Digby's ability as an educator or to the level of contribution she had made to the profession during her career as a teacher. The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Miss Digby 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 Miss Digby.

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;

- failure in their duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk or failing to promote the safety and welfare of the children (as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE);
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions...

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors. Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

There was evidence that Miss Digby's actions were deliberate.

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

Miss Digby 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 not provided with evidence to show that Miss Digby had demonstrated any level of insight and remorse. The panel was particularly struck by the attitude that Miss Digby had shown towards these proceedings. In correspondence to the TRA she had referred to the allegations against her as 'ridiculous'. During the School investigation she described the proceedings as being "not a big issue". Miss Digby also emailed the TRA in May 2026 and stated that she was not 'taking part in the hearing, as stated a complete waste of time and money'. In the panel's view this was indicative of Miss Digby's contempt for her regulatory body and the function it performs. The TRA's function is, primarily, to ensure that members of the teaching profession meet the standards expected of the profession. By virtue of this, it ensures that the wellbeing and safeguarding of pupils can be maintained. Miss Digby's disregard for the importance of these proceedings, demonstrated by the language and manner of her comments made about the TRA proceedings and by her voluntary absenteeism from the hearing, is telling. Miss Digby's conduct during these proceedings demonstrated to the panel that she did not show insight or remorse into the seriousness of the allegations or the potential effect that her conduct could have had on others.

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 Miss Digby of prohibition.

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Miss Digby. Her unwillingness to recognise the importance of these proceedings or the seriousness of the allegations against her was a significant factor in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate for it to decide to recommend a review period of the order. The panel was mindful that the Advice states that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances, in any given case, that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 2 years.

The Advice indicates that there are certain types of case where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period.

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

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

One of these includes:

- fraud or serious dishonesty.

The panel found that the dishonesty element linked to Miss Digby's deliberate failure to disclose the ongoing TRA proceedings to the School was serious. This seriousness was compounded by Miss Digby's disregard for the importance of these proceedings, as described above. The panel considered that a shorter review period would not be appropriate in the circumstances. Additionally, Miss Digby failed to recognise the seriousness of the School's concern about her fitness to teach on or around 4 October 2023; which was serious enough to send her home in order to safeguard the pupils.

Based on the evidence available, the panel could not determine with any degree of certainty that Miss Digby would not repeat the conduct that led to these proceedings and therefore concluded that there was a risk of repetition. However, equally the panel could not provide an indication as to the level of that risk, based on the evidence available.

The panel's view was that a prohibition order was proportionate but that a review period was also proportionate. In light of the above findings, the panel also concluded that a longer review period was necessary in the circumstances.

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 4 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 some 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 also found some of the allegations not proven. I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Miss Tina Digby should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of four years.

In particular, the panel has found that Miss Digby 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....
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Miss Digby 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 Miss Digby fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding “...that Miss Digby had been seriously dishonest and that on one occasion she had been unfit to teach because of consumption of alcohol...”.

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 Miss Digby, 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 safeguard pupils. The panel has observed this in relation to this case, *“There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of 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 sets out as follows, *“The panel was not provided with evidence to show that Miss Digby had demonstrated any level of insight and remorse.”*

The panel has also commented,

“Miss Digby’s conduct during these proceedings demonstrated to the panel that she did not show insight or remorse into the seriousness of the allegations or the potential effect that her conduct could have had on others.”

In my judgement, the lack of evidence of insight or 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 observe, *“...that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Miss Digby 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 Miss Digby herself. The panel comment *“Miss Digby 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.”*

A prohibition order would prevent Miss Digby 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 was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Miss Digby. Her unwillingness to recognise the importance of these proceedings or the seriousness of the allegations against her was a significant factor in forming that opinion.”*

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that Miss Digby was dishonest with her then employer about being subject to regulatory action.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Miss Digby 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 remorse or insight, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

For these reasons, I have concluded that a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest in order to achieve the intended aims of a prohibition order.

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended a four-year review period.

I have considered the panel’s comments *“The panel found that the dishonesty element linked to Miss Digby’s deliberate failure to disclose the ongoing TRA proceedings to the School was serious. This seriousness was compounded by Miss Digby’s disregard for the importance of these proceedings.”*

The panel has also said, *“Based on the evidence available, the panel could not determine with any degree of certainty that Miss Digby would not repeat the conduct that led to these proceedings and therefore concluded that there was a risk of repetition. However, equally the panel could not provide an indication as to the level of that risk, based on the evidence available.”*

The panel has also said that a four-year review period was necessary in the circumstances.

I have considered whether a four-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. A review period may not be set at less than two years. In my view, the factors in this case mean that a two-year review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession, and that a longer review period is necessary. These elements are the seriousness of the conduct, the dishonesty found by the panel and the lack of any evidence of insight or remorse.

I therefore agree with the panel that a four-year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

This means that Miss Tina Digby 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 24 July 2030, four years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If she does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Miss Digby remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Miss Digby 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: 17 July 2026

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