



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mrs Jennifer Wallington: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

September 2021

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	10
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	14

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

Teacher:	Mrs Jennifer Wallington
Teacher ref number:	1545886
Teacher date of birth:	22 April 1984
TRA reference:	18472
Date of determination:	9 September 2021
Former employer:	Malcolm Sargent School, Stamford

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 9 September 2021 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mrs Jennifer Wallington.

The panel members were Mrs Oluremi Alabi (lay panellist – in the chair), Mr Paul Millett (lay panellist) and Mr Paul D Hawkins (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Robert Kellaway of Birketts LLP solicitors.

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Mrs Wallington that the allegations be considered without a hearing. A signed statement of agreed facts had been agreed in advance of the meeting.

The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, Mr Ian Perkins of Browne Jacobson LLP solicitors (previously Andrew Cullen of the same firm), Mrs Wallington or any representative of Mrs Wallington.

The meeting took place in private by way of a virtual meeting, save for the announcement of the panel’s decision, which was announced in public and recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 24 June 2021.

It was alleged that Mrs Wallington was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst employed as a teacher at Malcolm Sargent Primary School:

1. She altered one or more pupils' Key Stage 2 National Curriculum tests after those tests had been marked.
2. She altered marks that had been awarded to one or more pupils on their Key Stage 2 National Curriculum tests in contravention with the relevant mark scheme.
3. Her conduct as may be found proven at allegations 1 and 2 was dishonest and/or demonstrated a lack of integrity.

Mrs Wallington admitted the facts of allegations 1 to 3 within a statement of agreed facts, which she signed on 9 October 2020. Mrs Wallington also admitted within the statement that her conduct in respect of allegations 1 to 3 amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Preliminary applications

There were no preliminary applications.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

- Section 1: Notice of proceedings, response to notice of proceedings and statement of agreed facts – pages 2 to 17
- Section 2: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 19 to 706
- Section 3: Teacher documents – pages 708 to 770.

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

- TRA's directions for professional conduct panel meeting (PCPM) – pages 771 to 773

- Presenting officer's representations for PCPM – pages 774 to 775
- Medical evidence provided by Mrs Wallington – pages 776 to 777
- Email exchanges between presenting officer, TRA and Mrs Wallington – pages 778 to 790.

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

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which Mrs Wallington had signed on 9 October 2020 and which the presenting officer had signed on 17 December 2020.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

The panel carefully considered the case and reached a decision.

In advance of the meeting, the TRA agreed to a request from Mrs Wallington for the allegations to be considered without a hearing. The panel noted it 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.

Mrs Wallington had been employed at Malcolm Sargent School ('the School') since 1 January 2016 as a teacher. Prior to being employed as a teacher, Mrs Wallington had been employed at the School as a teaching assistant from April 2011. At the time of the alleged misconduct, Mrs Wallington was a Year 3 teacher.

In spring 2019, Year 3 pupils at the School completed their Key Stage 2 National Curriculum tests, which included maths and English assessments.

In or around March 2019, Individual A [redacted] noticed that a significant number of marks appeared to have been altered on a number of pupils' assessment papers. It was alleged that Mrs Wallington had altered the marks that had been awarded by Individual B [redacted].

Mrs Wallington was suspended on 2 April 2019 and the School commenced a disciplinary investigation. A disciplinary hearing was held on 21 May 2019 and Mrs Wallington was later dismissed for gross misconduct on 4 June 2019.

The School referred the matter to the TRA on 18 June 2019.

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. You altered one or more pupils' Key Stage 2 National Curriculum Tests after those tests had been marked.

The panel noted that in the signed statement of agreed facts dated 9 October 2020, Mrs Wallington admitted this allegation in its entirety.

Mrs Wallington admitted that she had altered marks on the Key Stage 2 tests after those tests had been marked by Individual B, Individual C [redacted] and Individual D [redacted]. Mrs Wallington admitted that she had altered a significant number of marks from '0' to '1'.

Mrs Wallington admitted she had inserted answers where pupils had left blank answers and that she had written over pupils' original answers after those original assessments had been marked. By using a pencil to complete those changes, Mrs Wallington accepted that she was trying to conceal the alterations that she had made.

In total, Mrs Wallington admitted to making 333 changes to the original marks given to the Year 3 pupils. The breakdown of those admitted changes is as follows:

- Maths - Paper 1 Arithmetic: 146 marks changed
- Maths - Paper 2 Reasoning: 75 marks changed
- Maths - Paper 3 Reasoning: 57 marks changed
- English - Reading Paper: 54 marks changed
- Grammar, Punctuation and Spelling: 1 mark changed

The parties agreed that by making the changes to the maths assessments 7 pupils had moved up from 'working towards the expected standard' to 'working at the expected standard'. Further, the accepted amendments to the English reading assessments had moved 1 pupil up to 'working at the expected standard' and two pupils from 'working at the expected standard' to 'working at greater depth'.

Mrs Wallington admitted that she amended pupils' answers after the tests had been marked in order to secure better grades for the pupils.

Mrs Wallington's signed statement of agreed facts accorded with the admissions she had previously made in her email to the presenting officer of 9 September 2020. The panel noted, Mrs Wallington had commented in that email:

"After burying my head in the sand for far too long, I've made the decision to admit my wrong doings, hoping that it isn't too late to finally allow myself to admit my grave mistake of changing some of the children's marks."

"I wish I had had the strength and courage to admit my mistake straight away, but once I had gone forward with denying I was just too embarrassed and mortified at myself to admit my failings! I can't apologise enough for not being honest with my ex colleagues and in turn the children who I loved and respected dearly and their parents."

Notwithstanding Mrs Wallington's admission, the panel made its own determination of the facts of this allegation on all of the evidence before it.

The panel considered there was substantial evidence within the bundle, in particular the statements provided by Mrs Wallington's colleagues as part of the disciplinary investigation and copies of the assessment papers, which supported Mrs Wallington's admission of the facts.

The panel considered there was no credible evidence before it that the alterations to the given marks had been undertaken by someone other than Mrs Wallington.

The panel noted that in the papers it had read Mrs Wallington referred to her state of mind at the time. However, the panel considered that Mrs Wallington had provided no good reason for making the substantial amendments she had made to the marks.

The panel found the facts of allegation 1 proven.

2. You altered marks that had been awarded to one or more pupils on their Key Stage 2 National Curriculum Tests in contravention with the relevant mark scheme.

The panel noted that in the signed statement of agreed facts dated 9 October 2020, Mrs Wallington admitted this allegation in its entirety.

Mrs Wallington admitted that she knowingly misapplied the marking criteria when altering the Year 3 assessments. Mrs Wallington admitted to 7 particular instances of this within the signed statement of agreed facts.

The panel considered the witness statements provided as part of the disciplinary investigation, and the copies of the assessment papers, accorded with Mrs Wallington's admission.

The panel was satisfied that Mrs Wallington had acted in contravention of the relevant mark schemes and procedures. Accordingly, the panel found the facts of allegation 2 proven.

3. Your conduct as may be found proven at allegations 1 and 2 was dishonest and/or demonstrated a lack of integrity.

Mrs Wallington admitted this allegation in its entirety within the signed statement of agreed facts dated 9 October 2020. Notwithstanding that admission, the panel made its own determination of the facts of this allegation on all of the evidence before it.

The panel found that by altering the marks and knowingly misapplying the relevant mark schemes, Mrs Wallington had intentionally given a false account of the achievement of the Year 3 pupils.

The panel concluded that Mrs Wallington's conduct had clearly been dishonest by the objective standards of ordinary decent people. In reaching this decision, the panel considered the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd t/a Crockford*.

When considering whether Mrs Wallington had failed to act with integrity the panel considered the case of *Wingate & Anor v The Solicitors Regulation Authority*. The panel, having considered all the evidence, found that Mrs Wallington had failed to act with integrity when altering a large number of marks and when she awarded marks in a clear contravention of the relevant mark schemes.

The panel found the facts of allegation 3 proven.

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

Having found the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. In doing so, the panel had regard to the document *Teacher Misconduct: The Prohibition of Teachers*, which is referred to as "the Advice".

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mrs Wallington, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mrs Wallington was in breach of the following standards:

- 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 Mrs Wallington in respect of allegations 1, 2 and 3 amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel considered it a basic expectation and essential requirement that teachers do not alter pupils' examination papers. Further, the panel considered that it was a fundamental requirement of the teaching profession that teachers acted both honestly and with integrity, especially in terms of pupil assessment where teachers are in a key position of trust and responsibility.

The panel considered that Mrs Wallington's actions amounted to dishonesty of a serious nature. She had made extensive and significant changes to the tests of pupils. The panel noted that Mrs Wallington's actions had serious consequences or could have had serious consequences if undiscovered by the School. In particular:

- future teaching, intervention and support for pupils would be based on false information, some pupils who may have required further support may have not received it;
- a number of pupils being given a false impression of their achievement in these tests;
- parents being provided with inaccurate feedback as to their child's academic progress; and
- assessment data reported to pupils, parents, School's leaders, governors, the local authority and Ofsted would be incorrect.

The panel took into account the way the teaching profession is viewed by others and considered the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community.

In the panel's view, it was clear that the public would not expect or tolerate a teacher dishonestly amending and upgrading the test results of pupils. The panel considered that schools, teachers and pupils who had kept to the examination rules would themselves feel cheated by such actions and this would undermine confidence in the credibility of the examination system.

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 they behave. The panel found that Mrs Wallington had not acted as a role model in respect of the proven allegations. The panel considered that if pupils were aware of Mrs Wallington's actions, this could set a bad example to pupils as it could suggest to those pupils that it is acceptable to cheat.

The panel therefore found that Mrs Wallington's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In summary, having found the facts of allegations 1, 2 and 3 proved, the panel further found that Mrs Wallington's conduct amounted to both unacceptable professional conduct and 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.

The panel noted that 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 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 maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct. The panel carefully considered the public interest of retaining the teacher in the profession but for the reasons set out below did not consider there to be a strong or substantial public interest consideration in this regard.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mrs Wallington, which involved conduct that was both dishonest and lacked integrity, the panel considered there was a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession. The panel considered the conduct found against Mrs Wallington as outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

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

The panel decided that there was not a public interest consideration in retaining Mrs Wallington in the profession.

The panel noted there was some evidence within the bundle that Mrs Wallington had made a positive contribution to the profession but did not consider there was enough evidence that she had made a significant or substantial contribution to the profession

since 2016 when she qualified as a teacher. The panel noted positive comments by some of Mrs Wallington's former colleagues of the contribution she had made whilst she had taught at the School. In particular:

- Individual E [redacted]
 - “Jennifer was very often praised by parents for her relationships with the children in parent’s evenings and academic reports: her kindness and warmth were key parts of her teaching values.”
 - “During these two years that I worked alongside Jennifer, I cannot fault her teaching or her attitude to her career.”
- Individual F [redacted]
 - “Many of the children in her class adored her and she was a valued member of our team.”
- Individual G [redacted]
 - “I witnessed many parents thanking Jennifer for her work with their children, commenting that they were happily talking about school at home and the fact that they no longer dreaded coming to school. Jennifer’s approach towards teaching was very pupil centred, she would always encourage the children to learn in ways that suited their personalities, passions and strengths.”

The panel also noted within the bundle examples of positive feedback which Mrs Wallington had received from parents whilst she had been a teacher at the School, particularly during the period she had been a Year 4 teacher.

- Individual H [redacted]
 - “Due to Mrs Wallington, our faith has been restored in Malcom Sargent School...”
- Individual I [redacted]
 - “I cannot thank Mrs Wallington enough for such a great year. She will be missed.”
- Individual J [redacted]
 - “Mrs Wallington has inspired [pupil] so much. She absolutely loves being around her and has come a long way in most areas.”

The panel had not had the opportunity to question these referees on the character references which had been provided. The panel noted that the parental reflections referred to above had been provided before the serious misconduct in spring 2019 had taken place.

Whilst there was some character references and previous positive parental reflections the panel was not convinced that there was evidence that there was a strong or substantial public interest consideration in retaining Mrs Wallington within the teaching profession.

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 Wallington.

In carrying out the balancing exercise, the panel had regard to the public interest considerations as well as the interests of Mrs Wallington.

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 well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- dishonesty especially where there have been serious consequences, and/or it has been repeated and/or covered up;

The panel considered that in spring 2019, Mrs Wallington by her actions of altering numerous test marks of her pupils and intentionally misapplying the relevant mark schemes, had seriously departed from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards. Moreover, the panel considered that Mrs Wallington's misconduct could have had serious consequences to more than one stakeholder and had only not done so because the School had discovered the misconduct.

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 Wallington's actions were not deliberate. Mrs Wallington had been aware that she was altering pupil's test marks.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mrs Wallington was acting under duress.

The panel did note that Mrs Wallington had suggested she had been [redacted] at the relevant time. However, the panel considered there was only limited evidence before it that this had been the case at the time Mrs Wallington extensively altered the Key Stage 2 examination results in spring 2019. The panel noted that the most recent [redacted] (relating to her [redacted]) was dated 5 January 2018, over a year before the serious misconduct took place in spring 2019 and no medical evidence from [redacted] had been provided. The panel considered the [redacted] included within the bundle suggested Mrs Wallington had received some support from the school in relation to her [redacted]. The

panel did not consider Mrs Wallington's [redacted] to be a strong mitigating factor in this case.

The panel noted Mrs Wallington also stated that she was also under additional pressure as it was the first time she had had a student teacher within her class. The panel considered this point but did not believe it be a compelling point of mitigation.

The panel noted that other than the events concerning these tests in spring 2019, no doubts had been cast as to Mrs Wallington's ability or professionalism. The panel noted there was no evidence that Mrs Wallington had previously been subject to any disciplinary sanctions. The panel considered a number of character references that were provided on Mrs Wallington's behalf. In particular, further to the statements referred to above the panel noted the following statements:

- Individual D [redacted]
 - "She was hard-working and we worked very well together and I found her to be a great team player."
- Individual E [redacted]
 - "I enjoyed working with Jennifer very much and found her to be professional in approach, a good team member and valued greatly by parents who were always very grateful for her genuinely caring attitude. It was very obvious she cared deeply for the children and had their best interests at heart."

As mentioned above, the panel also noted a number of parent reflection forms and thank-you cards, submitted within the bundle.

The panel considered that Mrs Wallington in her written submission had displayed some remorse in relation to her misconduct, as outlined in her email to the presenting officer, dated 9 September 2020. Mrs Wallington admitted that, although she initially denied the allegations, this was because she was extremely embarrassed of her actions. The panel noted that Mrs Wallington now accepts responsibility for her actions.

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.

The panel did consider whether a recommendation that the publication of adverse findings would be sufficient. However, the panel determined that doing so would unacceptably compromise the strong public interest considerations of maintaining public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct

which the panel found to be present in this case. The panel decided that those public interest considerations outweighed any public interest of retaining Mrs Wallington in the profession.

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. 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 two years.

The panel noted that in her statement of 9 September 2020, Mrs Wallington had accepted full responsibility for her actions and understands the seriousness of her misconduct. It appeared to the panel from this statement that Mrs Wallington was remorseful for her actions.

The panel considered that Mrs Wallington had demonstrated some insight into her conduct, both in terms of acknowledging its severity and to some extent the consequences. However, the panel considered that Mrs Wallington could develop further insight into why her actions had been wrong and the potential negative consequences of her misconduct, particularly on the pupils she had taught and on the wider teaching profession.

The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. One of these behaviours include serious dishonesty. The panel found that Mrs Wallington was responsible for being dishonest and showing a lack of integrity. However, the panel did not consider that Mrs Wallington's actions amounted to dishonesty at a level at which no review period would be a proportionate or appropriate sanction.

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. The panel considered that the minimum period of 2 year review was appropriate and proportionate in light of all the considerations referred to above.

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 Jennifer Wallington should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of two years.

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

- 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 also, “satisfied that the conduct of Mrs Wallington fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.”

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of dishonesty involving a course of conduct designed to give a false account of the achievement of Year 3 pupils.

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 that may 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 Wallington, and the impact that will have on her, 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, “In the light of the panel’s findings against Mrs Wallington, which involved conduct that was both dishonest and lacked integrity, the panel considered there was a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession. The panel considered the conduct found against Mrs Wallington as outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.”

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 considered that Mrs Wallington had demonstrated some insight into her conduct, both in terms of acknowledging its severity and to some extent the consequences. However, the panel considered that Mrs Wallington could develop further insight into why her actions had been wrong and the potential negative consequences of her misconduct, particularly on the pupils she had taught and on the wider teaching profession."

In my judgement, the lack of full insight and remorse means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk, the future well being 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. I note that, "The panel decided that those public interest considerations outweighed any public interest of retaining Mrs Wallington in 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, 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 Wallington herself, "The panel noted that other than the events concerning these tests in spring 2019, no doubts had been cast as to Mrs Wallington's ability or professionalism." The panel also noted, "there was no evidence that Mrs Wallington had previously been subject to any disciplinary sanctions."

A prohibition order would prevent Mrs Wallington from teaching and 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 full insight or remorse.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mrs Wallington has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order, in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published

decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, that is not backed up by full 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 2 year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments, "The panel found that Mrs Wallington was responsible for being dishonest and showing a lack of integrity. However, the panel did not consider that Mrs Wallington's actions amounted to dishonesty at a level at which no review period would be a proportionate or appropriate sanction."

I note that, "The panel considered that the minimum period of 2 year review was appropriate and proportionate in light of all the considerations referred to above."

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. Although an allegation of dishonesty was found proven in this case, I am satisfied that a 2 year review period is sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession as Mrs Wallington displayed some insight and remorse and now accepts responsibility for her actions.

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 Jennifer Wallington is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. She may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 20 September 2023, 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 Jennifer Wallington remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mrs Wallington has a right of appeal to the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court within 28 days from the date she is given notice of this order.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "John Knowles". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'J'.

Decision maker: John Knowles

Date: 10 September 2021

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