



National College for  
Teaching & Leadership

# **Miss Jill Dodds: Professional conduct panel outcome**

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

**September 2016**

## Contents

A. Introduction	3
B. Allegations	4
C. Preliminary applications	5
D. Summary of evidence	6
Documents	6
Witnesses	6
E. Decision and reasons	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	13
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	15

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

**Teacher:** Miss Jill Dodds  
**Teacher ref number:** 0156512  
**Teacher date of birth:** 21 January 1974  
**NCTL case reference:** 14615  
**Date of determination:** 9 September 2016  
**Former employer:** Kenton School, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

### **A. Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the National College for Teaching and Leadership (“the National College”) convened on 8 September 2016 – 9 September 2016 at the Hilton Hotel, Paradise Way, Walsgrave Triangle, Coventry, CV2 2ST to consider the case of Miss Jill Dodds.

The panel members were Mr Robert Cawley (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Steve Woodhouse (teacher panellist) and Ms Nicole Jackson (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mrs Harpreet Marok of Eversheds LLP.

The presenting officer for the National College was Ben Chapman of Browne Jacobson LLP.

Miss Jill Dodds was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

## **B. Allegations**

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Proceedings dated 20 May 2016.

It was alleged that Miss Jill Dodds was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, in that whilst employed as a teacher at Kenton School in Newcastle-upon-Tyne, she:

**1) Was guilty of maladministration of the 2015 Design Technology: Textiles GCSE and in particular she:**

**a) failed to keep one or more pupils' assessed practical coursework secure including that she:**

- i. took one or more corsets home;**
- ii. lost one or more corsets;**
- iii. failed to produce one or more corsets for moderation when asked to do so.**

**b) Submitted marks for one or more pupils that:**

- i. exceeded the quality of their coursework at that time;**
- ii. did not reflect the fact that their practical coursework was unfinished at that time.**

**c) contributed to one or more pupils' assessed practical coursework including undertaking the following tasks for one or more pupils:**

- i. lining;**
- ii. adding loops;**
- iii. sewing;**
- iv. tie-dying;**
- v. printing.**

**2) Acted dishonestly in doing the conduct described at (1) above in that she was attempting to conceal the fact that one or more pupils had not completed their practical coursework.**

## C. Preliminary applications

The panel has considered whether this hearing should continue in the absence of the teacher.

The panel is satisfied that the National College has complied with the service requirements of paragraph 19 a to c of the Teachers' Disciplinary (England) Regulations 2012, (the "Regulations").

The panel is also satisfied that the Notice of Proceedings complies with paragraphs 4.11 and 4.12 of the Teacher Misconduct: Disciplinary Procedures for the Teaching Profession, (the "Procedures").

The panel has determined to exercise its discretion under Paragraph 4.29 of the Procedures to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Miss Dodds.

The panel understands that its discretion to commence a hearing in the absence of the teacher has to be exercised with the utmost care and caution, and that its discretion is a severely constrained one.

In making its decision, the panel has noted that Miss Dodds may waive her right to participate in the hearing. The panel has taken account of the various factors drawn to its attention from the case of *R v Jones* [2003] 1 AC1. Miss Dodds has responded to the email address used by the National College previously. In an email to the National College dated 1 April 2016 Miss Dodds indicated that she is now living and working in Thailand. She has expressed that neither she nor a representative will be attending the hearing. The panel heard from the presenting officer that Miss Dodds had corresponded most recently in the week commencing 5 September 2016 from the same email address to say that she wanted to know the outcome of the hearing. Therefore the panel considered that Miss Dodds has voluntarily absented herself from the hearing in the knowledge of when and where the hearing is taking place.

The panel has had regard to the requirement that it is only in rare and exceptional circumstances that a decision should be taken in favour of the hearing taking place. There is no indication that an adjournment might result in Miss Dodds attending the hearing. Miss Dodds has also indicated that she does not wish to be legally represented at the hearing.

The panel has had regard to the extent of the disadvantage to Miss Dodds in not being able to give her account of events, having regard to the nature of the evidence against her. The panel has the benefit of representations made by the teacher and is able to ascertain the lines of defence. The panel is also able to exercise vigilance in making its

decision, taking into account the degree of risk of the panel reaching the wrong decision as a result of not having heard the teacher's account.

The panel also notes that there are two witnesses present at the hearing, who are prepared to give evidence, and that it would be inconvenient for them to return again.

The panel has had regard to the seriousness of this case, and the potential consequences for the teacher and has accepted that fairness to the teacher is of prime importance. However, it considers that in light of Miss Dodds' waiver of her right to appear; by taking such measures referred to above to address that unfairness insofar as is possible; and taking account of the inconvenience an adjournment would cause to the witnesses; that on balance, these are serious allegations and the public interest in this hearing proceeding within a reasonable time is in favour of this hearing continuing today.

## **D. Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section 1: Chronology and anonymised pupil list – pages 2 to 3

Section 2: Notice of Proceedings and Response – pages 5 to 13

Section 3: NCTL witness statements – pages 15 to 16

Section 4: NCTL documents – pages 18 to 115

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 117 to 132

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

### **Witnesses**

The panel heard oral evidence from Witness A (Team Leader, Technology Department at Kenton School) and Witness B (Acting Head of Department at Kenton School).

## **E. Decision and reasons**

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

The panel confirms that it has read all the documents provided in the bundle in advance of the hearing.

Miss Jill Dodds was employed by Kenton School as member of the teaching staff in the Technology Department.

At some point during 2014 – 2015 it is alleged that Miss Dodds assisted pupils with their Textiles coursework. Following this, on 24 April 2015 she allegedly submitted inaccurate coursework marks.

On 27 April 2015, Miss Dodds was suspended on an unrelated matter. On 14 May 2015, the exam board requested her work for moderation.

## **Findings of fact**

Our findings of fact are as follows:

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

**1) Were guilty of maladministration of the 2015 Design Technology: Textiles GCSE and in particular you:**

**a) failed to keep one or more pupils' assessed practical coursework secure including that you:**

**i. took one or more corsets home;**

The panel considered all of the evidence and in particular noted the fact that two separate pupils (Pupils A and B) have provided statements to the effect that Miss Dodds did take their corsets home. The panel believed that it was unlikely that two pupils would separately make up something that is of no benefit to them at all.

In addition to this, in an email dated 18 May 2015, Individual A, Miss Dodds' union representative stated, "Re the coursework etc., it is in different places! Some at school and some at home." On the balance of probabilities the panel did not believe that the union representative would have misunderstood Miss Dodds on this and that he must have been told by her that there were one or more corsets belonging to the pupils at her home. The panel was told that all written coursework was found secured in a cupboard in Miss Dodds' classroom.

The panel is therefore satisfied that this allegation was proven.

**ii. lost one or more corsets;**

Similarly to the above allegation the panel noted that three separate pupils (Pupils A, B and C) provided evidence in statements to the effect that Miss Dodds had lost their corsets. In addition to this Miss Dodds herself admitted in an investigatory meeting held on 10 June 2015 that she had misplaced some of the corsets, however she "wasn't worried about it I knew they would turn up." The panel noted the fact that Miss Dodds did

not think to mention that she had misplaced the corsets to Witness A. It also noted that Miss Dodds did not comply with section 6.7 of the AQA GCSE Specification Design and Technology: Textiles Technology 2014 (“AQA Specification”), which says AQA should be notified immediately if work is lost. The panel believed that Miss Dodds had lost one or more corsets.

The panel is therefore satisfied that this allegation is proven.

Looking to the stem of allegation 1 (a) the panel found that Miss Dodds had failed to keep one or more pupils’ assessed practical coursework secure and found that in this respect Miss Dodds was guilty of maladministration of the 2015 Design Technology: Textiles GCSE.

**b) Submitted marks for one or more pupils that:**

**i. exceeded the quality of their coursework at that time;**

The panel took into consideration the evidence from Miss Dodds that she did not think that the marks she was providing Witness A with were the final marks that would be submitted to AQA. The panel considered the email from Witness A dated 21 April 2015, which was sent to the entire technology department at the School, including Miss Dodds. The panel preferred Witness A’s witness evidence regarding this email and it believes that the email was very clear that teachers were to submit the final coursework marks. Furthermore there was a link within that email to a spreadsheet which also clearly states that these are the final coursework marks. Miss Dodds argued that the marks provided on 24 April 2015 were not final, and that she would have a further week to bring the corsets up to the marks she provided. However it is clear from the oral and written evidence that this was not the case. The week following the deadline date was timetabled in order to allow Witness A to deal with the administrative tasks involved in submitting marks to AQA for the whole of the technology department.

The panel found that Miss Dodds had submitted marks as if the pupils had completed the coursework, even though this was not the standard of the corsets at the time. Miss Dodds was aware that the corsets were not complete and that these marks were aspirational.

The panel is therefore satisfied that this allegation is proven.

**ii. did not reflect the fact that their practical coursework was unfinished at that time.**

Witness A told the panel that Miss Dodds had not communicated to her that the marks she had submitted for AQA were not the final marks. In her response to the allegations Miss Dodds argues that these were aspirational marks and there was work still left to complete. She says that she had tried to inform Witness A on the day the aspirational



marks were submitted, but that she had left for the day. However Miss Dodds did not take further steps to ensure Witness A was aware.

Whilst it is true that Miss Dodds did not submit the marks to AQA herself, and was not expected to, the panel considered that Miss Dodds did have a responsibility to inform Witness A that the marks were aspirational and related to incomplete corsets.

The panel noted the fact that Miss Dodds submitted the marks to Witness A at 4.02 pm on 24 April 2015 and believes that Miss Dodds made little, or no, attempt to inform anyone that the marks were not final.

The panel is therefore satisfied that this allegation is proven.

Looking to the stem of allegation 1 (b) the panel found that Miss Dodds had submitted marks for one or more pupils that exceeded the quality of their coursework at the time and did not reflect the fact that their practical coursework was unfinished at that time. In this respect the panel found that Miss Dodds was guilty of maladministration of the 2015 Design Technology: Textiles GCSE.

**c) yourself contributed to one or more pupils' assessed practical coursework including undertaking the following tasks for one or more pupils:**

**i. lining;**

The panel noted that Miss Dodds admitted that she added the lining to the pupils' corsets. In her response to the allegations Miss Dodds claims she was asked to add the linings by Witness A. In contrast to this the panel heard evidence from Witness A that she would only add lining to garments produced by A-level pupils, not GCSE pupils. This is because, unlike GCSE pupils, A level pupils are not marked on the construction of their garments.

Given Miss Dodd's admission the panel is therefore satisfied that this allegation is proven.

**ii. adding loops;**

The panel noted Miss Dodds' admission contained in her response to the allegations that she "pinned some of the loops on a couple of garments." The panel also noted that despite this admission Miss Dodds did not annotate any candidate record form to record that she provided this assistance to pupils, as per the requirements of the AQA Specification.

Given Miss Dodd's admission the panel is therefore satisfied that this allegation is proven.

**iii. sewing;**

The panel considered the witness evidence of pupils A, B and D, which all state that Miss Dodds assisted them with the sewing of their garments. Furthermore the panel considered that by the admissions that Miss Dodds undertook the lining and adding of loops she has also indirectly admitted to sewing the corsets as these tasks involve sewing.

The panel is therefore satisfied that this allegation is proven.

#### **iv. tie-dying;**

The panel noted the witness evidence from Pupil B that Miss Dodds had tie-dyed her corset for her, and went further to say that she didn't think the colours were as nice as when she had tie-dyed it herself. This witness evidence is corroborated by Pupil A. The panel believed that Miss Dodds had contributed to a pupil's coursework by undertaking the task of tie-dying.

The panel is therefore satisfied that this allegation is proven.

#### **v. printing.**

The panel noted that in her response to the allegations, Miss Dodds admits to printing images provided by pupils, explaining that her PC is the only one linked to an A3 printer. In addition to this Miss Dodds admits in her investigatory meeting held on 10 June 2015 that she, "...printed off the ice-creams onto transfer paper." The panel were satisfied that Miss Dodds had contributed to a pupil's coursework by undertaking the task of printing.

Given Miss Dodd's admission the panel is therefore satisfied that this allegation is proven.

Looking to the stem of allegation 1 (c) the panel found that Miss Dodds had contributed to one or more pupils' assessed practical coursework including undertaking lining, adding loops, sewing, tie-dying and printing. In this respect the panel found that Miss Dodds was guilty of maladministration of the 2015 Design Technology: Textiles GCSE.

### **2) Acted dishonestly in doing the conduct described at (1) above in that you were attempting to conceal the fact that one or more pupils had not completed their practical coursework**

The panel received and accepted advice from the legal adviser that if it was satisfied, on a balance of probabilities, that Miss Dodds had concealed the fact that one or more pupils had not completed their practical coursework, then there was a further requirement to consider two limbs when deciding whether Miss Dodds' actions were dishonest in doing so.

The panel was advised that the first limb of the traditional test to which panels are referred is "whether the panel is satisfied on the balance of probabilities that Miss Dodds'

actions would be regarded as dishonest according to the standard of a reasonable and honest man". This is the objective test.

The panel was informed of a High Court case of May 2015 concerning the appeal against a decision of a professional conduct panel which stated that the tribunal should first determine whether, on the balance of probabilities, a defendant acted dishonestly by the standards of ordinary and honest members of that profession. If so, it was advised that it must then go on to determine whether or not it is more than likely that the defendant realised that what he or she was doing was, by those standards, dishonest. The panel accepted that only if the answer to both these questions is yes can the allegation of dishonesty be established in this case. The panel was also informed that the Court of Appeal, in an appeal against a criminal conviction in December 2015, held that the required standard under the objective limb was the ordinary standards of reasonable and honest people. However, the panel understands that it has yet to be seen whether that decision will be applied in the context of professional discipline proceedings, given the shift away from that test by the High Court.

If the panel finds the objective limb satisfied, it must go on to determine whether it is more likely than not that the teacher realised that what he or she was doing was by those standards, dishonest. This is the subjective test.

In this case, firstly the panel considered the objective limb of the two limb test. The panel did not determine that there would be any difference between the standards of the reasonable and honest person and the standards of the reasonable and honest teacher. In reaching this conclusion the panel considered that everyone, teacher or not, would view controlled assessments and the conditions around them as something that should be adhered to strictly. Due to the need to maintain the integrity and trust in the examination system the panel concluded that the reasonable and honest person (and teacher) would find Miss Dodds' actions dishonest.

The panel then went on to consider the subjective limb of the test. The AQA Specification is very clear, in that it states, "Candidates must not submit work which is not their own." Due to the fact that Miss Dodds had been teaching for quite some time, the panel is clear that she should have been aware of the requirements outlined in the AQA Specification. Miss Dodds had previously taught textiles and had also taught graphics, which is examined on a similar basis. In addition to her experience it is an expectation and a professional duty of teachers to be aware of the curriculum they are teaching. At GCSE level curricula are determined by specifications set out by the awarding bodies. Miss Dodds therefore is expected to have been aware of the requirements of the AQA Specification she was delivering to her pupils.

Furthermore, when Miss Dodds had the opportunity to disclose that which has been found proven in allegation 1, she failed to do so. The panel considers that she thereby concealed her actions which compounded the dishonesty. Miss Dodds had made no attempt to own up to what she had done and in fact in her response to the allegations

she attempts to pass on the blame to her colleagues and pupils. The panel concluded that Miss Dodds realised that what she was doing was dishonest.

Having reviewed all of the evidence, the panel does find allegation 2 proven.

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

**1) Were guilty of maladministration of the 2015 Design Technology: Textiles GCSE and in particular you:**

**a) failed to keep one or more pupils' assessed practical coursework secure including that you:**

**iii. failed to produce one or more corsets for moderation when asked to do so.**

The panel noted the timing of the moderation and considered that due to the fact that Miss Dodds was suspended from work this meant that she was not able to produce one or more corsets for moderation when asked to do so. The panel considered that the very nature of a suspension is that Miss Dodds was not supposed to do any work. Moreover the panel heard witness evidence from Witness B that Miss Dodds would not have had access to the School during this time. The panel believed that Miss Dodds was not in a position to produce the corsets for moderation, rather than she had failed to do this.

The panel is therefore satisfied that this allegation is not proven.

## **Findings as to unacceptable professional conduct**

Having found a number of the allegations to have been proven, the panel has gone on to consider whether the facts of those proven allegations amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

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

The panel is satisfied that the conduct of Miss Dodds in relation to the facts found proven, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considers that by reference to Part Two, Miss Dodds 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...;
- 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 is satisfied that this is serious misconduct falling significantly short of the standards expected of the profession. Furthermore, as a direct result of Miss Dodds' actions pupils in her class were unable to achieve a grade C or above in their textiles GCSE. The pupils' grades were only made up of their examinations, as their coursework, which is worth 60% of their final grade, was voided. This not only had an adverse impact on the individual pupils affected, but also affected the School's results as a whole.

The panel has also considered whether Miss Dodds' conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 8 and 9 of the Advice. There is no evidence of this being anything other than an isolated occurrence by Miss Dodds and having regard to the facts of the case the panel does not consider the dishonesty to be serious. Therefore the panel has found that none of the offences listed are relevant.

Accordingly, the panel is satisfied that Miss Dodds is guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

## **Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State**

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct, it is 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 has to consider whether it is an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it is 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 has considered the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and having done so has found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely:

- the maintenance of public confidence in the profession
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct

The panel's findings against Miss Dodds involved dishonesty in concealing the fact that one or more pupils had not completed their practical coursework. In light of that, the panel considers that there is a strong public interest consideration to maintain the public confidence in the profession, given that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Miss Dodds were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession. Further the panel considered that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Miss Dodds was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

Notwithstanding 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 Dodds.

In carrying out this balancing exercise the panel has considered the public interest considerations both in favour of and against prohibition as well as the interests of Miss Dodds. 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 proven. In the list of such behaviours, those that the panel considers relevant in this case include:

- 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 has also gone on to consider whether or not there were sufficient mitigating factors to militate against a prohibition order being an appropriate and proportionate measure to impose, particularly taking into account the nature and severity of the behaviour in this case. The panel has found Miss Dodds' actions to have been deliberate, and has seen no evidence to suggest that she was acting under duress. The panel noted that there was no evidence to suggest that Miss Dodds did not have a previous good history in her career as a teacher; however it also noted that no references have been provided from any colleagues that can attest to her abilities as a teacher. The panel also had regard to the context of the period leading up to Miss Dodd's actions. The panel noted that it was a difficult time for Miss Dodds, and that she was dealing with some personal and health issues. In addition to this the panel considered Miss Dodds' representations about her perceptions of the context of the working environment of the school at the time, and the fact that Miss Dodds was under pressure to deliver the textiles course to her pupils, following the previous teacher giving them the wrong controlled assessment.

Nevertheless, the panel is of the view that the public interest considerations outweigh the interests of Miss Dodds. The integrity of controlled assessments and the important role teacher's play in these are of fundamental importance to the profession. Miss Dodds' actions have undermined the confidence in the pupils' practical coursework resulting in their coursework being voided. As a direct result of Miss Dodds' actions pupils in her class were unable to achieve a grade C or above in their textiles GCSE. The pupils' grades were only made up of their examinations, as their coursework, which is worth 60% of their final grade, was voided. This not only had an adverse impact on the individual pupils affected, but also affected the School's results as a whole. Furthermore, there has been no evidence that Miss Dodds has understood the consequences of her actions.

In the circumstances the panel is of the view that prohibition is both proportionate and appropriate, and sees no reason to depart from the guidance set out in the Advice. Accordingly, the panel makes a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel has gone on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate for it to recommend that a review period of the order should be considered. The panel were mindful that the Advice advises 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 is concerned that Miss Dodds' actions were serious, and that she has not yet shown any remorse or any insight into her misconduct. The panel is mindful that a prohibition order is not intended to be punitive and considers that Miss Dodds should be given the opportunity to re-enter the profession in the future should she wish to do so, having reflected on her actions and demonstrated an insight into their consequences.

In setting the review period the panel has had regard to the response by AQA to the situation. AQA imposed a suspension on Miss Dodds' involvement in AQA examinations until after the summer 2018 examination session. Applying its own independent mind to the situation, the panel felt that this was a proportionate timescale in the circumstances of the case.

The panel considers that it would be appropriate and proportionate for the prohibition order to be recommended with provision for a review period of two years.

## **Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State**

I have given careful consideration to the findings and recommendations of the panel in this case. The panel has found a number of the allegations proven, and where the panel has made no such finding I have put that allegation from my mind.

The panel is satisfied that Miss Dodds is guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

I agree with the panel's view that Miss Dodds is in breach of the following Teachers' Standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school...;
- 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 is satisfied that this is serious misconduct falling significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel's findings against Miss Dodds involved dishonesty in concealing the fact that one or more pupils had not completed their practical coursework.

I have considered the public interest considerations in this case.

I have noted the panel's consideration of the public interest in this case, and I agree with the panel that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if the conduct found proved in this case were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession. The panel found that Miss Dodds' conduct was outside of that which could be reasonably tolerated.

I note the panel's consideration of the public interest both in favour of and against prohibition as well as the interests of Miss Dodds. The panel considered the mitigating factors in this case and has found Miss Dodds' actions to have been deliberate, and has seen no evidence that she was acting under duress. The panel noted that it was a difficult time for Miss Dodds, and she was dealing with personal and health issues.

The panel is of the view that the public considerations outweigh the interests of Miss Dodds. I agree with that view.

Miss Dodds' actions have undermined the confidence in the pupils' practical coursework resulting in their coursework being voided. As a direct result of Miss Dodds' actions, pupils in her class were unable to achieve a grade C or above in their textiles GCSE.

The panel notes there has been no evidence that Miss Dodds has understood the consequences of her actions.

The panel is of the view that prohibition is both proportionate and appropriate. I agree with that view. The integrity of controlled assessments and the important role teacher's play in these are of fundamental importance to the profession.

I now turn to the matter of a review period. Miss Dodds actions were serious, and the panel is concerned that Miss Dodds has not yet shown any remorse or insight into her misconduct. I note the panel, in setting the review period, has taken due regard of the AQA's response to the situation, and that AQA have imposed a suspension on Miss Dodds' involvement in AQA examinations until after the summer 2018 examination session.

The panel considers that a two year review period is both appropriate and proportionate. I agree with the panel's recommendation. Miss Dodds should be given the opportunity to re-enter the profession in the future, having reflected on her actions and demonstrated an insight into their consequences.



I have decided that prohibition is both appropriate and proportionate in this case, and I have decided that the minimum of a two year review period is appropriate.

**This means that Miss Jill Dodds 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 21 September 2018, 2 years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If he does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Miss Dodds remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Miss Dodds 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, appearing to be 'J. Millions', written on a light-colored background.

**NAME OF DECISION MAKER: Jayne Millions**

**Date: 13 September 2016**

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