



National College for
Teaching & Leadership

Mrs Elizabeth Basson: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

March 2018

Contents

A. Introduction	3
B. Allegations	4
C. Preliminary applications	5
D. Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Statement of agreed facts	5
E. Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
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 Elizabeth Basson

Teacher ref number: 0600618

Teacher date of birth: 15 February 1981

NCTL case reference: 16497

Date of determination: 8 March 2018

Former employer: Streatham & Clapham High School

A. Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the National College for Teaching and Leadership (“the National College”) convened on 8 March 2018 at 53 to 55 Butts Road, Earlsdon Park, Coventry CV1 3BH to consider the case of Mrs Elizabeth Basson.

The panel members were Mr John Elliott (lay panellist – in the Chair), Mr Peter Cooper (teacher panellist) and Ms Ann Walker (former teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Delme Griffiths of Blake Morgan LLP, solicitors.

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

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

B. Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Meeting dated 23 February 2018.

It was alleged that Mrs Basson was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that, whilst employed at Streatham & Clapham High School and during the administration of and/or the submission of work for the GCSE PE controlled assessment in the academic year 2016/2017 she:

1. Did not adhere to the applicable guidance in respect of video footage of candidates in that she:
 - a. Failed to ensure that candidates could be easily identified in the video evidence;
 - b. Edited the video evidence;
2. Did not adhere to the applicable guidance in respect of the trekking module in that she:
 - a. Inflated the marks of one or more candidates despite the candidate(s) not meeting the criteria required for that mark;
 - b. Gave improper assistance to one or more candidates by showing them a log book completed by a candidate during a previous assessment period;
 - c. Amended one or more candidates trek logs after final submission by the candidate(s);
3. Demonstrated a lack of professional integrity and/or was dishonest in that:
 - a. In respect of her actions at 1(a)-(b) she manipulated the video evidence such that the controlled assessments did not take place as presented in the video evidence provided to the moderator;
 - b. In respect of her actions at 2(a) and 2(c) she misled the moderator by suggesting that all the requirements for the trekking module had been fulfilled;
 - c. In respect of her actions at 2(b) and 2(c) she submitted log books for moderation which were not the unaided work of the candidate(s).

Mrs Basson admitted the facts of all of the allegations and that her conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

C. Preliminary applications

There were no preliminary applications.

D. Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Correspondence – pages 2 to 7

Section 2: Notice of Referral, Response and Notice of Meeting – pages 9 to 15

Section 3: Statement of Agreed Facts and Presenting Officer representations – pages 17 to 22

Section 4: NCTL documents – pages 24 to 698

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 700 to 705

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

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mrs Basson on 30 January 2018.

E. Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

In advance of the meeting, the National College agreed to a request from Mrs Basson that the allegations be considered without a hearing.

The panel has 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 is necessary or appropriate in this case.

The panel proceeded to carefully consider the case, having read all the documents within the bundle in advance of the meeting, and reached a decision.

Mrs Basson was employed in two roles as Head of PE and subsequently Head of Academic PE at Streatham & Clapham High School ("the School") from 1 September 2008 until her resignation on 9 June 2017.

On 11 May 2017, Mrs Basson sent an internal email concerning the administration of GCSE PE controlled assessments.

The information she provided indicated possible malpractice regarding the identification of pupils on controlled assessment video footage and the editing of the video footage. An investigation was commenced by the School, during which further concerns were raised in relation to a practical trekking option that six pupils had submitted as part of their controlled assessment.

At the conclusion of the School's investigation a disciplinary process was commenced and a disciplinary meeting was scheduled for 13 June 2017. Prior to this meeting, Mrs Basson resigned with immediate effect.

She was subsequently referred to the National College.

In considering the allegations set out in the Notice of Meeting, the panel has not relied upon any findings made or opinions expressed in papers which formed part of the documentation for the investigation undertaken by the School. It formed its own independent view of the allegations based on the evidence presented to it.

Findings of fact

Our findings of fact are as follows:

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

1. Did not adhere to the applicable guidance in respect of video footage of candidates in that you:

a. Failed to ensure that candidates could be easily identified in the video evidence;

b. Edited the video evidence;

The relevant guidance was included within the hearing papers and considered by the panel.

Mrs Basson admitted the facts of allegations 1(a) and 1(b). The evidence considered by the panel was consistent with her admissions.

In relation to allegation 1(a), Mrs Basson admits that she deliberately failed to ensure that candidates could be easily identified. The guidance on submitting video evidence refers to the use of numbered bibs or lettered shirts. In her email to the School dated 11 May 2017 Mrs Basson stated:

"I purposefully this year did not use numbered bibs .. in an effort to 'hide' weaker performers in activities. This requires the moderator to 'go looking' for an individual, which may make spotting weaknesses harder."

There were further examples within the papers of Mrs Basson's attempts to make it difficult to identify candidates.

In relation to allegation 1(b), Mrs Basson accepts that she acted deliberately in editing candidates' video evidence. There was compelling evidence that Mrs Basson inappropriately edited video evidence contrary to the relevant guidance. In her email to the School dated 11 May 2017, Mrs Basson stated:

"I have bombarded the moderator with evidence submitting over 12 hours of DVD footage (edited down from over 40 hours of raw footage from 8 sports). I have focussed on higher level skills only, following the assumption that if the girls are good at the more challenging skills; they will be able in the other skills. This has allowed me to remove skills that the girls are weaker in. The exam guidance for video editing does request that unnecessary or repetitive evidence be edited out in the final presentation. I have tried to manipulate this to again elevate the girls level."

Accordingly, in light of the admissions made and the evidence, the panel found the facts of allegation 1 proved.

- 2. Did not adhere to the applicable guidance in respect of the trekking module in that you:**
 - a. Inflated the marks of one or more candidates despite the candidate(s) not meeting the criteria required for that mark;**
 - b. Gave improper assistance to one or more candidates by showing them a log book completed by a candidate during a previous assessment period;**
 - c. Amended one or more candidates trek logs after final submission by the candidate(s);**

The relevant guidance was included within the hearing papers and considered by the panel.

Mrs Basson admitted the facts of allegations 2(a), 2(b) and 2(c).

She accepted that she deliberately failed to follow the guidance in respect of the trekking module in relation to each of the sub-particulars of allegation 2.

The evidence considered by the panel was consistent with her admissions. In relation to allegation 2(a), Mrs Basson awarded marks to all candidates who offered trekking as an activity notwithstanding the fact that they had not met the criteria (which included

camping for at least five nights – in fact they only camped for two nights). There was clear evidence that she had made changes to logbooks after submission by fabricating and manipulating dates and diary entries, including changes made without candidates' knowledge. She also gave improper assistance by sharing an example logbook from a previous examination.

Accordingly, in light of the admissions made and the evidence, the panel found the facts of allegation 2 proved.

3. Demonstrated a lack of professional integrity and/or were dishonest in that:

a. In respect of your actions at 1(a)-(b) you manipulated the video evidence such that the controlled assessments did not take place as presented in the video evidence provided to the moderator;

Having found the facts of allegations 1(a) and 1(b) proven, the panel went on to consider whether Mrs Basson had acted dishonestly and/or demonstrated a lack of professional integrity in manipulating video evidence.

Mrs Basson accepted that she had acted deliberately in manipulating the video evidence such that the controlled assessments did not take place as presented in the evidence provided to the moderator.

The panel noted that she deliberately:

- failed to ensure that candidates could be easily identified;
- edited candidates' video evidence; and
- failed to adhere to the applicable guidance relating to video footage of candidates.

Whilst the guidance may permit a degree of editing, the video evidence must represent the actual performance of each individual candidate being assessed. The video submitted by Mrs Basson clearly did not do this.

Mr Basson also accepted that she had acted dishonestly and in a way that demonstrated a lack of professional integrity.

In light of the admission made and the evidence, the panel was satisfied that Mrs Basson acted dishonestly by the standards of reasonable and honest people and that she had demonstrated a lack of professional integrity. Accordingly, the panel found allegation 3(a) proved.

b. In respect of your actions at 2(a) and 2(c) you misled the moderator by suggesting that all the requirements for the trekking module had been fulfilled;

Having found the facts of allegations 2(a) and 2(c) proven, the panel went on to consider whether Mrs Basson had acted dishonestly and/or demonstrated a lack of professional integrity in misleading the moderator by suggesting that all requirements for the trekking module had been fulfilled.

Mrs Basson accepted that she had misled the moderator and that in doing so she had acted dishonestly and demonstrated a lack of professional integrity.

The panel agreed. In light of the admission made and the evidence, the panel was satisfied that Mrs Basson acted dishonestly by the standards of reasonable and honest people and that she had demonstrated a lack of professional integrity. Accordingly, the panel found allegation 3(b) proved.

c. In respect of your actions at 2(b) and 2(c) you submitted log books for moderation which were not the unaided work of the candidate(s).

Having found the facts of allegations 2(b) and 2(c) proven, the panel went on to consider whether Mrs Basson had acted dishonestly and/or demonstrated a lack of professional integrity in submitting log books for moderation which were not the unaided work of candidates.

On the evidence, the panel concluded that Mrs Basson had plainly submitted log books for moderation which were not the unaided work of candidates. Mrs Basson accepted that she "adjusted" and "adapted" pupils' written work without their knowledge. In an interview with the School on 25 May 2017, she noted that the effect was that whilst "the majority of the work is the girls' ... it's hard to say how much." She further accepted in this interview that "there was deceit".

Mrs Basson also accepted that she had acted dishonestly and demonstrated a lack of professional integrity.

In light of the admission made and the evidence, the panel was satisfied that Mrs Basson acted dishonestly by the standards of reasonable and honest people and that she had demonstrated a lack of professional integrity. Accordingly, the panel found allegation 3(c) proved.

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

Having found all of the allegations to have been proven, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proven allegations amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Mrs Basson admitted that the facts found proven in relation to all of the allegations amounts to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Whilst the panel took this admission into account, it formed its own judgment.

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 Basson in relation to the facts found proven, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considered that by reference to Part Two, Mrs Basson was in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher’s professional position;
- 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 Basson amounts to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession. The public expect and have a right to expect that teachers will comply with the rigorous guidance underpinning public examinations.

The panel also considered whether Mrs Basson's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 8 and 9 of the Advice.

The panel found that behaviours associated with the offences of fraud or serious dishonesty were relevant.

The Advice indicates that where behaviours associated with such offences exist, a panel is likely to conclude that an individual’s conduct would amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mrs Basson is guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, which she admitted.

In considering whether Mrs Basson's conduct may bring the profession into disrepute, the panel has taken into account how the teaching profession is viewed by others and considered the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel has taken account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils’ lives and that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way they behave.

The findings of misconduct are serious and the conduct displayed would likely have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public perception.

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

Having found the facts of allegations 1, 2 and 3 proven, the panel further found that Mrs Basson's conduct amounts 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 went 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 considered whether it is an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it is in the public interest to do so. The panel had regard to the fact 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 has considered 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 maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In light of the panel's findings against Mrs Basson, which involved findings of a lack of professional integrity and dishonesty in the conduct of public examinations, there is a strong public interest consideration in protecting the authority, reputation and credibility of the public examination system.

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

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 Mrs Basson was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated. The panel regarded the manipulation of public examinations as a very serious matter. This has a negative impact on public trust and confidence in the profession and the reputation of teachers.

The panel also considered that there was a public interest consideration in retaining Mrs Basson in the profession. No doubts had previously been cast upon her abilities as an

educator; there were positive references from her previous school attesting to her abilities as a teacher and she was re-appointed to a leadership role within the School. The panel considered that Mrs Basson has the potential, in future, to make a valuable contribution to the 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 Basson.

In carrying out the balancing exercise the panel considered the public interest considerations both in favour of and against prohibition as well as the interests of Mrs Basson. 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 are relevant in this case are:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or well-being of pupils ...;
- dishonesty especially where there have been serious consequences ...;

Even though there were behaviours that would point to a prohibition order being appropriate, the panel went 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 considered that there were the following mitigating circumstances:

- Mrs Basson had a previously good record and her conduct appeared to be out of character given the positive accounts of her teaching practice included within the papers.
- Mrs Basson admitted the facts of the allegations at a very early stage during the course of the School investigation and in these proceedings. Mrs Basson made no attempt to conceal her shortcomings. On the contrary, she brought her misconduct to the School's attention in her initial email to the School which triggered the investigation. Mrs Basson was very open about her conduct and accepted she had "taken risks".
- Mrs Basson had engaged with the National College in these proceedings and had fully engaged with the School's investigation.
- There was evidence of health and family issues in Mrs Basson's personal life at the relevant time and that it was a period of significant and ongoing stress for her. This was acknowledged by the School.

- Mrs Basson has demonstrated a deep regret and genuine remorse as well as showing clear insight into her conduct. She took full responsibility for her actions at an early stage and demonstrated an early awareness of the negative impact of her actions on the pupils and the School. During her initial investigation meeting she stated that "the exam board needs to know this was my call, not the girls". In her statement to the School dated 22 May 2017 she stated:

"It has been killing me inside to think that any actions, which I undertook, believing were in the best interests of the girls, will ultimately have a negative impact: for this I feel genuine remorse as it was the farthest thing from my mind".

- Mrs Basson's conduct, which concerns a single examination period, may be seen as an isolated episode in an otherwise unblemished teaching career.
- Mrs Basson was not motivated by personal gain.

The panel noted that the following aggravating factors were present in this case:

- Mrs Basson's actions were deliberate and there was repeated dishonesty albeit over a short period covering a single examination.
- There was a serious breach of the Teachers' Standards.
- There was a detrimental impact on pupils and the School.
- She was head of department and an experienced teacher and was therefore a role model who ought to have set an example to both staff and pupils.

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 is sufficient.

The panel is of the view that applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen recommending no prohibition order is not a proportionate and appropriate response. Recommending that publication of adverse findings is sufficient in the case would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of consequences for the teacher of prohibition.

The panel is of the view that prohibition is both proportionate and appropriate. The panel has decided that the public interest considerations outweigh the interests of Mrs Basson. In arriving at this conclusion the panel had regard to the fact that Mrs Basson's conduct compromised public examinations and that consequently there was a detrimental impact on pupils and the School. There was a clear public interest consideration in maintaining the integrity of examinations. The panel had concluded that Mrs Basson's actions were a deliberate attempt to mislead the moderator and she had disregarded examination regulations.

Accordingly, the panel makes 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 to recommend that a review period of the order should be considered. The panel was 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 2 years.

The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proven, would militate against a review period being recommended. These behaviours include fraud or serious dishonesty. The panel has found that Mrs Basson has been responsible for wilfully misrepresenting the attainment levels of her pupils.

However, as noted above Mrs Basson has shown significant and immediate insight and remorse for her actions. In all the circumstances the panel was satisfied that the risk of repetition was low. The panel's view was that Mrs Basson was not a fundamentally dishonest person but one who had made a serious mistake. In the panel's view it would be punitive to prohibit her indefinitely.

For these reasons the panel felt its 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 provision for a review period of two years. The panel considered that this period was appropriate and proportionate. It would allow Mrs Basson to continue as a teacher after further reflection on her conduct. As noted above, the panel considered that she has the potential to be an asset to the teaching profession.

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 sanction and review period.

In considering this case, I have also given very careful attention to the advice that is published by the Secretary of State concerning the prohibition of teachers.

In this case, the panel has found 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 Elizabeth Basson should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of two years.

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher’s professional position;
- 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 Basson amounts to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession. The public expect and have a right to expect that teachers will comply with the rigorous guidance underpinning public examinations.

The panel also considered whether Mrs Basson's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 8 and 9 of the Advice. The panel found that behaviours associated with the offences of fraud or serious dishonesty were relevant.”

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of dishonesty on the part of a teacher.

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 or not 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 Basson and the impact that will have on her, is proportionate.

In this case I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children. The panel has observed, “There was a detrimental impact on pupils and the School”. 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, “Mrs Basson has shown significant and immediate insight and remorse for her actions. In all the circumstances the panel was satisfied that the risk of repetition was low.” I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision, especially concerning the review period.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observes that it finds, “the manipulation of public examinations as a very serious matter. This has a negative impact on public trust and confidence in the profession and the reputation of teachers.”

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 failure to impose a prohibition order might be regarded by the public 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 Basson. The panel comment, “she has the potential to be an asset to the teaching profession.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mrs Basson 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, “Mrs Basson's conduct compromised public examinations and that consequently there was a detrimental impact on pupils and the School. There was a clear public interest consideration in maintaining the integrity of examinations. The panel had concluded that Mrs Basson's actions were a deliberate attempt to mislead the moderator and she had disregarded examination regulations.”

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

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

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 carefully. The legislation requires a minimum of a 2 year review period unless there are reasons for extending this. The panel has said that, “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 provision for a review period of two years. The panel considered that this period was appropriate and proportionate. It would allow Mrs Basson to continue as a teacher after further reflection on her conduct.”

I have considered whether a 2 year review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, I support the recommendation of the panel.

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

This means that Mrs Elizabeth Basson 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 22 March 2020, 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 Elizabeth Basson remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mrs Elizabeth Basson 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.



Decision maker: Alan Meyrick

Date: 15 March 2018

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