



National College for  
Teaching & Leadership

# **Miss Kirsty Hoffman: 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  |
| Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State         | 11 |
| 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:** Ms Kirsty Hoffman  
**Teacher ref number:** 1072649  
**Teacher date of birth:** 25 September 1988  
**NCTL case reference:** 16206  
**Date of determination:** 12 March 2018  
**Former employer:** Marden High School

### **A. Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the National College for Teaching and Leadership (“the National College”) convened on 12 March 2018 at 53 to 55 Butts Road, Earlsdon Park, Coventry CV1 3BH to consider the case of Ms Kirsty Hoffman.

The panel members were Ms Sarah Evans (Teacher Panellist – in the chair), Mr Anthony Bald (Teacher Panellist) and Ms Claire McManus (Lay Panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Eve Piffaretti of Blake Morgan LLP solicitors.

In advance of the meeting, the National College agreed to a request from Miss Hoffman that the allegations be considered without a hearing after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice. Miss Hoffman provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, Miss Hoffman 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 19 February 2018.

It was alleged that Miss Hoffman was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst employed as a teacher at Marden School between 1 September 2012 and 31 August 2016:

1. Developed and/or engaged in an inappropriate relationship with Child A, including by:
  - a. Giving Child A a card whilst working at Marden High School which:
    - i. Contained comments that failed to adhere to professional boundaries;
    - ii. Had your personal contact details attached to it;
  - b. Sending inappropriate messages to Child A including:
    - i. Messages disclosing personal information relating to [Redacted];
    - ii. Messages in which you suggested [Redacted];
    - iii. Messages stating that you love Child A;
  - c. Hugging Child A on one or more occasions;
  - d. Meeting and/or attempting to meet Child A outside of school on one or more occasions;
2. Failed to refer to the appropriate agency/agencies concerns you claimed to have about Child A's well-being and/or home life;
3. Received a caution on 01/03/17 for the offence of sending a letter/communication/article conveying false information with intent to cause distress or anxiety contrary to Section 1(a)(a) of the Malicious Communications Act 1988.

Miss Hoffman admitted the facts of the allegations and that those facts amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or 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: Chronology and anonymised pupil list – pages 2 to 3

Section 2: Notice of Referral response and Notice of Meeting – pages 5 to 11(ii)

Section 3: Statement of Agreed Facts and presenting officer representations– pages 13 to 20

Section 4: NCTL documents – pages 22 to 406

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 408 to 420

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 Miss Hoffman and dated 31 October 2017.

## **E. Decision and reasons**

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

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

In advance of the meeting, the National College agreed to a request from Miss Hoffman 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 was necessary or appropriate in this case.

The case involves Miss Hoffman's engagement in an inappropriate relationship with Child A, who was attending the Marden High School ('the School'). Miss Hoffman was employed as a teacher at the School from 1 September 2012 until 31 August 2016.

Thereafter Miss Hoffman has been engaged in supply teaching at a number of schools between 16 August 2016 until 8 March 2017.

Miss Hoffman, who was then employed at the School, gave Child A a card on her last working day in August 2016 that contained a bear on with 'a hug for you' written on the front. Miss Hoffman wrote inside the card "*ten things I want you to remember always*" and listed a number of comments regarding life in general. Attached to the card was a note which had her contact details and a line stating "*save/add what you want then destroy this, I won't abandon you, don't be sad*". On the same day, Miss Hoffman saw Child A after the School day and went walking with her in a field until around 9pm. During this meeting, Miss Hoffman and Child A hugged.

The contact between Miss Hoffman and Child A developed after Miss Hoffman left the School. During this period, Miss Hoffman was engaged as a supply teacher at a number of schools via a supply agency from 16 August 2016 to 8 March 2017.

Miss Hoffman went to the School to attend an event that was later cancelled, and as she was leaving the School she saw Child A. She and Child A hugged and talked briefly before returning to her car. On the Sunday, Miss Hoffman was preparing to drive back to the North West, she states that Child A messaged her to say she was upset. At this point, Miss Hoffman suggests that she was nearby where Child A lived and Child A asked to see her. Miss Hoffman met Child A at the end of Child A's road and hugged her.

In November 2016, Miss Hoffman visited the School and stayed in a hotel for a few days. Miss Hoffman messaged Child A and said that there was a spare bed in the hotel room she was staying in. During the visit, Miss Hoffman met with Child A outside of the School's premises and gave Child A a hug.

Miss Hoffman admits that she sent and received electronic messages and there was no evidence before the panel that any of the messaging involved a third party.

## **Finding of facts**

Our finding of facts are as follows:

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

**Whilst employed as a teacher at Marden School between 1 September 2012 and 31 August 2016 you :**

**1. Developed and/or engaged in an inappropriate relationship with Child A, including by:**

**a. Giving Child A a card whilst working at Marden High School which:**

**i. Contained comments that failed to adhere to professional boundaries;**

**ii. Had your personal contact details attached to it;**

Miss Hoffman admits that she developed and/or engaged in an inappropriate relationship with Child A by giving Child A (a pupil at the School) a card whilst working at the School on her last day. Miss Hoffman accepts the card contained comments that failed to adhere to professional boundaries and contained her personal contact details.

Miss Hoffman admits that she sent Child A a greetings card with a bear on the front with: 'a hug for you' written on the front. Inside the card, Miss Hoffman wrote "*ten things I want you to remember always*" and listed a number of comments regarding life in general. Attached to the card was a note which had her contact details and a line stating "*save/add what you want then destroy this, I won't abandon you, don't be sad*".

**b. Sending inappropriate messages to Child A including:**

**i. Messages disclosing personal information relating [Redacted];**

**ii. Messages in which you suggested [Redacted];**

**iii. Messages stating that you love Child A;**

Miss Hoffman admits that she developed and/or engaged in an inappropriate relationship with Child A by sending inappropriate messages to Child A, in particular messages disclosing personal information, messages where she was stating [Redacted] and a message stating that she loved Child A.

Miss Hoffman admits that she shared her thoughts regarding [Redacted] with Child A. Those messages were retained by Child A and have been included in the case bundle. The panel have carefully noted their contents and noted that the messages confirmed the exchanges between Miss Hoffman and Child A.

Miss Hoffman admits that she sent the following comments to Child A;

- a. *"I just need to getaway, I need to feel free to decide... To clear things and see what is left... [Redacted]"*
- b. *"I need to get away";*
- c. *"2017 is the year I sort everything out or the year [Redacted], I can feel it";*
- d. *"It will be somewhere nice. It will be far enough away that no one would have to deal with anything";*
- e. *"Everything would be better";*
- f. *"I need to go away, I need to be free!";*
- g. *"So the worse anxiety I have ever ever had was down to you and you alone?";*
- h. *"[Redacted] and normally you would help me with that and you can't anymore and I know you're not even going to see this so I don't know why I'm writing it but I'm freaking out and its completely broken me that you think something that"*

*isn't true*".

Miss Hoffman admits the above comments may be seen as comments of a personal [Redacted] and were therefore not appropriate to send to Child A.

During the communication between Miss Hoffman and Child A, there was reference to love. Child A wrote to Miss Hoffman "*LYSM*" meaning I love you so much. Miss Hoffman had also told Child A "*Ly2*" meaning love you too.

**c. Hugging Child A on one or more occasions;**

Miss Hoffman admits that she developed and/or engaged in an inappropriate relationship with Child A by hugging Child A on one or more occasions.

Miss Hoffman admits that during the last day of the summer term 2016 she hugged Child A on a field outside of the School's premises.

Miss Hoffman admits that during early November 2016, she visited the School and stayed in a hotel for a few days. During this visit she met Child A outside of the School's premises and gave Child A a hug. Miss Hoffman suggests that this meeting lasted no more than 5 minutes.

The panel also noted the contents of electronic messages sent by Miss Hoffman to Child A which make references to hugging.

**d. Meeting and/or attempting to meet Child A outside of school on one or more occasions;**

Miss Hoffman admits that she developed and/or engaged in an inappropriate relationship with Child A by meeting and/or attempting to meet Child A outside of the School on one or more occasions.

Miss Hoffman admits that on the last day of the summer term 2016 she met Child A after the School day and went walking together in a field, Miss Hoffman admits she stayed with Child A until around 9pm. Miss Hoffman suggests that this meeting was a coincidence as she was already out walking when she bumped into Child A and continued walking with her.

Miss Hoffman admits that early in November 2016, when she was visiting the School and staying in a hotel, she sent a message to Child A saying that there was a spare bed in the hotel she was staying in. Child A interpreted this as an invitation for her to attend but this was not Miss Hoffman's intention.



## **2. Failed to refer to the appropriate agency/agencies concerns you claimed to have about Child A's well-being and/or home life;**

Miss Hoffman admits that she failed to refer to the appropriate agency/agencies concerns she claimed to have about Child A's well-being and/or home life.

Miss Hoffman admits that she was continuously aware that Child A [Redacted].

Whilst communicating with Child A outside of the School, Miss Hoffman admits that she became aware [Redacted]. Miss Hoffman accepts that she should have notified the appropriate agency/agencies when being aware about this information.

## **3. Received a caution on 01/03/17 for the offence of sending a letter/communication/article conveying false information with intent to cause distress or anxiety contrary to Section 1(1)(a) of the Malicious Communications Act 1988.**

Miss Hoffman admits that she received a caution on 01/03/17 for the offence of sending a letter/communication/article conveying false information with intent to cause distress or anxiety contrary to Section 1(1)(a) of the Malicious Communications Act 1988, in connection with the matters set out at allegations 1 and 2 above. Miss Hoffman was not charged in relation to any other matter.

The panel also noted the contents of the Police National Computer disclosure print which confirms the caution.

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

Having found 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 and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In the statement of agreed facts, Miss Hoffman accepts that her admitted conduct amounts to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel finds that Miss Hoffman's conduct represents misconduct of a serious nature falling significantly short of the standards expected of a teacher. Consequently, the panel finds Miss Hoffman guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and of conduct which may bring the reputation of the profession into disrepute.

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

The panel is satisfied that the conduct of Miss Hoffman in relation to the facts found proven, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considers that by reference to Part Two, Miss Hoffman is in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
  - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position;
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions;
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel is satisfied that the conduct of Miss Hoffman in allegations 1, 2 and 3 amounts to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel has also considered whether Miss Hoffman's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 8 and 9 of the Advice and found these not to be relevant.

The panel noted that Miss Hoffman sent messages to Child A after she had left employment at the school when she had no educational reason to contact Child A.

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 into account 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 noted that the individual's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting. The panel also noted that Miss Hoffman had made contact with Child A when there was no educational reason for doing so. The panel has found that Miss Hoffman developed and engaged in an inappropriate relationship with Child A [Redacted]. The panel was concerned that the messages were sent over a period of time causing Child A distress and anxiety. Miss Hoffman

overstepped professional boundaries with pupils by hugging Child A on more than one occasion and meeting or attempting to meet the child outside of school. Miss Hoffman failed to refer her concerns about Child A's welfare to any relevant or appropriate body. The panel were particularly concerned about Miss Hoffman's poor judgement in relation to safeguarding of Child A over a period of time.

This conduct resulted in Miss Hoffman receiving a caution for the offence of sending a letter/communication/article conveying false information with intent to cause distress or anxiety contrary to the Malicious Communications Act 1988.

The panel has also taken account of how the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Miss Hoffman's behaviour could affect the public confidence in the teaching profession given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community.

The panel has taken into account the written evidence that has been adduced attesting to the teacher's experience as a teacher. The panel has also taken into consideration Miss Hoffman's account of her on-going health difficulties. However, the panel had no evidence that these had impacted on her conduct or professional abilities.

## **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 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 protection of pupils, the protection of other members of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession, declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct and the interest of retaining the teacher in the profession.

The panel's findings against Miss Hoffman involved developing and engaging in an inappropriate relationship with a vulnerable child over a period of time including giving the child a card containing personal contact details and comments, sending inappropriate messages, hugging the child on more than one occasion and meeting or attempting to meet the child outside of school.

There is a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils given the serious findings of Miss Hoffman's inappropriate relationship with this vulnerable child and her failure to refer welfare concerns about this child to any relevant or appropriate body despite her professional experience.

Similarly, the panel considers that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Miss Hoffman 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 Miss Hoffman was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

The panel considered that there was a strong public interest consideration in retaining the teacher in the profession, and noted that no doubt had previously been cast upon her abilities as an educator and she may be able 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 Miss Hoffman.

In carrying out the balancing exercise the panel has considered the public interest considerations both in favour of and against prohibition as well as the interests of Miss Hoffman. 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, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving vulnerable pupils) or violation of the rights of pupils;
- other deliberate behaviour that undermines pupils, the profession, the school or colleagues;

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.

There was no evidence that the teacher's actions were not deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that the teacher was acting under duress.

The teacher did have a previously good history. The panel noted the character reference provided by Ms Hogg dated 6 November 2017, addressed "to whom it may concern". Although this is evidence of good character, the panel noted that no professional references have been provided from colleagues that can attest to Miss Hoffman's abilities as a teacher.

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 Miss Hoffman. The serious findings of Miss Hoffman's inappropriate relationship with a vulnerable child, her failure to refer welfare concerns about Child A to any relevant or appropriate body despite her professional experience and her caution under the Malicious Communications Act 1988 were significant factors in forming that opinion. 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. The panel has not found these behaviours to be present in this case.

Miss Hoffman has been found to be responsible for developing and engaging in an inappropriate relationship with Child A and failing to refer welfare concerns about this child to any relevant or appropriate body, despite her professional experience. She has admitted all of the allegations and has expressed remorse. She has a previous good history and has demonstrated some insight into her professional failings. Miss Hoffman has sought support for her health condition.

The panel felt that its findings indicate that a review period would be appropriate. The panel consider that it would be appropriate in all the circumstances for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a review period of three years. The panel consider that a three year review period would enable Miss Hoffman to reflect on the impact of her conduct on Child A. Such a review period would also allow Miss Hoffman to reflect on the importance of maintaining appropriate behaviours with pupils, fully assimilate the importance of child protection and safeguarding processes and to continue to seek appropriate support for her health condition.

## **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 three year 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 Miss Hoffman should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of three years.

In particular the panel has found that Miss Hoffman is in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
  - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position;
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions;
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel finds that the conduct of Miss Hoffman fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

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 Miss Hoffman, 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 is a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils given the serious findings of Miss Hoffman's inappropriate relationship with this vulnerable child and her failure to refer welfare concerns about this child to any relevant or appropriate body despite her professional experience." A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present. I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse which the panel sets out as follows, "She has admitted all of the allegations and has expressed remorse. She has a previous good history and has demonstrated some insight into her professional failings. Miss Hoffman has sought support for her health condition." I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, "that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Miss Hoffman were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct 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 Miss Hoffman herself. The panel comment "The teacher did have a previously good history. The panel noted the character reference provided by Ms Hogg dated 6 November 2017, addressed "to whom it may concern". Although this is evidence of good character, the panel noted that no professional references have been provided from colleagues that can attest to Miss Hoffman's abilities as a teacher."

A prohibition order would prevent Miss Hoffman from continuing in the teaching profession. A prohibition order would also clearly deprive the public of her contribution to the profession for the period that it is in force.

In this case I have placed considerable weight on the panel's comments concerning the lack of insight or remorse.

I have also placed considerable weight on the serious findings of the panel of Miss Hoffman's inappropriate relationship with a vulnerable child, her failure to refer welfare concerns about Child A to any relevant or appropriate body despite her professional experience and her caution under the Malicious Communications Act 1988.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Miss Hoffman 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 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 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 3 year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments "The panel consider that a three year review period would enable Miss Hoffman to reflect on the impact of her conduct on Child A."

The panel has also said that a 3 year review period would also, "allow Miss Hoffman to reflect on the importance of maintaining appropriate behaviours with pupils, fully assimilate the importance of child protection and safeguarding processes and to continue to seek appropriate support for her health condition."

I have considered whether a 3 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, there are three factors that in my view mean that a two year review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the serious nature of the misconduct, the lack of full insight or remorse, and the caution under the Malicious Communications Act 1988.

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



**This means that Miss Kirsty Hoffman 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 2021, 3 years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If she does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Miss Hoffman remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Dawn Dandy', with a stylized flourish at the end.

**Decision maker: Dawn Dandy**

**Date: 15 March 2018**

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