



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mrs Karen Owen: Professional conduct panel outcome**

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

**October 2019**

## Contents

A. Introduction	3
B. Allegations	4
C. Preliminary applications	4
D. Summary of evidence	6
Documents	6
Witnesses	6
E. Decision and reasons	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	12
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:** Mrs Karen Owen  
**Teacher ref number:** 0948779  
**Teacher date of birth:** 19/08/1962  
**TRA reference:** 17365  
**Date of determination:** 9 October 2019  
**Former employer:** St Michael's Church of England Primary Academy, Norfolk

### **A. Introduction**

A professional conduct panel ("the panel") of the Teaching Regulation Agency ("the TRA") convened on 7 October 2019 to 9 October 2019 at Cheylesmore House, 5 Quinton Road, Coventry, CV1 2WT, to consider the case of Mrs Karen Owen.

The panel members were Mrs Alison Walsh (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Maurice McBride (lay panellist) and Mr Brian Hawkins (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Surekha Gollapudi of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Kayleigh Brooks of Ropewalk Chambers.

Mrs Owen 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 27 June 2019.

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

1. She engaged in inappropriate physical contact and/or unprofessional behaviour with one or more pupils during the academic year(s) 2016/2017 and/or 2017/2018, including by:
  - a. touching Pupil A's face whilst he was eating
  - b. standing on Pupil B's foot
  - c. touching Pupil B's head
  - d. shouting and/or screaming at Pupil B, on one or more occasions
  - e. shouting and/or screaming in the presence of pupils, on one or more occasions
2. She failed to adequately undertake her safeguarding duties in that she:
  - a. in or around September 2017, failed to act upon a safeguarding concern raised by Individual A in respect of Pupil E
  - b. on one or more occasion(s), failed to maintain accurate child protection/safeguarding records
3. In so doing 1 and/or 2 above, she exposed pupil(s) to and/or failed to protect them from the risk of potential harm

The teacher denied the allegations.

## C. Preliminary applications

### *Proceeding in absence*

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

The panel was satisfied that the TRA had complied with the service requirements of paragraph 19 a to c of the Teachers' Disciplinary (England) Regulations 2012, (the "Regulations").

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

The panel determined to exercise its discretion under paragraph 4.29 of the Procedures to proceed with the hearing in the absence of the teacher.

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

In making its decision, the panel noted that the teacher may waive her right to participate in the hearing. The panel took account of the various factors drawn to its attention from the case of *R v Jones* [2003] 1 AC1. The panel noted that the teacher responded to the notice of proceedings indicating that she would not attend and would not be represented, on more than one occasion. The panel, therefore, considered that the teacher waived her right to be present at the hearing in the knowledge of when and where the hearing was taking place.

The panel 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 was no indication that an adjournment might result in the teacher attending the hearing.

The panel had regard to the extent of the disadvantage to the teacher in not being able to give her account of events, considering the nature of the evidence against her. The panel had the benefit of representations made by the teacher and was able to ascertain the lines of defence. The panel had the teacher's evidence addressing mitigation and was able to take this into account at the relevant stage. The panel noted that five witnesses relied upon by the presenting officer were to be called to give evidence. The panel could test their evidence by questioning those witnesses, including such points as were favourable to the teacher. The panel did not identify any significant gaps in the documentary evidence provided. The panel noted that should such gaps arise during the course of the hearing, it could take such gaps into consideration in deciding whether the hearing should be adjourned for such documents to become available and in considering whether the presenting officer had discharged the burden of proof. The panel noted it was 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 noted that there were five witnesses present at the hearing, who were prepared to give evidence, and that it would be inconvenient and distressing for them to return again.

The panel had regard to the seriousness of this case, and the potential consequences for the teacher and accepted that fairness to the teacher is of prime importance. However, it

considered that the teacher waived her right to appear. The panel considered that by taking such measures referred to above, that any possible unfairness would be addressed. The panel further noted that an adjournment would cause inconvenience and distress to the witnesses. On balance, the panel found that these were serious allegations and the public interest was in the hearing proceeding.

## **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 4 to 11

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 12 to 39

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 40 to 596

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 597 to 642

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

Letter from DBS – Annex A pages 1 to 2

Email chain and attachment – Annex A pages 3 to 8

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

### **Witnesses**

The panel heard oral evidence from [REDACTED], identified as Witness X, and [REDACTED], identified as Individual A, Individual B, Individual C and Individual E.

## **E. Decision and reasons**

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

Mrs Owen had been employed at the school from 1 April 2015 as the teacher in charge of the Special Resources Base (“SRB”). SRB is a unit within the school which caters for Key Stage 1 pupils with significant behavioural or emotional needs.

It is alleged that during the academic years 2016/2017 and 2017/2018 Mrs Owen engaged in unprofessional behaviour towards, and in front of, a number of pupils within

the SRB, failed to act upon concerns (which were subsequently raised by a whistleblower) and keep proper records in relation to safeguarding. It is further alleged that her actions exposed pupils to harm and failed to protect them from harm.

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

- 1. You engaged in inappropriate physical contact and/or unprofessional behaviour with one or more pupils during the academic year(s) 2016/2017 and/or 2017/2018, including by:**
  - a. touching Pupil A's face whilst he was eating**
  - b. standing on Pupil B's foot**
  - c. touching Pupil B's head**
  - d. shouting and/or screaming at Pupil B, on one or more occasions**
  - e. shouting and/or screaming in the presence of pupils, on one or more occasions**

The teacher denied this allegation in her statements dated 7 September 2018 and 30 August 2019.

The panel heard evidence from [REDACTED], known as Individual A, Individual B, Individual C and Individual E. The panel found each of these witnesses to be credible and consistent, giving a clear account of their recollection of the individual incidents that they witnessed. All witnesses were challenged with Mrs Owen's written account, and all confirmed that it was not a true reflection of the incidents.

The panel preferred the evidence of Individual A, Individual B, Individual C and Individual E to that of the teacher. The panel did not accept Mrs Owen's assertion that there was an element of collusion between the [REDACTED] as their accounts were individual but consistent.

The panel had the benefit of a written statement from Individual D, however placed less weight on this evidence as Individual D confirmed that she spent less time on site due to the nature of her role. The panel accepted that whilst she was on site, Individual D did not see anything of concern in respect of Mrs Owen's behaviour towards pupils.

The panel saw documentary evidence that the pupils themselves did not confirm that the incidents occurred. However, the panel was satisfied with the explanation provided by Individual E in oral evidence that the pupils had extremely complex needs and would not necessarily have understood or processed what was happening at the time. She particularly stated that the incidents would have, *“gone over their heads”*.

*Allegation 1.a.*

Individual A gave oral evidence describing the incident in detail to the panel. This account was largely consistent with her previous account during the police investigation and the school’s investigation.

*Allegation 1.b.*

Mrs Owen confirmed that she did, on one occasion, stand on Pupil B’s foot, but that this was an accident. She stated *‘I did not do this deliberately and did not realise I was doing so until a Teaching Assistant told me I was doing so. I asked the child to check his foot, but he said he was fine, and I would never force a child to let me look at a part of their body.’*

The panel acknowledged that Mrs Owen suffered from a health concern. However it did not accept that this health concern caused or contributed to this incident.

Individual B was firm in her evidence that the incident she saw was deliberate, and that Mrs Owen had stood on Pupil B’s feet after Pupil B continued to scream despite being asked to stop by Mrs Owen. Individual B went on to say that the following day, Mrs Owen said, *“I was silly yesterday and could have lost my job. [Pupil B] was screaming and I was stressed.”*

*Allegation 1.c.*

The panel heard oral evidence from Individual C in respect of this allegation. Individual C stated that during relaxation time *‘Pupil B suddenly started to get up again off the floor. When Pupil B was about halfway up from the ground in a push-up motion, Ms Owen moved her hand up from his back to his head, just below his crown, and shoved him back down in the sort of motion you would use to close a car door.’*

*Allegations 1.d. and 1.e.*

The panel heard oral evidence from Individual E in respect of a specific incident in which Mrs Owen screamed at Pupil B.

Individual E stated that Pupil B had been screaming and that this was not unusual for this child. Individual B went on to state that Mrs Owen *‘suddenly stomped into the area, and then either crouched down or got down onto her knees so she was eye*



*level with Pupil B. Ms Owen placed her hands over Pupil B's [hands], and screamed at him. This was basically screaming in his face due to proximity.'*

Individual A, Individual B, Individual C and Individual E all gave oral evidence that Mrs Owen would scream at pupils on occasion and that this would happen in front of, or in the vicinity of, other pupils.

The panel was satisfied that each of the individual incidents were inappropriate and/or unprofessional.

The panel therefore found this allegation proven, on the balance of probabilities.

## **2. You failed to adequately undertake your safeguarding duties in that you:**

### **a. in or around September 2017, failed to act upon a safeguarding concern raised by Individual A in respect of Pupil E**

*Mrs Owen denied this allegation and stated that 'If staff raised concerns I always asked for them to be written up. I would do my utmost to follow up these concerns to the point on one occasion I was told by a social worker that I should never have made a referral.'*

The panel heard compelling evidence from Individual A that she raised a serious safeguarding concern with Mrs Owen about Pupil E, during conversation, but that Mrs Owen responded saying, *"there is no need to write this up..."*.

This concern ultimately came to light following an unrelated police investigation, after which Witness X made further enquiries as to whether there had been any concerns relating to Pupil E. Witness X confirmed in oral evidence that there was no written record of this incident. Individual A was then asked to formally record this safeguarding concern retrospectively using the appropriate forms.

The panel preferred the evidence of Witness X and Individual A and found this allegation proven on the balance of probabilities.

### **b. on one or more occasion(s), failed to maintain accurate child protection/safeguarding records**

The panel considered that in this allegation Mrs Owen made significant admissions.

*Mrs Owen stated in her written evidence that she 'acted upon safeguarding concerns raised with me, but did fail in maintaining timely records of my actions, for which I am truly sorry. I feel that I was under unprecedented pressure in terms of workload and lack of time, and was struggling to manage [REDACTED].'*

The panel did not accept Mrs Owen's assertion that the unit was significantly oversubscribed for long periods of time and that this contributed to her lack of

opportunity available to complete paperwork related to safeguarding. The panel had the opportunity to question all of the [REDACTED] witnesses about the effect of staff absences on the running and maintenance of the SRB, and was satisfied that there was sufficient cover for those periods. The panel also noted that Mrs Owen was provided with additional preparation, planning and assessment time during the week, following a conversation with Witness X. This additional half day was allotted each Friday when no pupils were present. This was further supported by the oral evidence of the [REDACTED] witnesses, who confirmed that Mrs Owen did not commit to significant teaching time and had ample opportunity to complete her paperwork relating to safeguarding.

The panel carefully considered a number of safeguarding concerns which were investigated by the school and for which no records were found. The panel was particularly troubled to note that there was evidence of five separate serious concerns in relation to one pupil, for which no records were kept. These five incidents took place within a two month period but no safeguarding forms were completed.

The panel heard oral evidence from Witness X about what should have happened with safeguarding concerns. The panel accepted that Witness X had approved the use of 'red books' rather than 'nagging concern' forms and stated in oral evidence that the red books should have been reviewed at least weekly. Witness X also confirmed that they should not be used to replace safeguarding referrals. However the panel noted that poor practice developed. Mrs Owen admitted in the school investigation that she only reviewed the red books '*once every half term, or probably more*' to identify whether any of the issues should be escalated as safeguarding concerns.

The panel heard oral evidence from Individual A, Individual B, Individual C and Individual E that Mrs Owen would review the red books very infrequently and would not direct teaching assistants to fill in the formal safeguarding paperwork following review of any of the incidents noted within the red books.

The panel went on to consider Mrs Owen's role as Designated Safeguarding Lead ("DSL") and noted that her responsibilities as set out within the school's safeguarding policy included '*The DSL will maintain written records and child protection files ensuring that they are kept confidential and stored securely.*' The safeguarding policy went on to state that, '*following receipt of any information raising a concern, the DSL will consider what action to take and seek advice from Children's Services as required. All information and actions taken, including the reasons for any decisions made, will be fully documented.*'

The panel found that Mrs Owen failed in this responsibility.

The panel found this allegation proven on the balance of probabilities.

### **3. In so doing 1 and/or 2 above, you exposed pupil(s) to and/or failed to protect them from the risk of potential harm**

Having found allegation 1 proven, the panel went on to consider whether this exposed pupils to harm. The panel found that the physical contact and screaming did expose both the individual pupils to harm, as well as those in the vicinity when the incidents occurred.

The panel further considered whether the lack of appropriate safeguarding forms failed to protect pupils from the risk of potential harm. The panel found that this failure did expose pupils to risk of potential harm, in that opportunities to intervene may have been missed due to lack of complete records and information sharing amongst the employees within the school.

The panel found this allegation proven on the balance of probabilities.

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

Having found the allegations 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.

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 Owen, in relation to the facts found proven, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considered that by reference to Part Two, Mrs Owen 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
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils’ well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mrs Owen amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

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

The panel found that the offence of violence was relevant.

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

The panel took into account the way the teaching profession is viewed by others and considered the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel also took account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils' lives and the fact that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way that they behave. The panel particularly noted that Mrs Owen was the only DSL within the SRB, and this carried specific expectations and responsibilities which could impact on both how pupils and parents viewed the teaching profession.

Having found the facts of particulars 1, 2 and 3 proven, the panel further found that Mrs Owen's conduct amounted to both unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

In deciding whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be made, the panel had to consider whether it would be an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it would be in the public interest to do so. Prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely, the protection of pupils, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mrs Owen, which involved serious safeguarding concerns, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils, given the serious findings of inappropriate physical contact with pupils and the lack of proper record keeping.

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

The panel was of the view that there was a strong public interest in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession as the conduct found against Mrs Owen was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

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 Owen.

In carrying out the balancing exercise, the panel had regard to the public interest considerations both in favour of and against prohibition as well as the interests of Mrs Owen. 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 were relevant in this case were:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving vulnerable pupils) or violation of the rights of pupils;
- deliberate behaviour that undermines pupils, the profession, the school or colleagues;

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

The panel found that the teacher's actions were deliberate. The panel accepted the teacher's evidence of [REDACTED], however did not have any medical evidence to confirm how this condition may have contributed to these allegations. The panel found that Mrs Owen was offered the opportunity for an occupational health referral to ascertain how the school could better support her, but chose not to engage with this.

The panel accepted that Mrs Owen did have a previously good history.

The panel did not have the benefit of any documentary references for Mrs Owen. The panel did hear evidence from Witness X that Mrs Owen was effective in her role. However this was not supported by the [REDACTED] who worked with Mrs Owen directly on a day to day basis.

The panel first considered whether it would be proportionate to conclude this case with no recommendation of prohibition, and whether the publication of the findings made by the panel would be sufficient.

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

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mrs Owen. The serious nature of the safeguarding concerns were a significant factor in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

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

The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proven, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. These behaviours include violence. The panel found that Mrs Owen displayed behaviours associated with violence against more than one extremely vulnerable pupil with complex needs.

The panel accepted that Mrs Owen acknowledged and apologised for her poor practice in keeping up to date safeguarding documentation but this acknowledgement was limited in that she failed to appreciate the impact of her actions. However, the panel further noted that Mrs Owen displayed no insight into the impact of her physical and emotional actions against particularly vulnerable pupils.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate. As such, the panel decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with no provision for a review period.

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

I have given very careful consideration to this case and to the recommendation of the panel in respect of both sanction and review period.

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

In this case, the panel has found all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mrs Owen should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Mrs Owen 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
- 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 Mrs Owen fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel also considered whether Mrs Owen's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 8 and 9 of the Advice and found "that the offence of violence was relevant." This makes the finding of misconduct particularly serious.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself, whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider

whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Mrs Owen, and the impact that will have on her, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children. The panel has observed, “there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils, given the serious findings of inappropriate physical contact with pupils and the lack of proper record keeping.”

A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future. I have also taken into account the panel’s comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, “The panel accepted that Mrs Owen acknowledged and apologised for her poor practice in keeping up to date safeguarding documentation but this acknowledgement was limited in that she failed to appreciate the impact of her actions.” The panel further noted, “that Mrs Owen displayed no insight into the impact of her physical and emotional actions against particularly vulnerable pupils.”

In my judgement, the lack of insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk future pupils’ safety. 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, “public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mrs Owen was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of violence in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

I have had to consider that the public has a high expectation of professional standards of all teachers and that the public might regard a failure to impose a prohibition order as a failure to uphold those high standards. In weighing these considerations, I have had to consider the matter from the point of view of an “ordinary intelligent and well-informed citizen.”

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of unacceptable professional conduct, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mrs Owen herself.

The panel comment that it, “accepted that Mrs Owen did have a previously good history.”



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

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

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mrs Owen has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, that is not backed up by full remorse or insight, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended that no provision should be made for a review period.

I have considered the panel's comments, "The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proven, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. These behaviours include violence. The panel found that Mrs Owen displayed behaviours associated with violence against more than one extremely vulnerable pupil with complex needs."


I have considered whether no provision for review 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, three factors 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 violence found, the serious nature of the safeguarding concerns and the lack of either insight or full remorse.

I consider therefore that allowing for no review period is necessary to maintain public confidence and is proportionate and in the public interest.

**This means that Mrs Karen Owen is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England.** Furthermore, in view of the seriousness of the allegations found proven against her, I have decided that Mrs Karen Owen shall not be entitled to apply for restoration of her eligibility to teach.

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

Mrs Owen 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 read 'Dawn Dandy', with a stylized, cursive script.

**Decision maker: Dawn Dandy**

**Date: 15 October 2019**

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