



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Ms Lauren Green: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome**

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

**April 2022**

## Contents

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Introduction   | 3  |
| Allegations  | 4  |
| Preliminary applications                                 | 4  |
| Summary of evidence                                      | 5  |
| Documents  | 5  |
| Statement of agreed facts                                | 5  |
| Decision and reasons                                     | 5  |
| Findings of fact   | 6  |
| Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State         | 11 |
| 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**

|                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>Teacher:</b>               | Ms Lauren Green                           |
| <b>Teacher ref number:</b>    | 0976009                                   |
| <b>Teacher date of birth:</b> | 24 February 1991                          |
| <b>TRA reference:</b>         | 19819                                     |
| <b>Date of determination:</b> | 20 April 2022                             |
| <b>Former employer:</b>       | St Barnabas CE Primary School, Warrington |

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel ('the panel') of the Teaching Regulation Agency ('the TRA') convened on 20 April 2022 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Ms Lauren Green.

The panel members were Mr Chris Major (teacher panellist – in the chair), Ms Caroline Downes (lay panellist) and Ms Alison Feist (former teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Natalie Kent of Birketts LLP solicitors.

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Ms Green that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Ms Green 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, Ms Carolyn Thackstone of Browne Jacobson solicitors, Ms Green or any representative for Ms Green.

The meeting took place in private by way of a virtual meeting.

## **Allegations**

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 18 March 2022.

It was alleged that Ms Green was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst employed at St Barnabas CE Primary School between 15 April 2015 and 27 January 2021:

1. She provided false and/or misleading information in that;
  - a. On or around February 2016 she falsely informed the School [REDACTED] had tested positive for stomach cancer;
  - b. Took periods of absence from work due to the alleged illness of [REDACTED];
  - c. Updated her colleagues regularly on the false terminal illness of [REDACTED];
  - d. Informed the School and colleagues that [REDACTED] had passed away on or around March 2020;
  - e. Engaged in false conversations about [REDACTED] illness with colleagues who have suffered bereavement;
  - f. Accepted collections, hampers and/or gifts from her colleagues;
  - g. Organised a Race for Life charity run at the School using false information about [REDACTED] illness;
  - h. Falsely informed the children at her school that the Race for Life was to help [REDACTED].
2. Her conduct as may be found proven at 1 above lacked integrity and/or was dishonest.

Ms Green admitted the facts of allegations 1 to 2 and that her behaviour amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, as set out in the response to the notice of referral dated 16 November 2021 and in the statement of agreed facts signed by Ms Green on 23 February 2022.

## **Preliminary applications**

There were no preliminary applications.

## Summary of evidence

### Documents

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

- Section 1: Notice of referral and response – pages 2 to 9
- Section 2: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 11 to 16
- Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 18 to 154
- Section 4: Teacher documents – pages 156 to 182

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

### Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Ms Green on 23 February 2022.

### Decision and reasons

The panel carefully considered the case and reached the following decision and reasons:

In advance of the meeting, the TRA agreed to a request from Ms Green for the allegations to be considered without a hearing. The panel had the ability to direct that the case be considered at a hearing if required in the interests of justice or in the public interest. The panel did not determine that such a direction was necessary or appropriate in this case.

Ms Green was employed as a class teacher at St Barnabas CE Primary School ('the School') from 15 April 2015.

In January 2016, Ms Green informed the School that [REDACTED] needed to have a scan for suspected cancer. In February 2016, Ms Green informed the School and her colleagues that [REDACTED] scan was positive for cancer and that [REDACTED] needed to begin treatment.

Between 2017 and 2020, periods of absence, amounting to 169.5 days, were taken from work by Ms Green due to the stress/depression caused by the alleged terminal illness of [REDACTED]. During this time, Ms Green spoke at length with colleagues about the

terminal illness and accepted donations of food, money and gifts, which had been provided out of the good will of her colleagues.

In March 2020, Ms Green informed the School and her colleagues that [REDACTED] had passed away.

On 14 January 2021, a meeting was held between the headteacher of the School and Ms Green. New evidence had come to light that [REDACTED] had not passed away. Ms Green admitted and accepted the evidence that her [REDACTED] was still alive.

On 27 January 2021, the School received a sick note for Ms Green stating that she was suffering from stress and anxiety. On the same day, Ms Green handed in her letter of resignation.

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

- 1. You provided false and/or misleading information in that;**
  - a. On or around February 2016 you falsely informed the School [REDACTED] had tested positive for stomach cancer;**
  - b. Took periods of absence from work due to the alleged illness of [REDACTED];**
  - c. Updated your colleagues regularly on the false terminal illness of [REDACTED];**
  - d. Informed the School and colleagues that [REDACTED] had passed away on or around March 2020;**
  - e. Engage in false conversations about [REDACTED] illness with colleagues who have suffered bereavement;**
  - f. Accepted collections, hampers and/or gifts from your colleagues;**
  - g. Organised a Race for Life charity run at the School using false information about [REDACTED] illness;**
  - h. Falsely informed the children at your school that the Race for Life was to help [REDACTED].**

The panel noted that within the response to the notice of referral dated 16 November 2021 and in the statement of agreed facts signed by Ms Green on 23 February 2022, Ms Green admitted to the facts of allegations 1(a) to 1(h). Nonetheless, the panel made a determination based on the facts and the evidence available to it.

**a. On or around February 2016 you falsely informed the School [REDACTED] had tested positive for stomach cancer;**

Ms Green admitted that she falsely informed the School [REDACTED] had tested positive for stomach cancer. The panel noted that there were various mentions of this in the documentary evidence which had been submitted as part of the bundle, in particular a former colleague Individual D noted that, *“At some point between March 2016 and June 2016, Lauren came to school very upset saying that [REDACTED] had stomach cancer. I took her into Individual E old office to comfort her.”*

**b. Took periods of absence from work due to the alleged illness of [REDACTED];**

Ms Green admitted that she took periods of absence leave from work due to the alleged illness of [REDACTED] and that she informed the School and/or led the School to believe that her stress and anxiety was due to the continued illness of [REDACTED].

The panel considered both the staff absence analysis and the various statements of fitness to work documents submitted in the bundle and noted that these demonstrated extensive periods of leave. In particular, the panel referred to the three entries within the staff absence analysis which stated, *“Other paid authorised absence, eg compassionate leave”*. The panel also noted the reference to *“bereavement”* in the fitness for work certificate dated 26 March 2020 which was provided at around the time Ms Green informed the School [REDACTED] had passed away.

**c. Updated your colleagues regularly on the false terminal illness of [REDACTED];**

Ms Green admitted that she updated her colleagues on [REDACTED] health when they asked about it. However, Ms Green averred in her submissions through her representative that she did not volunteer this information or initiate any such conversations but instead responded to their queries, concerns and offers of support. Despite this, Ms Green admitted that she abused the trust of her colleagues.

The panel found the evidence provided by Ms Green’s former colleagues credible. The accounts given of conversations Ms Green had had with colleagues updating them on the false terminal illness of [REDACTED] were, in the opinion of the panel, overwhelming in both their number and detail and span the duration of the relevant period. There were several accounts of conversations which Ms Green had had with her colleagues which the panel found particularly egregious:

- Screenshots of messages from Ms Green which stated, *“Macmillan are coming this afternoon and bringing us a hamper of goodies and movies for us to watch over the weekend”*
- One colleague Individual F stated, *“Lauren used to tell me on a daily basis of [REDACTED] illness, how [REDACTED] being sick and also brining blood up, how [REDACTED] blood counts weren’t right, how she worried about the time she had to have off work taking [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] appointments etc., [REDACTED].”*
- Another colleague Individual G stated, *“December 2020 – LG distressed in school, she was upset as she said since coming back to school, “No one asks about her and how she is coping without [REDACTED]”*

**d. Informed the School and colleagues that [REDACTED] had passed away on or around March 2020;**

Ms Green admitted that she informed the School and her colleagues that [REDACTED] had passed away.

The panel again gave weight to the credible accounts of Ms Green’s former colleagues. One colleague Individual H stated, *“She said [REDACTED] had died with [REDACTED] around [REDACTED], she stayed with [REDACTED] until the undertakers came. They struggled getting [REDACTED] down the stairs and scuffed the hall walls with the body bag.”* Another colleague Individual F stated, *“Lauren told me how she held [REDACTED] hand while [REDACTED] passed away. When Lauren returned to work, she even told me how the undertakers had scraped the wall trying to get Individual I’s body down the stairs, how terrible the smell was and how stained the bed and carpet were and that she had to [REDACTED].”*

**e. Engage in false conversations about [REDACTED] illness with colleagues who have suffered bereavement;**

Ms Green admitted that she had engaged in conversations about [REDACTED] illness with colleagues, some of whom had suffered bereavement.

The panel noted that this is referred to within the written accounts of those former colleagues. [REDACTED].

**f. Accepted collections, hampers and/or gifts from your colleagues;**

Ms Green further admitted that she accepted two cash collections from her colleagues, one of £180 and one of £120. Ms Green admitted that she also received a food hamper at Christmas and a number of gifts from colleagues, including a Pandora bracelet, when her [REDACTED] and she later informed the School of [REDACTED] death.



The panel noted that these donations were referred to within the written evidence of former colleagues.

**g. Organised a Race for Life charity run at the School using false information about [REDACTED] illness;**

**h. Falsely informed the children at your school that the Race for Life was to help [REDACTED].**

Ms Green admitted that she organised a Race for Life charity run at the School. Ms Green also admitted that it was possible she had mentioned her [REDACTED] in the process of organising the event. Ms Green admitted that it was also possible she had mentioned [REDACTED] illness as part of an assembly. However, Ms Green averred that she would not have told anyone that the Race for Life was to help [REDACTED].

The panel determined from the witness evidence provided that it was clear that a Race for Life had been organised and that Ms Green's colleague Individual G states that, "*LG discussed and organised a Race for Life at St Barnabas, she told the children in the assembly about [REDACTED] being poorly and how the charity was helping [REDACTED]. I listened to the assembly with my class due to their age, no other teachers present.*" The panel found that it was unclear whether the Race for Life was intended to help [REDACTED] directly but did find that Ms Green had made a link between the Race for Life and [REDACTED] illness to the children.

The panel found allegations 1(a) to 1(h) proven.

**2. Your conduct as may be found proven at 1 above lacked integrity and/or was dishonest.**

The panel firstly considered whether Ms Green had failed to act with integrity. The panel considered the case of *Wingate & Anor v The Solicitors Regulation Authority* to determine whether Ms Green had met the higher standards which society expects from professional persons. The panel noted that teachers have a privileged and trusted role in society and serve as role models to their pupils and the public at large. On this basis, the panel found that Ms Green had lacked integrity.

The panel then considered whether Ms Green had acted dishonestly. In reaching its decision on this, the panel considered the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd t/a Crockford*. The panel noted that this particular case was about card-counting, which was considered by some as dishonest whereas others do not consider it so. The panel noted that the present case was less ambiguous as to whether Ms Green lacked honesty. The ordinary person would consider Ms Green's behaviour, in deceiving her colleagues and the School over the period of around February 2016 to January 2021, to be dishonest.

The panel sought to ascertain the actual state of Ms Green's knowledge or belief as to the facts. The panel noted that Ms Green maintained the deception long after she allegedly discovered that this was not true in September 2018.

The panel found allegation 2 proven.

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

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

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

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Ms Green, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Ms Green 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.
- 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 was satisfied that the conduct of Ms Green fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel also considered whether Ms Green's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

The panel found that whilst there were elements of serious dishonesty in the allegations, they did not feel that the offence of fraud was relevant.

Accordingly, as a result of the breach of professional standards, coupled with the serious dishonesty, the panel was satisfied that Ms Green was guilty of 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 they behave.

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

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

Having found the facts of particulars 1(a), 1(b), 1 (c), 1(d), 1(e), 1(f), 1(g), 1(h) and 2 proved, the panel further found that Ms Green's conduct amounted to both unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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

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

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be made, the panel had to consider whether it would be an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it would be in the public interest to do so. 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 maintenance of public confidence in the profession; declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct; and that prohibition strikes the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest, if they are in conflict.

In light of the panel's findings against Ms Green which involved lacking integrity and being dishonest, there was a strong public interest consideration in maintaining the public's trust in the profession.

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

The panel decided that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Ms Green was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

The panel also however decided that there was a strong public interest consideration in retaining the teacher in the profession, since no doubt had been cast upon her abilities as an educator and/or she is able to make a valuable contribution to the profession, as demonstrated by the character references provided, as well as the reports from her induction year at the School, one of which stated, *“Miss Green has been a huge asset to the school. She volunteers for many additional roles including a basketball club. Her personal and professional conduct is excellent, and behaviour and work ethos are admirable.”*

Notwithstanding the clear public interest considerations that were present, the panel considered carefully whether or not it would be proportionate to impose a prohibition order, taking into account the effect that this would have on Ms Green.

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 Ms Green. The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours of a teacher have been proved. In the list of such behaviours, those that are relevant in this case are:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers’ Standards;
- other deliberate behaviour that undermines the profession and the school;
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions or purposeful destruction of evidence, especially where these behaviours have been repeated or had serious consequences, or involved the coercion of another person to act in a way contrary to their own interests;

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

There was no evidence that Ms Green’s actions were not deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Ms Green was acting under extreme duress.

The panel accepted that there was some limited evidence from the beginning of her career that she had the potential to reach high standards in both personal and professional conduct and that, given more time in the education section, she may contribute significantly. The panel was mindful that this incident had come at a very early stage in Ms Green’s career, and she had not yet had the opportunity and/or time to fulfil that potential.

In respect of other mitigation, the panel also noted that within a letter from Ms Green's representative, dated 7 May 2021, Ms Green submitted that she was in a [REDACTED].

Ms Green's representative submitted that Ms Green's [REDACTED] around Christmas 2015 and [REDACTED] informed her in February 2016 that [REDACTED] had been diagnosed with stomach cancer. Ms Green consequently informed the headteacher at the School. In 2018, Ms Green found out that [REDACTED] no longer had cancer and had been in remission for some time. [REDACTED].

On the balance of probabilities, the panel did not feel that the evidence provided by Ms Green by way of explanation and mitigation for her actions had been substantiated and noted that it remained untested.

The panel noted character references submitted on behalf of Ms Green. In particular, the panel noted the following:

- Individual A [REDACTED]
  - *"Whilst here, Lauren was well-regarded by the staff, the parents and the children. She was committed to the [REDACTED] ethos and was prepared to go above and beyond to ensure that the children had as broad a range of experiences as possible."*
  - *"I can confirm that I never had any concerns about Lauren's integrity or honesty whilst she worked here."*
- Individual B [REDACTED]
  - *"She fit perfectly into the school, so much so that she was provided the opportunity to complete two periods of maternity cover. During this time Lauren was an enthusiastic, creative and dedicated teacher. She built strong and respected relationships with all of the children she taught, their parents and the colleagues she worked with."*
  - *"Lauren has helped me to develop my own classroom practice with advice on planning and easement and has shared her plethora of creative ideas for learning."*
- Individual C [REDACTED]
  - *"During this time, Lauren facilitated opportunities for the development of teaching skills and knowledge in relation to training targets and the teaching standards."*
  - *"Lauren was always approachable to ask for support, advice or ideas whilst also encouraging independence and autonomy as a trainee teacher."*

- *“In her own teaching, Lauren modelled good practice and professionalism and I was able to observe her teaching a range of subjects across the primary curriculum.”*

The panel considered whether Ms Green had shown insight and remorse into her actions. They noted that within the letter from Ms Green’s representative, dated 7 May 2021, Ms Green, *“would like to take this opportunity to apologise, to her colleagues, Head, pupils and their parents, the TRA and her profession for the concern that this has caused.”* However, the panel also noted that whilst she had said she would do a number of things to demonstrate her remorse, including returning the money she had received, there was no evidence that she had done so.

Considering the principles drawn out in the case of *GMC v Khetyar*, and whether there was a future risk of repetition, the panel did not feel there was sufficient evidence to demonstrate this either way as they determined that this was an isolated incident, albeit that it subsisted over a protracted period. The panel noted that there was nothing to suggest from her history that she will not continue to be an excellent 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 would be sufficient.

Following extensive deliberations, the panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings was sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Ms Green of prohibition, which the panel noted would be severe and would likely impede her future employment prospects within the education sector.

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 Ms Green. The length of time that Ms Green maintained the deception was a significant factor in forming that opinion, as was the impact that Ms Green’s deception had on her colleagues, in particular those who had experienced bereavement. 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 to recommend that a review period of the order should be considered. 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 proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. The panel found that Ms Green was not responsible for any such behaviours.

The Advice also indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer review period. One of these behaviours is fraud or serious dishonesty. The panel found that whilst Ms Green was responsible for lacking integrity and being dishonest in lying about [REDACTED] terminal illness and death, this did not amount to fraud.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate in all the circumstances for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a review period of 2 years.

The panel hoped that during this review period Ms Green would be afforded a further period of reflection and, if possible, therapeutic intervention to examine the reasons for the sustained deception and demonstrate an understanding as to the cause of the issues.

## **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 Ms Lauren Green should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of two years. The panel has recommended that the findings of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, should be published and that such an action is proportionate and in the public interest.

In particular, the panel has found that Ms Lauren Green is in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school.
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach 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 Ms Green fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are serious as they involved a lack of integrity and were dishonest.

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 Ms Green, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, "They noted that within the letter from Ms Green's representative, dated 7 May 2021, Ms Green, *"would like to take this opportunity to apologise, to her colleagues, Head, pupils and their parents, the TRA and her profession for the concern that this has caused."* However, the panel also noted that whilst she had said she would do a number of things to demonstrate her remorse, including returning the money she had received, there was no evidence that she had done so. I have 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, "In light of the panel's findings against Ms Green which involved lacking integrity and being dishonest, there was a strong public interest consideration in maintaining the public's trust in 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 Ms Green herself and the panel comment “The panel also however decided that there was a strong public interest consideration in retaining the teacher in the profession, since no doubt had been cast upon her abilities as an educator and/or she is able to make a valuable contribution to the profession, as demonstrated by the character references provided, as well as the reports from her induction year at the School, one of which stated, *“Miss Green has been a huge asset to the school. She volunteers for many additional roles including a basketball club. Her personal and professional conduct is excellent, and behaviour and work ethos are admirable.”*

I have also noted “there was some limited evidence from the beginning of her career that she had the potential to reach high standards in both personal and professional conduct and that, given more time in the education section, she may contribute significantly. The panel was mindful that this incident had come at a very early stage in Ms Green’s career, and she had not yet had the opportunity and/or time to fulfil that potential.”

A prohibition order would prevent Ms Green 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 evidence and mitigation, “On the balance of probabilities, the panel did not feel that the evidence provided by Ms Green by way of explanation and mitigation for her actions had been substantiated and noted that it remained untested.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that “the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Ms Green. The length of time that Ms Green maintained the deception was a significant factor in forming that opinion, as was the impact that Ms Green’s deception had on her colleagues, in particular those who had experienced bereavement. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Miss Green 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, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended a 2 year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments "The panel hoped that during this review period Ms Green would be afforded a further period of reflection and, if possible, therapeutic intervention to examine the reasons for the sustained deception and demonstrate an understanding as to the cause of the issues."

I consider that 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.

**This means that Miss Lauren Green 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 29 April 2024, 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, Miss Green remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Miss Lauren Green 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 'S Buxcey', with a horizontal line underneath.

**Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey**

**Date: 25 April 2022**

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