



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mrs Emma Wright: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

May 2022

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	5
Summary of evidence	6
Documents	6
Witnesses	6
Decision and reasons	6
Findings of fact	7
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 Emma Wright
Teacher ref number:	03/65864
Teacher date of birth:	27 June 1980
TRA reference:	17746
Date of determination:	20 May 2022
Former employer:	Huxlow Science College, Northamptonshire

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 17 May 2022 at The Ramada Hotel and Suites by Wyndham, The Butts, Coventry, CV1 3GG, to consider the case of Mrs Wright.

The panel members were Mr Maurice McBride (lay panellist – in the chair), Ms Shabana Robertson (lay panellist) and Ms Beverley Williams (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Sarah Price of Blake Morgan solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Miss Sherelle Appleby of Browne Jacobson solicitors.

Mrs Wright was present and was represented by Mr Nicholas Kennan of Cornwall Street Chambers instructed by Ms Sharon Liburd of the National Education Union.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegation(s) set out in the notice of proceedings dated 21 March 2022.

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

1. She permitted and/or failed to prevent one or more VCert Art pupils during the academic years 2016/2017 and/or 2017/2018:
 - a. to produce and or submit photographs and/or re-renderings depicting one or more pupils and/or young people:
 - i. wearing only underwear;
 - ii. holding cigarette(s) and/or alcohol container(s);
 - iii. with their hands covering their otherwise naked breasts;
 - iv. with alcohol container(s) covering their otherwise naked breasts;
 - v. posing with their hand inside their underwear and/or in a pose which simulated masturbation.
 - b. to base their work on one or more artists without:
 - i. updating the relevant teaching plans and/or schemes of work;
 - ii. otherwise informing and/or obtaining approval from her line manager;
 - iii. properly notifying the school and/or pupils and/or parents that the course material was sexual in nature.
2. She permitted and/or failed to prevent one or more pupils from;
 - a. accessing school computing equipment which was logged in to her personal school account;
 - b. viewing material stored on her personal staff area;
 - c. uploading and/or storing material in her personal staff area including photographs and/or videos of one or more pupils and/or young people:
 - i. displaying offensive hand gestures, including whilst wearing school uniform;
 - ii. exposing their torso whilst wearing school uniform;

- iii. posing with open alcohol container(s);
 - iv. smoking cigarette(s) including whilst in school uniform;
 - v. posing in swimwear.
3. Following her alleged conduct at Allegations 1 and/or 2 above coming to the school's attention she:
- a. removed Art coursework material from the school site;
 - b. failed to maintain the confidentiality of the school's investigation into her conduct.
4. Her conduct as may be found proven at Allegation 3 above was dishonest and/or lacked integrity.

Mrs Wright admitted allegation 2 in its entirety, and allegation 3b. Mrs Wright did not admit that her conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Preliminary applications

There were no preliminary applications.

Following the conclusion of the TRA's case, but before the Teacher's case was opened, the panel heard an application for the TRA to call a third witness, Individual A [REDACTED]. The TRA had initially intended to call this witness, but at the time of closing its case, it was understood that Individual A [REDACTED] was unable to attend to give oral evidence. However, Individual A [REDACTED] attended the hearing on the second day and was willing to give evidence. The panel determined that it would benefit from hearing evidence from the witness, that this would not cause prejudice to the teacher and that it was in the interests of justice to hear from the witness. Therefore, the panel granted the TRA's application.

During the proceedings, the panel heard an application made on behalf of the teacher to admit some additional documents, comprising of a letter from NSEAD and a checklist for introducing sensitive subject and issue-based work. This application was not opposed. The panel heard and accepted legal advice on this application. The panel determined that it was in the interests of a fair hearing for the documents to be admitted. The application was granted.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Correspondence – pages 9 to 16

Section 2: Teaching Regulation Agency Evidence – pages 18 to 601

Section 3: Teacher Evidence – pages 603 to 744

Additional documents:

- Letter from NSEAD – pages 745-746
- A checklist for introducing sensitive subject and issue-based work – pages 747-748.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the hearing and the additional documents that the panel decided to admit.

Witnesses

The panel heard oral evidence from the following witnesses called on behalf of the TRA (roles are those held by the witnesses at the School, at the time of the incident in question):

- Individual B [REDACTED];
- Individual C [REDACTED];
- Individual A [REDACTED].

The panel heard oral evidence from the following witnesses called on behalf of the teacher:

- Mrs Emma Wright (the teacher);
- Individual D [REDACTED].

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

Mrs Wright had been employed at Huxlow Science College ("the School") since September 2004 as an art teacher. On 14 December 2017, during internal moderation of a number of year 11 student art portfolios, inappropriate photographs and artwork within

those portfolios were discovered by the Head of Design Technology. The concerns were reported and the Deputy Head Teacher, Individual C [REDACTED], was asked to undertake an investigation. Following the internal investigation, the School held disciplinary proceedings that resulted in Mrs Wright's dismissal. The TRA received a referral from the School dated 26 September 2018.

Findings of fact

The panel heard live evidence from a number of witnesses. The panel considered all of the witnesses to be credible. The panel took in to account the fact that Mrs Wright was of good character when considering her credibility as a witness and her propensity to act as alleged. The panel heard and accepted the legal advice.

The findings of fact are as follows:

1. You permitted and/or failed to prevent one or more VCert Art pupils during the academic years 2016/2017 and/or 2017/2018:

a. to produce and or submit photographs and/or re-renderings depicting one or more pupils and/or young people:

i. wearing only underwear;

ii. holding cigarette(s) and/or alcohol container(s);

iii. with their hands covering their otherwise naked breasts;

iv. with alcohol container(s) covering their otherwise naked breasts;

v. posing with their hand inside their underwear and/or in a pose which simulated masturbation.

The panel was provided with the artwork that had been produced by the pupils. The panel found that the photographs included in the portfolios were as described in the particulars of the allegation set out at 1a i to v.

Mrs Wright told the panel that when she had introduced a new artist Individual E [REDACTED] to the pupils, she had not expected them to produce the photographs that were evidenced in the student's portfolios. The panel noted that during the School's suspension meeting, Mrs Wright had accepted that the artist she had introduced did do "*suggestive pictures*", but she told the students this did not mean for them to do suggestive pictures. Mrs Wright informed the panel that she had told the pupils that she did not expect them to be naked, but to use their arm, face, or something. During her evidence, Mrs Wright stated that art is a process. On balance, the panel determined that Mrs Wright would have seen the photographs that had been produced by the pupils before the final artwork had been produced.

The panel heard from Mrs Wright that on reflection she should have challenged the photographs and raised it with her line manager. Mrs Wright explained that there were a number of personal and work related factors that meant that she did not challenge the photographs at the time. The panel found that Mrs Wright had failed to give clear guidance to the pupils and should have challenged the nature of the photographs. In not doing so, she failed to prevent the pupils from producing and submitting the photographs.

The panel considered at length the suitability of art images from other artists, and examination papers in the bundle and the photographs produced by the students which were found in the portfolios. The panel found the photographs of the students, who were under the age of 16 at the time the photographs were taken, were a safeguarding concern and as such were highly inappropriate.

On balance, the panel found the facts of this allegation proved.

b. to base their work on one or more artists without:

i. updating the relevant teaching plans and/or schemes of work;

ii. otherwise informing and/or obtaining approval from your line manager;

iii. properly notifying the school and/or pupils and/or parents that the course material was sexual in nature

The panel heard live evidence from Individual C [REDACTED]. Individual C [REDACTED] had carried out an internal investigation on behalf of the School. Individual C told the panel that teachers do have autonomy to change schemes of work, but that if it was a significant change, it should also be discussed with the teacher's line manager. Individual C [REDACTED] stated that Mrs Wright should have updated the scheme of work and had conversations with the School in order to protect the pupils, when she decided to introduce the artist, Individual E [REDACTED]. This was also confirmed in a written statement from Individual F [REDACTED] (Head of Department and Learning Leader) who stated that he was responsible for ensuring the quality of the schemes of work were appropriate and fit within school policies and guidance. Individual F [REDACTED] also stated that there was an expectation that if changes were made to the schemes of work, that the Learning Leader would be informed.

Mrs Wright accepted in her evidence that she did not update the schemes of work to reflect the new artist that she introduced to the pupils, nor did she discuss it with her line manager, the School or parents of the pupils.

Although Mrs Wright told the panel that in her opinion the work of Individual E [REDACTED] was not sexual in nature, she did accept that with hindsight, she should have told the pupils that the photographs they produced were not appropriate. She also accepted that she should have spoken to the pupil's parents and the School's Designated

Safeguarding Lead, to ensure appropriate support was in place for those students involved. The panel considered the personal and work circumstances that Mrs Wright faced at the relevant time. However, the panel found that Mrs Wright, who was an experienced teacher, ought to have considered that it was possible for the pupils to perceive the artist's work as sexual in nature. As such, safeguarding steps should have been put in place.

The panel assessed the weight and reliability of the evidence, and on the balance of probabilities, it found that Mrs Wright acted as alleged.

The facts of this allegation are found proved.

2. You permitted and/or failed to prevent one or more pupils from;

a. accessing school computing equipment which was logged in to your personal school account;

b. viewing material stored on your personal staff area;

c. uploading and/or storing material in your personal staff area including photographs and/or videos of one or more pupils and/or young people:

i. displaying offensive hand gestures, including whilst wearing school uniform;

ii. exposing their torso whilst wearing school uniform;

iii. posing with open alcohol container(s);

iv. smoking cigarette(s) including whilst in school uniform;

v. posing in swimwear.

This allegation was admitted by Mrs Wright. The panel considered that particulars of the allegation 2a and 2c were supported by evidence presented to the panel.

The panel considered Mrs Wright's evidence that she had "*no reasonable option*" other than to allow the students to access school computing equipment which was logged in to her personal school account.

However, in Individual D [REDACTED] evidence, who was in a similar situation in that she had a lack of suitable IT equipment, provided alternative solutions to overcome this issue, that were more appropriate.

The panel did not consider that there was any evidence to support the particular 2b. Therefore, the facts of this allegation are found proved in regards to particulars 2a and 2c only.

3. Following your alleged conduct at Allegations 1 and/or 2 above coming to the school's attention you:

a. removed Art coursework material from the school site;

Mrs Wright told the panel that she did have some art coursework at home, but that this was coursework from a different unit, not those subject to the allegations. The evidence provided to the panel was clear in that there was no issue with coursework being taken home by Mrs Wright. This was substantiated by Individual C [REDACTED] in her oral evidence.

The panel assessed the weight and reliability of the evidence, and on the balance of probabilities, it found that Mrs Wright already had the art coursework material at home for the purposes of marking the pupil's work. The panel did not find that there was evidence to support the allegation.

The facts of this particular of the allegation is found not proved.

b. failed to maintain the confidentiality of the school's investigation into your conduct.

This allegation was admitted by Mrs Wright and was supported by evidence presented to the panel.

The panel noted that Mrs Wright had agreed that Individual G [REDACTED] account was more accurate. In her witness statement, Individual G [REDACTED] stated that she had seen Mrs Wright in the morning, where Mrs Wright told Individual G [REDACTED] that she was worried she was going to be suspended. After the meeting when Mrs Wright was suspended, Mrs Wright then went to Individual G [REDACTED] office and confirmed she had been suspended. This was a clear breach of the instructions given by Individual B [REDACTED] not to discuss the suspension.

With regards to disclosing the investigation to Individual H [REDACTED], Mrs Wright admitted that she told Individual H [REDACTED] that she had been suspended by the School.

Mrs Wright told the panel that she did this as she had seen Individual H [REDACTED] in town during school hours and Mrs Wright felt the need to justify why she was not in School.

The panel considered Mrs Wright's reasons for disclosing that she had been suspended, but found that Mrs Wright had failed to maintain confidentiality as per the instructions given to her by the School.

Therefore, the facts of this particular was found proved.

4. Your conduct as may be found proven at Allegation 3 above was dishonest and/or lacked integrity.

The panel considered this particular of the allegation in respect of 3b only as particular 3a was found not proved.

The panel did not consider that the conduct at 3b was dishonest. However, the panel did find that it amounted to a lack of integrity. The panel was mindful that Mrs Wright had discussed the suspension with two individuals on separate occasions, and that this risked the confidentiality of the School's investigation, as well as the reputation of the School. The panel was mindful that teachers are subject to higher ethical and moral standards and in disclosing the suspension, Mrs Wright fell short of those standards.

Therefore, the panel found the facts of this allegation proved, in respect of lack of integrity.

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

Having found allegations 1a, 1b, 2a, 2c, 3b and 4 (with respect to a lack of integrity) 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 Mrs Wright, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mrs Wright 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
 - 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 Wright amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel also considered whether Mrs Wright's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice. The panel found that none of these offences was relevant.

The panel was mindful that Mrs Wright was an experienced teacher who had been at the School for many years. She had completed safeguarding training and had signed the Digital Technologies Acceptable Use Agreement. As such she should have been fully aware that the photographs produced by the students were inappropriate and a safeguarding concern. In addition, Mrs Wright allowed the students to use her computer whilst she was logged on, which was a clear breach of the Digital Technologies Acceptable Use Agreement.

The panel found that Mrs Wright had acted with a lack of integrity with respect to particular 3b. This was a serious finding.

The panel was satisfied that Mrs Wright's conduct 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 findings of misconduct are 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 Mrs Wright's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In summary, the panel found that Mrs Wright'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/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 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. The panel also considered the interests of retaining the teacher in the profession.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mrs Wright which involved serious findings of misconduct and acting with a lack of integrity, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils.

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

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

The panel did have in mind whether the right balance had been struck in regards to the rights of the teacher in being able to continue to teach, and the public interest considerations that were present in this case.

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 Wright.

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 Wright. 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 were relevant in this case were:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- misconduct seriously affecting the safeguarding and well-being of pupils;

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.

The panel found that Mrs Wright's actions were deliberate. In particular, Mrs Wright accepted that she was aware that she had not followed the School's policy when she allowed students to use the computer when it was logged on to her personal school account.

The panel found that there was no evidence to suggest that Mrs Wright was acting under duress.

Mrs Wright did have a previous good history and the panel were not made aware of any previous safeguarding concerns. The panel took in to consideration the character testimonials provided in the bundle. In particular, it noted the character reference from Individual I [REDACTED] who had worked with Mrs Wright up until 2013. Individual I [REDACTED] stated that at that time of working with her Mrs Wright was *"a very capable and experienced teacher, who provides students in her classes with an engaging and appropriate curriculum"* and further stated that he *"had no hesitation in seeking her advice and support on issues surrounding teaching, learning and safeguarding"*.

Whilst the panel was satisfied that there was a low risk of repetition, it did not find that Mrs Wright had fully reflected on the safeguarding implications of allowing pupils to take photographs of themselves or others in a state of undress. During the course of the hearing, Mrs Wright carried out research, and produced to the panel, a risk assessment to be used when considering artistic content.

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.

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 would be sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mrs Wright 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 Wright. The risk of harm, due to the lack of safeguarding pupils, was 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 proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. The panel found that none of these were relevant.

The panel found that Mrs Wright had not fully reflected, some 4 years after the event. In particular, the panel determined that Mrs Wright had not fully accepted that the

photographs of the pupils were totally inappropriate. Although she had stated that with hindsight that other people may view the artwork as inappropriate, Mrs Wright did not accept that the photographs of the pupils were inappropriate.

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. The panel determined that a 2 year review period was appropriate and proportionate.

The panel considered that any future panel would be assisted by evidence from Mrs Wright of clear insight and understanding of the safeguarding implications of her actions.

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 some of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. In this case, the panel has found some of the allegations not proven (including 2b and 3a, as well as finding allegation 4 proven only in respect of integrity regarding 3b). I have therefore put all of those matters entirely from my mind.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mrs Emma Wright should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of two years.

In particular, the panel has found that Mrs Wright 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
 - 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 also, “satisfied that the conduct of Mrs Wright amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which 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 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 Wright, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children and safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, “she should have been fully aware that the photographs produced by the students were inappropriate and a safeguarding concern.” 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 found that Mrs Wright had not fully reflected, some 4 years after the event. In particular, the panel determined that Mrs Wright had not fully accepted that the photographs of the pupils were totally inappropriate. Although she had stated that with hindsight that other people may view the artwork as inappropriate, Mrs Wright did not accept that the photographs of the pupils were inappropriate.”

In my judgement, the lack of full insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. 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 it, “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.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of lack of integrity in respect of allegation 3b 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 Wright herself. The panel comment “Mrs Wright did have a previous good history and the panel were not made aware of any previous safeguarding concerns. The panel took in to consideration the character testimonials provided in the bundle.”

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on two of the panel’s comments. The panel has said, “it did not find that Mrs Wright had fully reflected on the safeguarding implications of allowing pupils to take photographs of themselves or others in a state of undress” and, “The risk of harm, due to the lack of safeguarding pupils, was a significant factor in forming that opinion.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mrs Wright 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 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 a 2 year review period. This is the minimum allowed for in the regulations.

I have considered the panel’s comments, “The panel determined that a 2 year review period was appropriate and proportionate.”

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

This means that Mrs Emma Wright 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 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, Mrs Emma Wright remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mrs Emma Wright 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 'Alan Meyrick', with a vertical line at the end.

Decision maker: Alan Meyrick

Date: 26 May 2022

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