



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Ms Noreen Chambers: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

June 2022

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Witnesses	6
Decision and reasons	6
Findings of fact	7
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	10
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	14

Professional conduct panel decision and recommendations, and decision on behalf of the Secretary of State

Teacher:	Ms Noreen Chambers
Teacher ref number:	8052636
Teacher date of birth:	4 May 1959
TRA reference:	19548
Date of determination:	10 June 2022
Former employer:	Philosophy Education

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ('the panel') of the Teaching Regulation Agency ('the TRA') convened on 9 to 10 June 2022 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Ms Noreen Chambers.

The panel members were Mr Peter Ward (lay panellist – in the chair), Mr Paul Millett (lay panellist) and Ms Susanne Staab (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Lucy Churchill of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Jacob Rickett of Capsticks solicitors.

Ms Chambers was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place by way of a virtual hearing in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 4 March 2022.

It was alleged that Ms Chambers was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst a teacher at St Francis RC Primary School:

1. On or about 6 March 2020, she engaged in inappropriate physical contact with Pupil A including by holding Pupil A by one or both arms.
2. On or about 6 March she used inappropriate and/or threatening language towards Pupil A, including by saying:
 - a. "I really want to slap you" or words to that effect; and/or
 - b. "do you want me to hit you" or words to that effect.
3. On or about 6 March 2020, she used inappropriate and/or threatening language towards Pupil B, including by saying "if I was your mother I would have slapped the back of your head" or words to that effect.

Ms Chambers made no admission of fact.

Preliminary applications

Application to admit additional documents

The panel considered a preliminary application from the presenting officer for the admission of additional documents.

The presenting officer's documents were: (1) Proof of Delivery of Capsticks' Letter to Ms Chambers dated 26 May 2022; and (2) Attendance Note of a telephone call between Capsticks and an individual purporting to be Ms Chambers dated 25 November 2020.

The documents subject to the application had not been served in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 5.37 of the Procedures. Therefore, the panel was required to decide whether the documents should be admitted under paragraphs 5.33 and 5.34 of the Procedures.

The panel heard representations from the presenting officer in respect of the application.

The panel considered the additional documents were relevant. Accordingly, the documents were added to the bundle.

Application to proceed in the absence of the teacher

Ms Chambers was not present at the hearing nor was she represented. The presenting officer made an application to proceed in the absence of Ms Chambers.

The panel accepted the legal advice provided in relation to this application and took account of the various factors referred to it, as derived from the guidance set down in the case of *R v Jones [2003] 1 AC 1* (as considered and applied in subsequent cases, particularly *GMC v Adeogba*).

The panel was satisfied that the Notice of Proceedings had been sent to Ms Chambers in accordance with the Teacher Misconduct: Disciplinary Procedures for the Teaching Profession 2018 (the 'Procedures').

The panel concluded that Ms Chamber's absence was voluntary and that she was aware that the matter would proceed in her absence.

The panel noted that Ms Chambers had not sought an adjournment to the hearing and the panel did not consider that an adjournment would procure her attendance at a hearing. There was no medical evidence before the panel that Ms Chambers was unfit to attend the hearing. The panel considered that it was in the public interest for the hearing to take place. It also considered the effect on the witnesses of any delay.

Having decided that it was appropriate to proceed, the panel agreed to seek to ensure that the proceedings were as fair as possible in the circumstances, bearing in mind that Ms Chambers was neither present nor represented.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

- Section 1: Chronology, anonymised pupil list and list of key people – pages 4 to 7
- Section 2: Notice of proceedings and service documents – pages 8 to 18
- Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 19 to 29
- Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 30 to 169

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

- Proof of Delivery of Capsticks' Letter to Ms Chambers dated 26 May 2022; and

- Attendance Note of a telephone call between Capsticks and an individual purporting to be Ms Chambers dated 25 November 2020.

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 by the TRA:

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

The panel carefully considered the case before it and reached a decision.

Ms Chambers commenced her role as a supply teacher for Philosophy Education ('the Agency') on 25 February 2020. The Agency provides teachers to schools on a supply basis as well as assisting with the permanent recruitment of staff.

On Friday 6 March 2020, Ms Chambers undertook a placement at St Francis RC Primary School ('the School'). During an afternoon lesson, Ms Chambers allegedly grabbed Pupil A by the arm and used threatening language towards Pupil A. In addition, Ms Chambers also allegedly used threatening language towards Pupil B during the same lesson.

At the end of the school day on Friday 6 March 2020, Pupil A and Pupil C reported to the headteacher that Ms Chambers had grabbed the arm of Pupil A and had left a mark. The headteacher submitted an initial report to the Agency regarding the alleged incidents.

On Monday 9 March 2020, the School commenced an investigation into the allegations, obtaining statements from Pupils A, B and C. Ms Chambers was suspended by the Agency pending investigation into the allegations.

On 10 March 2020, the Agency sent Ms Chambers a suspension letter and requested in writing that Ms Chambers provide a written statement. The incident was also referred to the LADO.

On 11 March 2020, the Agency requested a written statement from Ms Chambers via telephone.

The headteacher obtained an additional statement from Pupil D on 13 March 2020.

During March to July 2020, the School/the LADO investigation was paused due to COVID-19.

The LADO reopened the investigation on 9 July 2020. The Agency called Ms Chambers again to request a written statement. Ms Chambers informed the Agency that she would no longer speak to them or provide a statement.

The Agency sent a further written request to Ms Chambers on 18 August 2020 via post and email setting a deadline of 1 September 2020. Ms Chambers did not respond.

In September 2020, the LADO closed their investigation.

On 7 September 2020, the Agency sent a letter to Ms Chambers informing her of the outcome of the LADO investigation and that referrals would be made to the DBS and the TRA. This was resent via email on 21 September 2020.

The matter was referred to the TRA on 30 September 2020.

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. On or about 6 March 2020, you engaged in inappropriate physical contact with Pupil A including by holding Pupil A by one or both arms.

The panel considered the witness statement and oral evidence of [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] submitted that, on 6 March 2020 at the end of the school day, she went out to the school gate. Pupil A and Pupil C approached [REDACTED] and informed her that ‘the teacher’ had grabbed Pupil A’s arm, which had hurt Pupil A. Pupil A only referred to the teacher as “*the supply teacher*”. [REDACTED] described to the panel the red mark she observed on Pupil A’s lower arm, which was approximately 2 inches long and looked like a thumb print.

[REDACTED] then spoke to [REDACTED], a new teacher at the School, who confirmed that Pupil A and Pupil C had also approached her and told her that a supply teacher had grabbed Pupil A’s arm. The way in which this was explained to [REDACTED], led her to believe that she was speaking about a male supply teacher.

On Monday 9 March 2020, [REDACTED] met separately with Pupil A, Pupil B and Pupil C. [REDACTED] contemporaneously recorded their statements as they spoke, thereafter confirming the accuracy of their recorded statement with each of them. Each pupil signed their statement as a true record. The three statements corroborated each other. It was at this meeting that [REDACTED] realised that the allegations were against Ms Chambers,

and not the male supply teacher she initially thought it was. On 13 March, [REDACTED] took a further statement from Pupil D, another member of the Year Six class.

[REDACTED] explained that her reason for doing so, was because Pupil A and C were friends, and Pupil B could potentially get up to mischief in class. [REDACTED] wanted to speak to a pupil who was present and who was sensible and reliable. Pupil D's statement corroborated Pupil A's and Pupil C's accounts of what had happened, namely that Ms Chambers had grabbed Pupil A's arm. Pupil D did not, however, mention that threatening comments were made.

The panel considered the Pupils' statements to be relevant and concluded it would be fair for their statements to be admitted as evidence. The Panel noted the Pupils' statements were provided to [REDACTED] as soon as reasonably practicable after the incident, and due to the timing of the incident (late Friday afternoon) and the statements being taken (the following Monday morning) there was no realistic opportunity for the Pupils to fabricate their accounts. Further, based on the evidence before it, the panel noted there was no obvious motive for the Pupils to misrepresent matters. The panel therefore found the statements credible and had been presented with no reason or evidence to suggest that these were not truthful accounts of the incident.

The panel considered the witness statement and oral evidence of [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] submitted that on 6 March 2020 her colleague received an email from [REDACTED] to inform her that there had been an incident involving Pupil A's arm being grabbed by a supply teacher. [REDACTED] confirmed that she had spoken to the pupils involved who had raised concerns relating to the teacher.

[REDACTED] called Ms Chambers on 9 March to inform her of the allegations that had been made and that she would be suspended whilst the matter was investigated. [REDACTED] stated that Ms Chambers appeared to be annoyed and angry and did not respond to the call well.

The panel found allegation 1 proven.

2. On or about 6 March you used inappropriate and / or threatening language towards Pupil A, including by saying:

- a. "I really want to slap you" or words to that effect; and / or
- b. "do you want me to hit you" or words to that effect.

3. On or about 6 March 2020, you used inappropriate and / or threatening language towards Pupil B, including by saying "if I was your mother I would have slapped the back of your head" or words to that effect.

The panel considered the witness statement and oral evidence of [REDACTED]. During [REDACTED] conversation with [REDACTED] on 10 March 2020, they discussed further allegations regarding statements made by Ms Chambers to the pupils.

The panel noted the statements of Pupil A, Pupil B, Pupil C, typed by [REDACTED], submitted as part of the bundle. Each Pupil made reference to inappropriate comments made by Ms Chambers. The panel finds that the comments were threatening and/or inappropriate. As above, the panel was presented with no reason or evidence to suggest that these statements were not a truthful account of the incidents on 6 March 2020.

The panel found allegation 2(a), 2(b) and 3 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 Chambers, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 1, Ms Chambers was in breach of the standard that a teacher must set high expectations which inspire, motivate and challenge pupils establishing a safe, and stimulating environment for pupils, rooted in mutual respect.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Ms Chambers 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, 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 Chambers amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel also considered whether Ms Chamber's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice. No evidence was presented to the panel that this was a relevant offence. Accordingly, the panel found that none of these offences was relevant.

Accordingly, in light of the breaches of the Teachers' Standards, the panel was satisfied that Ms Chambers 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 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 Ms Chambers actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in particular due to the use of excessive force on primary school age children.

Having found the facts of allegations 1, 2(a), 2(b) and 3 proved, the panel further found that Ms Chambers 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.

The panel were aware that prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice. Having done so, the panel found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely:

- the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public;
- the maintenance of public confidence in the profession;
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct within the teaching profession; and
- that prohibition strikes the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest, if they are in conflict.

In the light of the panel's findings against Ms Chambers, which involved inappropriate physical contact and threatening language towards Pupil A and Pupil B, 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 Ms Chambers was 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 Ms Chambers was outside of what could reasonably be tolerated.

The panel noted there was no evidence presented to suggest that there was a strong public interest consideration in retaining the teacher in the profession and/or that the teacher had made a valuable contribution to the profession, or would do so in the future.

In view of the clear public interest considerations that were present, the panel considered carefully whether it would be proportionate to impose a prohibition order, taking into account the effect that this would have on Ms Chambers.

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 Chambers. The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours of a teacher are 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 education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- failure in their duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk or failing to promote the safety and welfare of the children (as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE);
- violation of the rights 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.

Ms Chambers failed to engage with the TRA proceedings from the outset and provided no evidence for the panel to consider at the hearing.

There was no evidence that Ms Chambers actions were not deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Ms Chambers was acting under extreme duress, although the panel noted there was a suggestion from the evidence Ms Chambers may have been experiencing personal difficulties at the relevant time. The panel considered that these purported difficulties did not justify the use of inappropriate physical contact and inappropriate, threatening language towards Pupil A and Pupil B.

No evidence was submitted to attest to her previous history as a teacher, nor did she submit any evidence by way of mitigation. The panel considered Ms Chamber's CV and the responses to the employment screening checks performed by the Agency. The panel noted Ms Chambers has 30 years' experience as a teacher and no evidence was presented which indicated she had any previous findings of misconduct against her.

No evidence was submitted to demonstrate exceptionally high standards in both personal and professional conduct or that Ms Chambers has contributed significantly to the education sector.

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 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 Ms Chambers. The panel considered that the behaviour demonstrated by Ms Chambers was serious involving three allegations against two pupils in a primary school setting.

Further, the lack of engagement in the TRA proceedings by Ms Chambers including her failure to demonstrate any insight or remorse for her actions was a significant factor in forming the opinion that prohibition was warranted in the circumstances. The panel noted Ms Chambers has refused to provide any account of her actions on 6 March 2020, and refused to engage with the Agency's enquiries, LADO investigation, and the TRA proceedings. 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 it would be appropriate for it to decide to recommend an opportunity for review of the prohibition 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 Ms Chambers 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. The panel noted that one of the considerations was the use of violence; however, the panel found that Ms Chamber's conduct did not fall into this category. Rather the panel found she had used unreasonable force against Pupil A.

The panel considered a review period would provide Ms Chambers with the opportunity to reflect and gain insight on her behaviour should she wish to re-enter the profession. This would provide Ms Chambers with sufficient time to reflect on her actions and to be able to demonstrate that she understood the safeguarding concerns, which led to her prohibition. It would also allow her to recognise her responsibility as a teaching professional to engage with her regulator, the TRA.

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 provision for a two-year review period. The panel is satisfied that this period is necessary to protect the public interest and that the impact on the teacher is proportionate.

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 Noreen Chambers should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of two years.

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

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

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Ms Chambers, involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE).

The panel finds that the conduct of Ms Chambers fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of inappropriate physical contact and also the use of inappropriate and/or threatening language.

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 Chambers, 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/safeguard pupils.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, "the lack of engagement in the TRA proceedings by Ms Chambers including her failure to demonstrate any insight or remorse for her actions was a significant factor in forming the opinion that prohibition was warranted in the circumstances."

In my judgement, the failure to demonstrate any insight or remorse 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, "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."

I am particularly mindful of the finding of inappropriate physical contact in this case, in particular due to the use of excessive force on primary school age children.

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 Chambers herself. A prohibition order would prevent her from teaching and deprive the public of her contribution to the profession for the period that it is in force. I note however the panel state “No evidence was submitted to demonstrate exceptionally high standards in both personal and professional conduct or that Ms Chambers has contributed significantly to the education sector.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the panels comments that there was no evidence that Ms Chambers actions were not deliberate or to suggest she was acting under extreme duress, the panel observe “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 Chambers. The panel considered that the behaviour demonstrated by Ms Chambers was serious involving three allegations against two pupils in a primary school setting.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Ms Chambers 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 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 a two year review period.

I have considered the panel’s comments “The panel noted that one of the considerations was the use of violence; however, the panel found that Ms Chamber’s conduct did not fall into this category. Rather the panel found she had used unreasonable force against Pupil A.”

The panel has also said that a “review period would provide Ms Chambers with the opportunity to reflect and gain insight on her behaviour should she wish to re-enter the profession. This would provide Ms Chambers with sufficient time to reflect on her actions and to be able to demonstrate that she understood the safeguarding concerns, which led to her prohibition.”

I consider therefore that a two 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 Ms Noreen Chambers 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, two years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If Ms Chambers does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, she remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Ms Chambers has a right of appeal to the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this order.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John Knowles". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Decision maker: John Knowles

Date: 14/06/2022

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