



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mrs Angela Bryer: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

29 September 2022

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
There were no preliminary applications.	4
Documents	4
Decision and reasons	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	11
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	14

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

Teacher:	Mrs Angela Bryer
Teacher ref number:	00/50909
Teacher date of birth:	3 July 1962
TRA reference:	0018859
Date of determination:	29 September 2022
Former employer:	St Edmunds Roman Catholic Primary School, Manchester

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 29 September 2022 via Microsoft Teams to consider the case of Mrs Angela Bryer.

The panel members were Mrs Shabana Robertson (lay panellist – in the chair), Mr Aidan Jenkins (teacher panellist) and Mrs Rosemary Joyce (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Sam Bumby of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP.

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Mrs Bryer that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mrs Bryer provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer Louise Ravenscroft, Mrs Bryer or Mrs Bryer’s representative, Denise Robinson.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 15 July 2022 (as amended in the notice of meeting dated 27 September 2022).

It was alleged that Mrs Bryer was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that, whilst a teacher at St Edmunds Roman Catholic Primary School:

1. On 16 May 2019, she slapped the cheek of Pupil A;
2. On 16 May 2019, she reported that physical contact with Pupil A's cheek had been an accident:
 - a. to Pupil A's Class Teacher
 - b. to Pupil A's parents;
 - c. in the School's CPOMS system.
3. By her conduct in paragraph 2, she:
 - a. was dishonest
 - b. failed to act with integrity;
4. By her conduct in the foregoing paragraphs, she failed to maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour.

Mrs Bryer in a statement of agreed facts dated 29 March 2022 admitted allegations 1 to 4. Mrs Bryer further admitted that the facts of the allegations amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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: Chronology, anonymised pupil list and list of key people – pages 3 to 5

Section 2: Notice of referral, response and notice of meeting – pages 6 to 20

Section 3: Statement of Agreed Facts and Presenting Officer Representations – pages 21 to 27

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 28 to 94

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 95 to 97

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

1. An updated notice of meeting dated 27 September 2022 which contained allegation 2(c) and corrected an error in the date of the meeting;
2. An email confirmation from Mrs Bryer dated 28 September 2022 that she had accepted allegation 2(c) and was content for the hearing to proceed as planned; and
3. An email confirmation from Denise Robinson (Mrs Bryer's representative) that she confirmed her agreement for the hearing to proceed as planned.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle in advance of the meeting and the additional documents admitted by the panel.

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mrs Bryer on 29 March 2022.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

The panel carefully considered the case and reached a decision.

In advance of the meeting, the TRA agreed to a request from Mrs Bryer 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.

Mrs Bryer had been employed at St Edmunds Roman Catholic Primary School since June 2001 and at the time of the allegations was working as a Reception teacher. On 16 May 2019, Pupil A was taken to Mrs Bryer by a teaching assistant because Pupil A was misbehaving in class. Mrs Bryer slapped Pupil A across the left side of his face. Later that day, Mrs Bryer inaccurately reported that the physical contact with Pupil A's cheek was an accident to Pupil A's class teacher, to Pupil A's parent and in the School's CPOMS system. Mrs Bryer resigned from the School on 9 September 2019.

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:

You are guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that, whilst a teacher at St Edmunds Roman Catholic Primary School:

1. On 16 May 2019, you slapped the cheek of Pupil A;

The allegation was admitted and was supported by evidence presented to the panel within the bundle. In addition to the Statement of Agreed Facts referred to above, the panel also considered the disciplinary report by the School. There were statements and evidence collated during the course of the School's investigation that were before the panel. In its determinations the panel did not take into account any of the investigation findings. The panel also considered the police disclosure which was in the bundle.

The panel considered on the balance of probabilities that allegation 1 had been found proved, noting in particular:

- the admission by Mrs Bryer in the Statement of Agreed Facts;
- the written statement from Mrs Bryer in which she admitted that she had slapped the cheek of Pupil A;
- the written statement from the teaching assistant who was also present corroborating the event;
- the letter which Mrs Bryer wrote to Pupil A and their parent apologising for the fact that she had slapped the cheek of Pupil A; and
- that Mrs Bryer had accepted a police caution for common assault arising out of the incident.

2. On 16 May 2019, you reported that physical contact with Pupil A's cheek had been an accident

a. to Pupil A's Class Teacher

The allegation was admitted and was supported by evidence presented to the panel within the bundle.

The panel considered on the balance of probabilities that allegation 2(a) had been found proved, noting in particular:

- the admission by Mrs Bryer in the Statement of Agreed Facts;
- the written statement from the class teacher which records that Mrs Bryer told her that the physical contact had happened accidentally; and
- the summary of the key evidence in the police report which also states that this occurred.

b. to Pupil A's parents;

The allegation was admitted and was supported by evidence presented to the panel within the bundle.

The panel considered on the balance of probabilities that allegation 2(b) had been found proved, noting in particular:

- the admission by Mrs Bryer in the Statement of Agreed Facts;
- the written statement from the class teacher which records that Mrs Bryer attended a meeting with Pupil A's parent and informed Pupil A's parent that the physical contact was an accident;
- the summary of the key evidence in the police report which states that Mrs Bryer told Pupil A's parent that she had accidentally hit Pupil A; and
- the letter which Mrs Bryer wrote to both Pupil A and to Pupil A's parent apologising for not telling the truth.

c. in the School's CPOMS system

The allegation was admitted and was supported by evidence presented to the panel within the bundle.

The panel considered on the balance of probabilities that allegation 2(c) had been found proved, noting in particular the admission by Mrs Bryer in the Statement of Agreed Facts and Mrs Bryer's entry on the CPOMS system from 16 May 2019, included in the bundle, which stated that the incident was accidental.

3. By your conduct in paragraph 2, you:

a. were dishonest

The allegation was admitted and was supported by evidence presented to the panel within the bundle.

On the basis of the evidence in the bundle, the panel reached the conclusion that Mrs Bryer understood that the incident was not accidental, however subsequently lied to both Pupil A's class teacher and Pupil A's parent about that fact and recorded a false entry into the School's CPOMS system at the end of the school day.

In addition to Mrs Bryer's admission, the panel considered:

- the teaching assistant's statement, which stated that when the incident had occurred, Mrs Bryer was upset about what had happened but that the teaching assistant had said "*don't worry nothing happened I didn't see anything*". Mrs Bryer subsequently adopted the position that the incident had been an accident even though her initial reaction was that it was not;
- Mrs Bryer's statement in which she records a conversation with the teaching assistant on the day after the incident. Mrs Bryer states that she told the teaching assistant that Pupil A "*is right*" about the events that had happened, namely that Mrs Bryer slapped Pupil A; and
- Mrs Bryer's letter to Pupil A and Pupil A's parent in which she acknowledged that she was not brave enough to tell the truth.

The panel then considered whether Mrs Bryer's actions were dishonest by the standards of ordinary honest people. The panel concluded that these actions were dishonest by that standard because she deliberately lied about the incident which had taken place. The panel considered that this dishonesty was compounded by the fact that Mrs Bryer had a number of opportunities to correct the record but failed to take any opportunity to do so.

The truth of the incident only came to light on 23 June 2019 when the teaching assistant provided a new statement which stated that Mrs Bryer slapped Pupil A. Until that point, the teaching assistant had corroborated Mrs Bryer's version of events. This revised statement followed Pupil A's parent raising further concerns about the incident on 22 June 2019.

The panel therefore considered on the balance of probabilities that allegation 3(a) had been found proved.

b. failed to act with integrity;

The allegation was admitted and was supported by evidence presented to the panel within the bundle.

The panel considered on the basis of the evidence in the bundle that Mrs Bryer's conduct had failed to meet the standards of the teaching profession and therefore lacked integrity. In particular, the panel took into account the premeditated nature of the entry into the CPOMS system which took place several hours after the incident had occurred. The CPOMS system is used not just by the teacher and the School but also by outside agencies and therefore knowingly recording an incorrect entry falls well below the standards of the profession.

The panel also took into account the effect which the incident may have had on Pupil A. Following the incident, Pupil A subsequently told other children in their class that Mrs Bryer had slapped him. However, he was not believed because Mrs Bryer had knowingly

conveying a false version of events to her colleagues which led them to disbelieve the account of Pupil A. Given his age, Pupil A was not at a sufficient stage in his development to challenge Mrs Bryer's account of event of his own volition. The panel considered that this was a further demonstration of Mrs Bryer's lack of integrity.

If the truth of the incident had not come to light (which was as a result of the actions of Pupil A's parent and the teaching assistant, not Mrs Bryer), it is likely that Pupil A may not have been believed about any future incidents. Mrs Bryer's actions may also have damaged the faith which not only Pupil A but Pupil A's parent had in the school system. As an experienced teacher, Mrs Bryer should have been aware of all of these potential consequences but instead chose not to tell the truth which was a serious lapse of professional judgment.

The panel therefore considered on the balance of probabilities that allegation 3(b) had been found proved.

4. By your conduct in the foregoing paragraphs, you failed to maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour.

The allegation was admitted and was supported by evidence presented to the panel within the bundle.

The panel considered on the basis of the evidence in the bundle that Mrs Bryer failed to maintain high standards of ethics. The panel recognised that all teachers can make mistakes, however teachers are expected to be role models for children and that includes an expectation of basic honesty. The panel considered that Mrs Bryer's actions in attempting to cover up the truth of the incident were particularly unethical for the reasons set out above.

The panel also considered on the basis of the evidence in the bundle that Mrs Bryer failed to maintain high standards of positive behaviour. As explained in further detail above, the evidence demonstrated that she:

- physically assaulted Pupil A;
- subsequently lied about it to both Pupil A's class teacher and Pupil A's parent;
- entered a false entry onto the CPOMS system;
- caused Pupil A's parent to doubt Pupil A's account of events; and
- caused other teachers at the School not to believe Pupil A's account of events.

The panel therefore considered on the balance of probabilities that allegation 4 had been found proved.

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 Mrs Bryer, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mrs Bryer 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 Mrs Bryer fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel also considered whether Mrs Bryer’s conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice. The panel found that the offences of violence and serious dishonesty were relevant.

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

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mrs Bryer was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

Disrepute

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 panel also considered whether Mrs Bryer's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice. The panel found that the offences of violence and serious dishonesty were relevant.

The panel considered that Mrs Bryer's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher, having particular regard to the impact on Pupil A's parent and their ongoing trust in both the School and the wider teaching profession. The panel therefore found that Mrs Bryer's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Having found the facts of particulars 1 to 4 proved, the panel further found that Mrs Bryer'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 public interest

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 safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct within the teaching profession.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mrs Bryer, which involved:

- assaulting Pupil A;

- lying about this incident to Pupil A's class teacher and Pupil A's parent; and
- knowingly entering a false entry onto the CPOMS system,

there was a strong public interest consideration in demonstrating that the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils was treated with the highest priority.

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

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

Proportionality

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 Mrs Bryer.

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 Bryer.

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;
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of The Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- failure to act on evidence that indicated a child's welfare may have been at 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;
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions or purposeful destruction of evidence, especially where those

behaviours have been repeated or had there have been serious consequences;

- collusion or concealment including:
 - any activity that involves knowingly substantiating another person's statements where they are known to be false;
 - failure to challenge inappropriate actions, defending inappropriate actions or concealing inappropriate actions;
 - encouraging others to break rules;
 - lying to prevent identification of wrongdoing.

Mitigation

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 considered Mrs Bryer's mitigation statement in the bundle [redacted].

Taking the above into consideration, the panel did not consider that the mitigation evidence was sufficient to outweigh the public interest considerations, particularly in circumstances where Mrs Bryer later fabricated an account of the incident which she told to Pupil A's parent and Pupil A's class teacher and inputted that false account into the CPOMS system in a premeditated manner. The panel also noted that there was a week between the incident and the teaching assistant providing an updated account in which Mrs Bryer could have admitted the truth of the incident.

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 was sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mrs Bryer 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 Bryer. The fact that Mrs Bryer had repeatedly lied about the incident 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 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 weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate. These behaviours include serious dishonesty and violence. The panel found that Mrs Bryer was responsible for violence against Pupil A and also engaged in serious and repeated dishonesty about the incident. However, the panel considered that these behaviours, whilst serious, was an isolated incident which occurred over a short period of time.

The panel noted that Mrs Bryer had been teaching for 18 years and that she stated in her written statement that she had an “*exemplary*” teaching record although there was no evidence to substantiate this in the bundle.

The panel also noted that whilst Mrs Bryer had expressed regret for her actions, this was only after the true details of the incident had been revealed by others. The panel were also concerned by the comment in Mrs Bryer’s statement that she did not consider Pupil A to have suffered “*significant harm*”. The panel considered that this suggested that Mrs Bryer did not appreciate the full significance of her actions and the long term potential impact on Pupil A.

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 3 years.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

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

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

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mrs Bryer is in breach of the following standards:

Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by

- treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
- having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions

Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.

Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel finds that the conduct of Mrs Bryer fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of dishonesty. "The panel considered that this dishonesty was compounded by the fact that Mrs Bryer had a number of opportunities to correct the record but failed to take any opportunity to do so."

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 Bryer, 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. The panel has observed, "The panel found that Mrs Bryer was responsible for violence against Pupil A and also engaged in serious and repeated dishonesty about the incident." 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 also noted that whilst Mrs Bryer had expressed

regret for her actions, this was only after the true details of the incident had been revealed by others.” The panel also observed, “The panel were also concerned by the comment in Mrs Bryer’s statement that she did not consider Pupil A to have suffered “*significant harm*”. The panel considered that this suggested that Mrs Bryer did not appreciate the full significance of her actions and the long term potential impact on Pupil A.” In my judgement, the lack of 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, “the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mrs Bryer were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of dishonesty 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 Bryer herself, the panel comment “The panel noted that Mrs Bryer had been teaching for 18 years and that she stated in her written statement that she had an “exemplary” teaching record, although there was no evidence to substantiate this in the bundle.” A prohibition order would prevent Mrs Bryer from teaching and would clearly deprive the public of her contribution to the profession for the period that it is in force.

I have placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that Mrs Bryer was dishonest, “The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mrs Bryer. The fact that Mrs Bryer had repeatedly lied about the incident was a significant factor in forming that opinion.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mrs Bryer 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 three year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments in relation to the finding of dishonesty "the panel considered that these behaviours, whilst serious, was an isolated incident which occurred over a short period of time." The panel also said that a three year review period, "would be proportionate".

I have considered whether the recommended review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that a three year review period is sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the dishonesty found and the lack of either insight.

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

This means that Mrs Angela Bryer 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 September 2025, three 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 Bryer remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mrs Bryer has a right of appeal to the King's Bench Division of the High Court within 28 days from the date she is given notice of this order.



Decision maker: John Knowles

Date: 5 October 2022

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