



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Ms Rebekah Goldson: Professional conduct panel outcome**

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

**July 2023**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	7
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	13
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:** Ms Rebekah Goldson  
**Teacher ref number:** 0460637  
**Teacher date of birth:** 11 January 1983  
**TRA reference:** 19890  
**Date of determination:** 5 July 2023  
**Former employer:** Millgate School, Leicester

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel ('the panel') of the Teaching Regulation Agency ('the TRA') convened on 3 to 5 July 2023 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Ms Rebekah Goldson.

The panel members were Mr Peter Ward (lay panellist – in the chair), Ms Rachel Kruger (teacher panellist) and Ms Laura Flynn (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Abigail Reynolds of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Mark Millin of Kingsley Napley solicitors.

Ms Goldson was present and was represented by Mr George Smith of NASUWT.

The hearing took place by way of a virtual hearing in public (save for parts which were heard in private) and was recorded.

## **Allegations**

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 19 April 2023.

It was alleged that Ms Goldson was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst employed as a teacher at Millgate school she:

1. On or around 29 October 2019, attended school under the influence of alcohol;
2. On or around 17 November 2019, was unable to safeguard and/or care for a child in her care;
3. On 17 November 2019, failed to provide a specimen for analysis, when driving or attempting to drive, contrary to section 7(6) of the Road Traffic Act 1988;
4. On 17 November 2019, failed to stop after an accident, contrary to section 170(4) of the Road Traffic Act 1988;
5. On 17 November 2019, resisted and/or obstructed a constable, contrary to section 89(2) of the Police Act 1996;
6. She was found guilty of failing to provide a specimen for analysis, when driving or attempting to drive, thereby in relation to her conduct at allegation 3, was conditionally discharged for 24 months and was disqualified from driving for 18 months;
7. She was found guilty of failing to stop after an accident, thereby in relation to her conduct at allegation 4, was conditionally discharged for 24 months; and
8. She was found guilty of resisting or obstructing a constable, thereby in relation to her conduct at allegation 5, was conditionally discharged for 24 months.

At the professional conduct panel hearing, Ms Goldson denied allegations 1 and 2 but admitted allegations 3 to 8.

## **Preliminary applications**

### Application for part of the hearing to be heard in private

It was suggested at the outset of the hearing by the presenting officer that part of the hearing – [redacted] - should be heard in private.

The panel heard submissions from the teacher's representative who, in the first instance, stated that it was felt there was no requirement for an application for privacy. However, following a discussion with the panel, the presenting officer and Ms Goldson, the teacher's representative confirmed that Ms Goldson would request that the relevant parts of the hearing should be heard in private. The presenting officer did not have any objection. The panel considered the representations from the presenting officer and the teacher's representative before reaching its decision.

The panel considered that the areas covered in the application legitimately related to aspects of Ms Goldson's private life and there was no contrary public interest in those areas being discussed in public. The panel further noted that the areas covered in the application would protect the interests of [redacted]. The hearing was still being held in public and these were discrete and limited areas which would not undermine the public's ability to otherwise understand the case. The panel therefore granted the application.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

- Section 1: Chronology and list of key people – pages 4 to 6
- Section 2: Notice of hearing and response – pages 7 to 14
- Section 3: TRA witness statements – pages 15 to 25
- Section 4: TRA documents – pages 26 to 312

### **Witnesses**

The panel heard oral evidence from the following witnesses called by the TRA:

- Witness A, [redacted]
- Witness B, [redacted]

Ms Goldson was present and gave oral evidence. No further witnesses were called to provide oral evidence at the hearing.

## **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 Goldson commenced employment as a teacher at Keyham Lodge school on 26 August 2014. Ms Goldson transferred to Millgate School ('the School') on 28 August 2019, where she worked as a primary teacher.

In October 2019, Witness A, [redacted], and Person C, [redacted], were approached by Witness B [redacted] and Person D, [redacted]. Witness B and Person D alleged that Ms Goldson smelled of alcohol. Witness A reported that, on the same day, she relayed the concerns to Ms Goldson. Ms Goldson denied drinking alcohol and stated that she'd had a glass of wine the previous night. Witness A reported that she offered Ms Goldson the use of the School's flat to "*sleep it off*", which was declined.

On 17 November 2019, the police received a telephone call reporting that Ms Goldson had driven her car whilst under the influence of alcohol, [redacted]. The police received a further call that evening, stating that Ms Goldson had been involved in a road traffic collision with a stationary car and that she allegedly drove away leaving the scene of the accident. Ms Goldson was arrested and later charged.

The LADO received a request for a strategy discussion on 18 November 2019. On 5 December 2019, the LADO held a multi-agency strategy meeting.

On 12 February 2020, Ms Goldson pleaded guilty to the following offences:

1. Contrary to section 7(6) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988, on 17 November 2019 when suspected of having driven a vehicle and having been required to provide a specimen or specimens of breath for analysis by means of a device of a type approved by the Secretary of State pursuant to section 7 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 in the course of an investigation into whether she had committed an offence under section 3A, 4, 5 or 5A thereof, failed without reasonable excuse to do so;
2. Contrary to section 170(4) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988, on 17 November 2019 at Leicestershire, being the driver of a mechanically propelled vehicle owing to the presence of which on a road, an accident occurred whereby damage was caused to another vehicle, failed to stop; and
3. Contrary to section 89(2) of the Police Act 1996, on 17 November 2019 resisted a constable in the execution of his duty.

Ms Goldson received a conditional discharge for 24 months and was disqualified from holding or obtaining a driving licence for 18 months.

On 11 May 2020, Ms Goldson was informed of an investigation by the School and was invited to attend an investigation meeting. The first meeting took place on 19 May 2020 but was adjourned.

The School held an investigation meeting on 13 October 2020. Ms Goldson was informed of the outcome of the investigation meeting, on 27 October 2020, confirming that the investigation was complete.

The School held a disciplinary hearing on 9 December 2020 to consider allegations made against Ms Goldson. Ms Goldson was informed of the outcome of the disciplinary hearing on 15 December 2020.

Witness A submitted a referral to the TRA on 26 February 2021.

## Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

### **1. On or around 29 October 2019, you attended school under the influence of alcohol;**

The panel noted the witness statement and oral evidence of Witness A, who submitted that, in October 2019, herself and Person C, [redacted], were approached by two members of staff who wanted to report concerns about Ms Goldson, specifically that she had smelt strongly of alcohol that day.

Witness A reported that, on the same day, she spoke to Ms Goldson to relay the concerns. Witness A stated that Ms Goldson said, *"I am not drunk"* and explained that she had been out with a friend the night before and had a glass of wine. Witness A reported that she felt this was unlikely given that Ms Goldson still smelt of alcohol, and that she offered Ms Goldson the school flat to *"sleep it off"*, but that Ms Goldson declined.

Witness A submitted in her oral evidence that Ms Goldson presented as being under the influence of alcohol as she smelt of alcohol and was defensive when questioned. Witness A confirmed that there were no other indicators that she was under the influence of alcohol.

Witness A further confirmed that she observed a lesson of Ms Goldson in the first period of the day, after her discussion with Ms Goldson. During that observation, there were no concerns, with Witness A stating that the observation was *"not less than good"*. Witness A confirmed that, in her opinion, Ms Goldson was fit to teach. Witness A confirmed that there were no further incidents during that day.

The panel noted the witness statement and oral evidence of Witness B. Witness B submitted that, on or around 29 October 2019, she was in the breakfast room. She

reported that she was sitting next to Ms Goldson and smelt alcohol on her breath. Witness B reported that, almost immediately after, she approached Person C, [redacted], to report her concerns. In her oral evidence, Witness B stated that her conversation with Ms Goldson was very short and that whilst the smell of alcohol was very strong, she could not say that Ms Goldson was, for example, slurring or unsteady on her feet.

In her oral evidence, Ms Goldson submitted that she had consumed a glass of wine the night before the events to which this allegation related but did not agree that she would have smelt of alcohol. Ms Goldson denied saying, "*I am not drunk*". Ms Goldson submitted that, in any event, she was allowed to continue to teach throughout the day. It was suggested to Ms Goldson that she was only allowed to continue to teach as Witness A gave her "*the benefit of the doubt*", however Ms Goldson did not accept this; it was Ms Goldson's view that it would be unprofessional to give a teacher who may have been drinking "*the benefit of the doubt*", and that any teacher who may be under the influence of the alcohol should immediately be sent home and would not be allowed to continue to teach. Ms Goldson submitted that being allowed to continue to teach that day indicated that she was not under the influence of alcohol.

The panel noted that Ms Goldson was allowed to continue to teach throughout the rest of the day, and that, during a lesson observation, she was observed as "*not less than good*".

The panel found that, in any event, if Ms Goldson was under the influence of alcohol, it would be more likely than not that Ms Goldson would not have been allowed to continue to teach, whereas in fact, she was allowed to continue to do so and no further action was taken. The panel further noted that the evidence indicated that, other than an alleged smell of alcohol, which the panel considered would not necessarily amount to being "*under the influence*" of alcohol, there was no further evidence that Ms Goldson was under the influence of alcohol on the date in question.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel found allegation 1 not proven.

## **2. On or around 17 November 2019 you were unable to safeguard and/or care for a child in your care;**

The panel was provided with a copy of an 'occurrence enquiry log report' from Leicestershire Police which stated that, on 17 November 2019, the police attended Ms Goldson's address following an anonymous report that Ms Goldson was intoxicated and had crashed her vehicle. The document recorded that, when the police attended Ms Goldson's address, they noted damage to her car. The document stated that Ms Goldson seemed intoxicated and that she refused to provide a specimen of breath upon request. Ms Goldson was arrested, [redacted].



Witness A submitted that, on 17 November 2019, she received a phone call from Ms Goldson who stated that she had crashed her car [redacted] and that she had been arrested. Witness A told her that she should see a doctor as soon as possible, and that she was there to support her if she needed. Witness A submitted that Ms Goldson became agitated on the phone and asked if she was going to lose her job. Witness A told her that she could not answer that question. Witness A recalled that there were other people at the time who checked in with Ms Goldson, including Witness B.

Witness A recalled that, on 18 November 2019, she received a report from the LADO that Ms Goldson had been arrested following a report to the police.

Witness A recalled that she attended the LADO multi agency strategy meeting on 5 December 2019. It was at this meeting that Witness A became aware of the allegation that Ms Goldson [redacted].

In her oral evidence, Ms Goldson submitted that, on 17 November 2019, [redacted]. Ms Goldson admitted that, with the benefit of hindsight, she should have stopped and reported the accident. [Redacted].

[Redacted].

In respect of allegation 2, the panel noted that during the hearing and as part of their evidence neither Witness A nor Witness B were extensively questioned on the issue of whether Ms Goldson's actions amounted to a failure to safeguard and/or care for a child in her care, which was not unexpected given that they did not witness the events. The panel noted that there was no written statement from any of those involved in the events on 17 November 2019, including Ms Goldson herself, any of the police officers who attended Ms Goldson's home or [redacted].

During cross-examination, Ms Goldson was not questioned directly on whether she considered her actions amounted to a failure to safeguard and/or care for a child in her care. Furthermore, the TRA did not call any individuals who witnessed the events on 17 November 2019 to give evidence (whether orally or by way of written statement). There was therefore limited evidence before the panel in respect of allegation 2. The panel found that there was insufficient evidence to prove that, on the balance of probabilities, on 17 November 2019, Ms Goldson was unable to safeguard and/or care for a child in her care.

The panel therefore found allegation 2 not proven.

- 3. On 17 November 2019, you failed to provide a specimen for analysis, when driving or attempting to drive, contrary to section 7(6) of the Road Traffic Act 1988.**

- 4. On 17 November 2019, you failed to stop after an accident, contrary to section 170(4) of the Road Traffic Act 1988.**
- 5. On 17 November 2019, you resisted and/or obstructed a constable, contrary to section 89(2) of the Police Act 1996.**

The panel was provided with a copy of the memorandum of entry in the register of the Leicester and Rutland Magistrates Court which detailed that Ms Goldson had pleaded guilty to the following offences:

1. Contrary to section 7(6) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988, on 17 November 2019 when suspected of having driven a vehicle and having been required to provide a specimen or specimens of breath for analysis by means of a device of a type approved by the Secretary of State pursuant to section 7 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 in the course of an investigation into whether she had committed an offence under section 3A, 4, 5 or 5A thereof, failed without reasonable excuse to do so;
2. Contrary to section 170(4) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988, on 17 November 2019 at Leicestershire, being the driver of a mechanically propelled vehicle owing to the presence of which on a road, an accident occurred whereby damage was caused to another vehicle, failed to stop; and
3. Contrary to section 89(2) of the Police Act 1996, on 17 November 2019 resisted a constable in the execution of his duty.

The panel further noted that, during the course of the hearing, Ms Goldson admitted the facts of allegations 3, 4 and 5.

Having been provided with the memorandum of entry in the register of the Court, the panel therefore found allegations 3, 4 and 5 proven.

- 6. You were found guilty of failing to provide a specimen for analysis, when driving or attempting to drive, thereby in relation to your conduct at allegation 3, were conditionally discharged for 24 months and were disqualified from driving for 18 months.**
- 7. You were found guilty of failing to stop after an accident, thereby in relation to your conduct at allegation 4, were conditionally discharged for 24 months.**
- 8. You were found guilty of resisting or obstructing a constable, thereby in relation to your conduct at allegation 5, were conditionally discharged for 24 months.**

The panel was provided with a copy of the memorandum of entry in the register of the Leicester and Rutland Magistrates Court which detailed that Ms Goldson had plead guilty to the following offences:

1. Contrary to section 7(6) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988, on 17 November 2019 when suspected of having driven a vehicle and having been required to provide a specimen or specimens of breath for analysis by means of a device of a type approved by the Secretary of State pursuant to section 7 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 in the course of an investigation into whether she had committed an offence under section 3A, 4, 5 or 5A thereof, failed without reasonable excuse to do so;
2. Contrary to section 170(4) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988, on 17 November 2019 at Leicestershire, being the driver of a mechanically propelled vehicle owing to the presence of which on a road, an accident occurred whereby damage was caused to another vehicle, failed to stop; and
3. Contrary to section 89(2) of the Police Act 1996, on 17 November 2019 resisted a constable in the execution of his duty.

This document confirmed that, for each offence, Ms Goldson received a conditional discharge of 24 months. In respect of the offence of failing to provide a specimen or specimens or breath for analysis, Ms Goldson was disqualified from holding or obtaining a driving licence for 18 months.

The panel further noted that, during the course of the hearing, Ms Goldson admitted the facts of allegations 6, 7 and 8.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that the facts of allegations 6, 7 and 8 were proven.

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

Having found a number of 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 Goldson, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Ms Goldson 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; and
- 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 Goldson amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

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

The panel found that the offence of serious driving offences was relevant. The Advice indicates that where behaviours associated with such an offence exist, a panel is more likely to conclude that an individual's conduct would amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel noted that allegations 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 took place outside the education setting in that they took place outside of school and outside of working hours. However, the panel believed that Ms Goldson's actions touched upon her profession as a teacher as she was convicted of serious driving offences.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Ms Goldson 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 Goldson's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Having found the facts of allegations 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 proved, the panel further found that Ms Goldson's conduct amounted to both unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

## Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

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

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be made, the panel had to consider whether it would be an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it would be in the public interest to do so.

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 and, having done so, found the following 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; and that prohibition strikes the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest, if they are in conflict.

In light of the panel's findings against Ms Goldson which included being found guilty of serious driving offences, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils and the public.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Goldson 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 Goldson was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

In view of the clear public interest considerations that were present, the panel considered carefully whether or not it would be proportionate to impose a prohibition order, taking into account the effect that this would have on Ms Goldson. The panel was mindful of the need to strike the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest.

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 Goldson. 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;
- 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.

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.

No evidence was submitted to attest to Ms Goldson's history or ability as a teacher, nor was any evidence submitted to indicate that Ms Goldson demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both personal and professional conduct or that she contributed significantly to the education sector. However, the panel did note that, prior to this incident, there had been no concerns raised in respect of Ms Goldson's ability as a teacher. Prior to the incidents to which the allegations relate, Ms Goldson appeared to have a long-standing record without any disciplinary issues having been raised.

The panel further noted that Ms Goldson appeared to have pleaded guilty to the offences at the earliest opportunity and that, at the outset of the hearing, Ms Goldson admitted the allegations which were ultimately found proven by the panel.

Ms Goldson submitted that, at the material time, she was [redacted]. Whilst the panel understood that this was a very difficult period in Ms Goldson's life and took into account the evidence she gave in this regard, the panel did not accept that this amounted to evidence that indicated that her actions were not deliberate, nor that she was acting under extreme duress.

In her oral evidence, Ms Goldson accepted that her conduct would be likely to bring the public's perception of teachers into disrepute. Ms Goldson told the panel of her love for her job as a teacher, and that her priority had always been the safety and wellbeing of her students.

Ms Goldson further stated that she was aware that what she had done was wrong, that she had never previously been found guilty of any similar offences and had not been in trouble since the incident in question. However, the panel was concerned that Ms Goldson had not adduced evidence in respect of the change in her personal circumstances or demonstrated how such behaviours would be avoided in the future.

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 Ms Goldson 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 Goldson. The nature of the offences 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 these behaviours were not relevant.

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 found that these behaviours were not relevant.

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 after 2 years. The panel was of the view that this would be a sufficient period of time for Ms Goldson to take positive steps to address the circumstances that led to her offending behaviour and demonstrate how such behaviours would be avoided in future.

## **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 allegations 1 and 2. I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Ms Rebekah Goldson should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of 2 years.

In particular, the panel has found that Ms Goldson 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; and
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel finds that the conduct of Ms Goldson 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 Ms Goldson, 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, "In light of the panel's findings against Ms Goldson which included being found guilty of serious driving offences, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils and the public." 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, "Ms Goldson further stated that she was aware that what she had done was wrong, that she had never previously been found guilty of any similar offences and had not been in trouble since the incident in question. However, the panel was concerned that Ms Goldson had not adduced evidence in respect of the change in her personal circumstances or demonstrated how such behaviours would be avoided in the future". In my judgement, the lack of full 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 panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Goldson was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of serious driving offences involving alcohol 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 Ms Goldson herself and the panel comment “No evidence was submitted to attest to Ms Goldson’s history or ability as a teacher, nor was any evidence submitted to indicate that Ms Goldson demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both personal and professional conduct or that she contributed significantly to the education sector. However, the panel did note that, prior to this incident, there had been no concerns raised in respect of Ms Goldson’s ability as a teacher. Prior to the incidents to which the allegations relate, Ms Goldson appeared to have a long-standing record without any disciplinary issues having been raised.”

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the following comments “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 Goldson was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.”

“The panel noted that allegations 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 took place outside the education setting in that they took place outside of school and outside of working hours. However, the panel believed that Ms Goldson’s actions touched upon her profession as a teacher as she was convicted of serious driving offences.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that “Ms Goldson submitted that, at the material time, she was [redacted]. Whilst the panel understood that

this was a very difficult period in Ms Goldson's life and took into account the evidence she gave in this regard, the panel did not accept that this amounted to evidence that indicated that her actions were not deliberate, nor that she was acting under extreme duress."

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

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

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

I have considered the panel's comments "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 after 2 years. The panel was of the view that this would be a sufficient period of time for Ms Goldson to take positive steps to address the circumstances that led to her offending behaviour and demonstrate how such behaviours would be avoided in future."

I have decided that a 2 year review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession.

**This means that Ms Rebekah Goldson 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 13 July 2025, 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, Ms Goldson remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Ms Goldson 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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'SABuxcey'.

**Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey**

**Date: 10 July 2023**

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