



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Miss Georgie Worboys: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

September 2023

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	6
Summary of evidence	7
Documents	7
Witnesses	7
Decision and reasons	8
Findings of fact	9
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	24
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	27

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

Teacher: Miss Georgie Worboys

Teacher ref number: 0641208

Teacher date of birth: 02 August 1979

TRA reference: 19414

Date of determination: 21 September 2023

Former employer: Prince William School, Oundle

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ('the panel') of the Teaching Regulation Agency ('the TRA') convened on 18 to 21 September 2023 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Miss Georgie Worboys.

The panel members were Mr Paul Millett (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Maxine Cole (lay panellist) and Mrs Anne Davis (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mrs Samantha Cass of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer engaged by Kingsley Napley Solicitors LLP on behalf of the TRA was Mr Mark Millin.

Miss Worboys 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 7 July 2023.

It was alleged that Miss Worboys was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst employed by Prince William School:

1. Between 27 February 2020 and June 2020, she engaged in inappropriate contact with Pupil A, in that:
 - a) She contacted Pupil A through Facebook messenger, when she knew or ought to have known this was not appropriate;
 - b) She asked Pupil A for her mobile phone number and/or contacted Pupil A on her mobile phone;
 - c) She sent an image of yourself to Pupil A without a top or bra on;
 - d) She requested Pupil A send her nudes and/or photos of Pupil A doing things of a sexual nature;
 - e) She exchanged a large volume of Facebook messages with Pupil A;
 - f) She sent Pupil A one or more inappropriate messages, including:
 - i. 'you always contact when I'm naked';
 - ii. 'I thought about running my hand up the inside of your thigh very discreetly';
 - iii. 'shame no pic evidence before' when Pupil A indicated to her that she found her bra;
 - iv. 'yum' when Pupil A indicated to her that she was in her bra;
 - v. 'being between your legs actually' when Pupil A asked her what she was thinking about;
 - vi. One or more messages of an explicit sexual nature;
2. On or around 10 April 2020, she attempted to cover up her contact with Pupil A and/or discourage Pupil A from disclosing her contact with her, in that:
 - a) She messaged Pupil A 'so then we stop' when Pupil A commented that 'if anyone saw these messages, you're f**cked';

- b) She messaged Pupil A 'so delete messages and numbers then done until next year'
- 3. Between March 2020 and April 2020, she contacted Pupil B via Facebook Messenger when she knew or ought to have known that this was not appropriate;
- 4. She failed to maintain professional boundaries in that she discussed matters of a personal nature which had happened in her past with one or more pupils when this was not appropriate.
- 5. She made inappropriate physical contact with pupils in that:
 - a) in or around December 2019, she placed her hand on Pupil A's back and/or would lean on Pupil A;
 - b) in or around 2020, she hugged Pupil B in the school toilets;
 - c) on an unknown date whilst in class she placed her hand on Pupil B's shoulder and/or placed her arm around Pupil B's shoulder.
- 6. In or around 2020, she made inappropriate comments to Pupil A in that:
 - a) she asked Pupil A about her sexuality;
 - b) she asked Pupil A about her "type" and/or who she was dating;
 - c) she asked Pupil A whether she was a virgin;
 - d) when Pupil A was telling classmates about graffiti in the toilets which mentioned wearing a condom she stated "well, you won't be needing any of those" or words to that effect;
 - e) when hanging something on the wall she said to Pupil A in front of other pupils "I don't know why I'm asking you as you're not straight" or words to that effect;
 - f) she commented on Pupil A's clothes and/or appearance;
 - g) she asked Pupil A meet you in the Art cupboard so that they could kiss;
 - h) she asked Pupil A whether she had sex with Pupil B and if it "was good" or words to that effect;
 - i) after asking whether Pupil A was having sex with Pupil B stated she would "do a better job" or words to that effect.
- 7. Her conduct, as set out in allegations 1a and/or 1b and/or 1c and/or 1d and/or 1e and/or 1f and/or 3 and/or 4 and/or 5a and/or 5b and/or 5c and/or 6a and/or 6b and/or

6c and/or 6d and/or 6e and/or 6f and/or 6g and/or 6h and/or 6i was sexually motivated

8. Her conduct, as set out in Allegation 2a and/or 2b was dishonest.
9. At the time of her alleged conduct in respect of Pupil A outlined above, you were aware that Pupil A was vulnerable.
10. At the time of her alleged conduct in respect of Pupil B outlined above, you were aware that Pupil B was vulnerable.

Miss Worboys stated that she did not admit the allegations, as set out in an email from Miss Worboys to the TRA dated 7 July 2023.

Preliminary applications

Application to proceed in the absence of the teacher

Miss Worboys was not present at the hearing nor was she represented. The presenting officer made an application on day one of the hearing to proceed in the absence of Miss Worboys.

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 Miss Worboys in accordance with the Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession May 2020 (the 'Procedures').

The panel concluded that Miss Worboys' absence was voluntary and that she was aware that the matter would proceed in her absence and acknowledged in writing that the panel should "*conduct*" the hearing.

The panel noted that Miss Worboys had not sought an adjournment to the hearing and the panel did not consider that an adjournment would procure her attendance at a hearing. Miss Worboys said that she would not be attending for [REDACTED]. However, there was no medical evidence before the panel that Miss Worboys 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 Miss Worboys was neither present nor represented.

Application to admit additional documents

On day two of the hearing, the panel considered an application from the presenting officer on behalf of the TRA for the admission of additional documents namely a 142-page Late Papers Bundle including screenshots received by Pupil A and a supplemental witness statement of Pupil A.

The documents subject to the application had been served on Miss Worboys but not in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 5.36 of the 2020 Procedures. Therefore, the panel was required to decide whether the documents should be admitted under paragraph 5.34 of the 2020 Procedures.

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

The panel considered the additional documents were relevant and that it was in the interests of fairness to admit them. Accordingly, the documents were added to the bundle.

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 20;
- Section 3: TRA witness statements – pages 21 to 51;
- Section 4: TRA documents – pages 52 to 686; and
- Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 687 to 689.

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

- Late Papers Bundle – pages 683 to 824; and
- Service Bundle – 23 pages.

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

Witnesses

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

- Pupil A
- Pupil B
- [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.

Miss Worboys commenced employment at Prince William School ('the School') as an art teacher on 1 September 2015. Miss Worboys completed level 2 safeguarding training in September 2018.

In November 2018, Pupil A made a disclosure to the School regarding serious harm to [REDACTED] caused by a family member. Miss Worboys subsequently became part of the safeguarding team that supported Pupil A in regards to this disclosure.

Miss Worboys attended the safeguarding training annual update in September 2019.

Pupil A allegedly began to notice that Miss Worboys was acting inappropriately towards [REDACTED] in December 2019.

Pupil A turned 18 in January 2020.

Miss Worboys allegedly sent a request to connect with Pupil A on Facebook Messenger on 27 February 2020 and there were various exchanges of messages which followed after that date.

On 14 March 2020 Miss Worboys allegedly asked Pupil A to meet up with her outside of school. The UK then went into lockdown as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic on 20 March 2020. Any alleged communication between Miss Worboys and Pupil A came to an end on 12 April 2020.

On 25 March 2020 Miss Worboys allegedly sent a message to Pupil B on Facebook Messenger.

On 16 June 2020 Miss Worboys met [REDACTED] to discuss concerns that her phone had been hacked.

On 18 June 2020 Pupil A asked to speak with [REDACTED] about some concerns. Pupil A attended the first meeting with [REDACTED] to disclose concerns relating to a member of staff on 19 June 2020.

Pupil A attended the second meeting with [REDACTED] to continue discussing [REDACTED] disclosure of concerns about a staff member on 23 June 2020. The following day Pupil A attended a third meeting.

Mr Kennedy was appointed to investigate the concerns and the LADO was also informed on 26 June 2020.

Pupil A provided screenshots of Facebook Messenger conversations demonstrating over 2000 messages between [REDACTED] and Miss Worboys.

An investigation into Miss Worboys' conduct concluded on 30 June 2020.

The disciplinary hearing took place on 14 July 2020.

The matter was referred to the TRA on 17 July 2020.

The police confirmed on 13 September 2020 that the matter did not reach the criminal threshold.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

The panel considered the particulars of the allegations against you in turn and gave the following reasons for finding each of these proved or not proved:

1. Between 27 February 2020 and June 2020, you engaged in inappropriate contact with Pupil A, in that:

a) You contacted Pupil A through Facebook messenger, when you knew or ought to have known this was not appropriate;

The panel considered pages 321 to 535 of the bundle and the documents within the Late Papers Bundle both of which contained an abundance of messages between Pupil A and Miss Worboys. In particular, the panel noted page 64 of the Late Papers Bundle which displays a notification stating "*Georgie Worboys would like to connect with you on Messenger.*"

The panel noted that Miss Worboys had claimed in her meeting with [REDACTED] on 16 June 2020 that her phone had been hacked. The panel inferred she meant that the messages had been sent by a third party without her knowledge or approval.

Miss Worboys denied this allegation and all other allegations around inappropriate messaging with Pupil A and Pupil B. Therefore, the panel considered whether it was clear that Miss Worboys had sent the messages in question herself and

concluded that there was sufficient evidence to find that she had. This was both in terms of the personal content of the messages and in Mr Kennedy confirming that they were sent from Miss Worboys' number which was recorded on the School system. The panel noted [REDACTED] oral evidence which was that all the evidence [REDACTED] had seen pointed to Miss Worboys having sent the messages herself. The panel agreed with [REDACTED] conclusion.

The panel considered that Miss Worboys had received safeguarding training and was part of Pupil A's safeguarding team responsible for [REDACTED] wellbeing and, as such, knew or ought to have known that this form of contact was not appropriate.

In addition, the panel noted that some of the messages sent by Miss Worboys to Pupil A, in particular messages within which she requested that Pupil A delete the messages, were indicative of the fact that Miss Worboys was aware that this was inappropriate contact with Pupil A. One message on page 308 of the bundle in particular from Miss Worboys to Pupil A said *"so delete messages and numbers and then done until next year."*

The panel also took the view that no teacher should be contacting pupils personally or directly through any form of social media. Any communication with pupils should be made through the School's formal channels.

The panel considered therefore that it followed that this amounted to Miss Worboys engaging in inappropriate contact with Pupil A.

The panel found allegation 1 a) proven.

b) You asked Pupil A for [REDACTED] mobile phone number and/or contacted Pupil A on [REDACTED] mobile phone;

The panel considered page 39 of the bundle and paragraph 80 of Pupil A's witness statement and noted that this was consistent with Pupil A's oral evidence at the hearing. Further, the panel considered the abundance of messages in the bundles between Miss Worboys and Pupil A.

The panel found that, on the balance of probabilities, it was more likely than not that Miss Worboys had asked Pupil A for [REDACTED] mobile phone number and that Miss Worboys sought to contact [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] mobile phone as the messages appeared to have been exchanged between them following Miss Worboys contacting Pupil A in this way.

As above, the panel found that contacting a pupil via [REDACTED] mobile phone number was not appropriate for a teacher.

The panel considered therefore that it followed that this amounted to Miss Worboys engaging in inappropriate contact with Pupil A.

The panel found allegation 1 b) proven.

c) You sent an image of yourself to Pupil A without a top or bra on;

The panel considered page 746 of the Late Papers Bundle within which there is a message exchange between Pupil A and Miss Worboys which includes an unviewable jpeg image sent by Miss Worboys to which Pupil A responds “wow” and Miss Worboys responds “*That’ll need deleting lol.*”

There was an earlier message from Miss Worboys to Pupil A referring to Miss Worboys having taken a “*naked boobs shot*” and Pupil A suggests that this image is shared with [REDACTED] saying “*you can’t say and not show*”. The panel also noted that Miss Worboys had sent a message to Pupil A saying “*Wanna see?????*” with a winky face Emoji.

The panel had not seen the photo but found that, on the balance of probabilities, it was more likely than not that Miss Worboys had sent a picture of herself without a top and bra on.

The panel considered therefore that it followed that this amounted to Miss Worboys engaging in inappropriate contact with Pupil A.

The panel found allegation 1 c) proven.

d) You requested Pupil A send you nudes and/or photos of Pupil A doing things of a sexual nature;

The panel considered page 33 of the bundle, in particular paragraph 45, within which Pupil A references Miss Worboys requesting nudes and/or photos of Pupil A.

The panel considered pages 717, 743 and 757 of the Late Papers Bundle which had explicit reference to a picture having been shown alongside a reference to a “*bra pic*” and to a surrounding discussion between Miss Worboys and Pupil A that was of a sexual nature.

The panel considered the oral evidence of Pupil A and found that, although [REDACTED] was reticent in providing evidence in direct support of this allegation, [REDACTED] was consistent and credible in [REDACTED] recollection of events. Further, the panel noted that there were messages in the bundle which had been sent by Miss Worboys which appeared as an unviewable jpeg image and comments after this image which had been shared and which suggested that the content of the image was of a sexual nature.

The panel found, on the balance of probabilities, and taking the overall circumstances of the exchanges into account, that Miss Worboys had requested that Pupil A send her nudes and/or photos of Pupil A doing things of a sexual nature.

The panel considered therefore that it followed that this amounted to Miss Worboys engaging in inappropriate contact with Pupil A.

The panel found allegation 1 d) proven.

e) You exchanged a large volume of Facebook messages with Pupil A;

The panel noted that there was a large volume of messages within the evidence bundle which had been exchanged between Miss Worboys and Pupil A.

For the reasons given in allegation 1 a) above, the panel considered therefore that it followed that this amounted to Miss Worboys engaging in inappropriate contact with Pupil A.

The panel found allegation 1 e) proven.

f) You sent Pupil A one or more inappropriate messages, including:

i. 'you always contact when I'm naked';

The panel considered the evidence on page 65 of the bundle, which was an image of this message.

The panel found allegation 1 f) i) proven.

ii. 'I thought about running my hand up the inside of your thigh very discreetly';

The panel considered the evidence on page 66 of the bundle, which was an image of this message.

The panel found allegation 1 f) ii) proven.

iii. 'shame no pic evidence before' when Pupil A indicated to you that she found her bra;

The panel considered the evidence on page 66 of the bundle, which was an image of this message.

The panel found allegation 1 f) iii) proven.

iv. 'yum' when Pupil A indicated to you that she was in her bra;

The panel considered the evidence on page 67 of the bundle, which was an image of this message.

The panel found allegation 1 f) iv) proven.

v. 'being between your legs actually' when Pupil A asked you what you were thinking about;

The panel considered the evidence on page 68 of the bundle and on page 755 of the Late Papers Bundle, which was an image of this message.

The panel found allegation 1 f) v) proven.

vi. One or more messages of an explicit sexual nature;

The panel noted that there was a significant number of messages between Miss Worboys and Pupil A and that the content would often be of a sexual nature, in particular pages 758 to 760 of the Late Papers Bundle within which Miss Worboys made explicit reference to sexual acts towards Pupil A.

The panel found allegation 1 f) vi) proven.

The panel considered therefore that it followed that these allegations 1f i) to vi) amounted to Miss Worboys engaging in inappropriate contact with Pupil A.

The panel found allegations 1 a) to 1 f) in their entirety proven.

2. On or around 10 April 2020, you attempted to cover up your contact with Pupil A and/ or discourage Pupil A from disclosing your contact with her, in that:

a) You messaged Pupil A 'so then we stop' when Pupil A commented that 'if anyone saw these messages, you're fcked';**

The panel considered page 71 of the bundle in considering this allegation to which Miss Worboys responded "*so then we stop.*"

The panel considered therefore that it followed that Miss Worboys had attempted to cover up her contact with Pupil A and/or discourage Pupil A from disclosing contact with her.

The panel found allegation 2 a) proven.

b) You messaged Pupil A 'so delete messages and numbers then done until next year'

The panel considered page 71 of the bundle in considering this allegation to which Pupil A responded “*really?*” and Miss Worboys responded “yes.”

The panel considered therefore that it followed that Miss Worboys had attempted to cover up her contact with Pupil A and/or discourage Pupil A from disclosing contact with her.

The panel found allegation 2 b) proven.

The panel found allegations 2 a) and 2 b) proven.

3. Between March 2020 and April 2020, you contacted Pupil B via Facebook Messenger when you knew or ought to have known that this was not appropriate;

The panel considered pages 572 to 599 and the number of messages between Pupil B and Miss Worboys.

As above in relation to allegation 1, the panel considered that it is inappropriate for teachers to have any personal contact with pupils on social media.

The panel found allegation 3 proven.

4. You failed to maintain professional boundaries in that you discussed matters of a personal nature which had happened in your past with one or more pupils when this was not appropriate.

The panel considered page 802 to 806 of the Late Papers Bundle within which Miss Worboys referenced to Pupil A, a number of sexual and very personal matters relating to her. The panel noted in Pupil A’s oral evidence that [REDACTED] had commented on Miss Worboys having shared personal news with the class and asked the class not to share this with Pupil A.

The panel also considered the oral evidence of Pupil B who the panel found to be credible to the extent that Pupil B recalled Miss Worboys discussing matters of a personal nature with [REDACTED] on more than one occasion.

The panel found that this sharing of personal information by a teacher with one or more pupils was not appropriate and that Miss Worboys had failed to maintain professional boundaries in this regard.

The panel found allegation 4 proven.

5. You made inappropriate physical contact with pupils in that:

a) in or around December 2019, you placed your hand on Pupil A's back and/or would lean on Pupil A;

Pupil A gave oral evidence during the hearing which was consistent with [REDACTED] written statement in describing the way that Miss Worboys became "*more touchy*" towards [REDACTED] from year 12 onwards.

Pupil B commented that Miss Worboys "*would always touch our shoulders*" and was "*touchy with us generally,*". Pupil B also stated that this contact was "*especially with Pupil A.*"

Pupil A's evidence was consistent in supporting this allegation and Pupil B's evidence corroborated Pupil A's evidence that Miss Worboys would touch Pupil A in class.

The panel considered that such tactile actions towards Pupil A were inadvisable but could not find on the balance of probabilities that, based on the evidence as at December 2019, it was inappropriate.

For this reason, the panel found allegation 5 a) not proven.

b) in or around 2020, you hugged Pupil B in the school toilets;

Pupil B submitted that around the time when [REDACTED] was in year 13, [REDACTED] was having a [REDACTED] in the School's toilet and Miss Worboys was consoling [REDACTED]; Miss Worboys put her arms around Pupil B and said "*if someone walked in right now they'd think this was really weird*". Pupil B recalled thinking to [REDACTED] "*why would anyone think that, she's my teacher*". Pupil B stated that the hug made [REDACTED] feel weird, but on the other hand [REDACTED] felt that Miss Worboys was trying to comfort [REDACTED] and hug [REDACTED] as a friend "*as that is what other friends would do*". Despite this, Pupil B explained that [REDACTED] was not expecting the hug and it caught [REDACTED] by surprise.

The panel considered that there was likely to have been a hug in the school toilets, as alleged. The panel believed that the hug was intended to console Pupil B. Therefore, the panel did not have the evidence before it to find that this amounted to inappropriate physical contact at the time.

The panel found allegation 5 b) not proven.

c) on an unknown date whilst in class you placed your hand on Pupil B's shoulder and/or placed your arm around Pupil B's shoulder.

Pupil B submitted in [REDACTED] witness statement that Miss Worboys "*would always get quite close*" to pupils in class, for example, she would put her hand on

Pupil B's shoulder or put her arm around [REDACTED] shoulder whilst they were talking. This made Pupil B feel uncomfortable, particularly as [REDACTED] family are not very "touchy." However, Pupil B submitted, at the time [REDACTED] always really liked Miss Worboys and thought of [REDACTED] as a friend.

In Pupil B's oral evidence [REDACTED] stated that Miss Worboys would "*always touch our shoulders*" and that this was "*normal for her*." Pupil B said that, at the time, they trusted Miss Worboys completely but, on reflection [REDACTED] can see that this was not appropriate contact and was not something which other teachers did.

The panel considered that such tactile actions towards Pupil B were inadvisable but cannot say that, on the balance of probabilities, based on the evidence, it was inappropriate.

The panel found allegation 5 c) not proven.

The panel found allegation 5 a), b) and 5 c) not proven.

6. In or around 2020, you made inappropriate comments to Pupil A in that:

a) you asked Pupil A about her sexuality;

When Pupil A returned to School following the Christmas break, [REDACTED] submitted that this is when the inappropriate comments from Miss Worboys became worse. Pupil A recalled that Miss Worboys asked [REDACTED] about [REDACTED] sexuality; Pupil A informed Miss Worboys [REDACTED]. From this point forwards, Pupil A submitted that Miss Worboys made jokes about [REDACTED] sexuality.

In Pupil A's oral evidence [REDACTED] confirmed that this incident was following [REDACTED] "*ranting to [Miss Worboys] about someone that I was talking to, I always used to not say the gender but I happened to say [REDACTED] and then it was a bit awkward because after that she would bring up my sexuality in conversation and discuss hers*". Pupil A stated that [REDACTED] felt that Miss Worboys felt more able to discuss sexuality with [REDACTED] once [REDACTED].

In light of the stream of messages containing explicit discussions about sexual matters, the panel considered that it was more likely than not that Miss Worboys would have asked Pupil A about [REDACTED] sexuality.

The panel accepted Pupil A's evidence that the statement had been made.

The panel considered that this amounted to inappropriate comments having been made to Pupil A.

The panel found allegation 6 a) proven.

b) you asked Pupil A about her “type” and/or who she was dating;

The panel considered page 810 of the Late Papers Bundle within which Miss Worboys commented “*you def have a type*” and Pupil A responded “*what’s my type then? If you’re so certain I have one!!*”

The panel considered page 805 of the Late Papers Bundle within which Miss Worboys sent a message to Pupil A asking Pupil A “*when are you going out with [REDACTED]?*” which the panel considered was, in the context of the content of the messages relating to who Pupil A was dating.

The panel also noted that on page 819 of the Late Papers Bundle Miss Worboys had commented on Pupil A’s relationship with Pupil B and had said “*so Pupil B was enjoying you today*” and “*[REDACTED] looks at you in a very ‘naughty’ way.*”

The panel accepted Pupil A’s oral and documentary evidence that the statements had been made.

The panel considered that this amounted to inappropriate comments having been made to Pupil A.

The panel found allegation 6 b) proven.

c) you asked Pupil A whether she was a virgin;

The panel considered page 805 of the Late Papers Bundle within which Miss Worboys commented “*so not a virgin*”. The panel noted that there was discussion around this comment with regards to Pupil A’s dating and an exchange of intimate sexual information.

The panel accepted Pupil A’s oral and documentary evidence that the statement had been made.

The panel considered that this amounted to inappropriate comments having been made to Pupil A.

The panel found allegation 6 c) proven.

d) when Pupil A was telling classmates about graffiti in the toilets which mentioned wearing a condom you stated “well, you won’t be needing any of those” or words to that effect;

In January 2020, Pupil A went to the toilet in the art department and there was graffiti on the wall that said something about wearing a condom. Pupil A stated

that [REDACTED] remembered telling everyone about the graffiti when [REDACTED] went back into class, and in response, Miss Worboys said “*well, you won’t be needing any of those*”.

The panel considered Pupil A’s oral evidence within which Pupil A was consistent with [REDACTED] written statement concerning a comment having been made by Miss Worboys about [REDACTED] not needing a condom. Pupil A could remember this because [REDACTED] recalled thinking that this was not something which a teacher would usually say and that [REDACTED] was surprised because normally [REDACTED] would have been told off if [REDACTED] had said anything like this in class. Pupil A commented that people in the art room would have been aware that Pupil A was [REDACTED] although [REDACTED] hadn’t told them specifically and [REDACTED] found this comment inappropriate and embarrassing.

The panel accepted Pupil A’s evidence that the statement had been made.

The panel considered that this amounted to inappropriate comments having been made to Pupil A.

The panel found allegation 6 d) proven.

e) when hanging something on the wall you said to Pupil A in front of other pupils “I don’t know why I’m asking you as you’re not straight” or words to that effect;

Pupil A submitted that [REDACTED] was helping Miss Worboys hang something on the wall when Miss Worboys asked whether “*it was straight*” but then proceeded to say “*I don’t know why I’m asking you as you’re not straight*”. This was in front of the class and everyone laughed.

The panel considered Pupil A’s oral evidence within which Pupil A was consistent with [REDACTED] written statement concerning a comment having been made by Miss Worboys about hanging a picture and commenting on Pupil A not being straight. Pupil A commented that [REDACTED] found this comment embarrassing and [REDACTED] did not welcome jokes about [REDACTED] sexuality. Pupil A noted that other teachers would not have made such comments and [REDACTED] considered this to be inappropriate and not just banter.

The panel accepted Pupil A’s evidence that the statement had been made.

The panel considered that this amounted to inappropriate comments having been made to Pupil A.

The panel found allegation 6 e) proven.

f) you commented on Pupil A's clothes and/or appearance;

The panel considered paragraph 17 of Pupil A's witness statement on page 28 of the bundle within which Pupil A said that *"Georgie Worboys often commented on what I was wearing, for example, she made comments about how low my top was, or how short my skirt was. This was in a complimentary form as opposed to referencing my uniform. Some examples include saying that I 'look really good today' or she would quite obviously look at my body which made me feel uncomfortable. Whilst working on large pieces of art work I would often sit on the table as it was more comfortable than sitting on a chair and she would look at my body and comment on 'how nice I looked'".*

The panel considered the messages on page 784 of the Late Papers Bundle within which Miss Worboys had commented *"don't wear one?"* referring to Pupil A's [REDACTED].

The panel accepted Pupil A's oral and documentary evidence that the statements had been made.

The panel considered that this amounted to inappropriate comments having been made to Pupil A.

The panel found allegation 6 f) proven.

g) you asked Pupil A meet you in the Art cupboard so that you could kiss;

The panel considered Pupil A's statement at paragraph 33 on page 31 of the bundle regarding *"Another example of inappropriate messages Georgie Worboys sent me during a lesson is that she would say how she saw me 'bending over earlier', and things of that nature. Everything was sexualised. She also used to ask to meet me in the art cupboard so we could kiss, I always refused. Sometimes I would go into the cupboard to get something and she would follow, come up behind me and be unnecessarily close to me, for example by putting her hands on me".*

The panel also considered the message exchange on page 754 of the Late Papers Bundle within which Pupil A said to Miss Worboys that [REDACTED] *"Might have the courage to initiate if you get too close"* and to which Miss Worboys responded *"I'll be careful of the cupboards lol."*

The panel heard oral evidence from Pupil A during which [REDACTED] described when [REDACTED] met with Miss Worboys and that Miss Worboys had tried to kiss [REDACTED] in Miss Worboys' car.

The panel accepted Pupil A's oral and documentary evidence that the statement had been made.

The panel considered that this amounted to inappropriate comments having been made to Pupil A

The panel found allegation 6 g) proven.

h) you asked Pupil A whether she had sex with Pupil B and if it "was good" or words to that effect;

The panel considered paragraph 42 on page 32 of the bundle within which Pupil A commented "*Pupil B was another pupil in the class and we used to date. Georgie Worboys knew this and used to say that Pupil B was "all over me". She asked me whether Pupil B and I had sex and if it was good, if so, she said that she would "do a better job". I felt that Georgie Worboys was jealous of me and Pupil B. I found it weird that she wanted to know so much about our relationship.*"

The panel accepted Pupil A's evidence.

The panel considered that this amounted to inappropriate comments having been made to Pupil A.

The panel found allegation 6 h) proven.

i) after asking whether Pupil A was having sex with Pupil B stated you would "do a better job" or words to that effect.

The panel considered paragraph 42 on page 32 of the bundle as referred to in allegation 6 h) above and accepted Pupil A's evidence.

The panel considered that this amounted to inappropriate comments having been made to Pupil A.

The panel found allegation 6 i) proven.

The panel found allegations 6 a) to 6 i) proven.

7. Your conduct, as set out in allegations 1a and/or 1b and/or 1c and/or 1d and/or 1e and/or 1f and/or 3 and/or 4 and/or 5a and/or 5b and/or 5c and/or 6a and/or 6b and/or 6c and/or 6d and/or 6e and/or 6f and/or 6g and/or 6h and/or 6i was sexually motivated

The panel's attention was drawn to section 78 *Sexual Offences Act 2003* and to the cases of *Sait v The General Medical Council [2018]*, *Basson v General Medical Council [2018]* and *The General Medical Council v Haris [2020] EWHC 2518*.

The panel considered whether the conduct was sexually motivated. It noted that in *Basson* it was stated that “A sexual motive means that the conduct was done either in pursuit of sexual gratification or in pursuit of a sexual relationship”.

The panel found allegations 1 and 6 referred to Pupil A. The panel was satisfied that the contact and comments made towards Pupil A were sexual and were sexually motivated in that the panel believed that the allegations were evidence of Miss Worboys wishing to have a sexual relationship with Pupil A. The panel also noted that they kissed in Miss Worboys car and this reinforces the panel’s view of Miss Worboys’ sexual intent.

The panel also found allegation 4 proved. However, the allegation referred to matters of a personal nature concerning Miss Worboys and the panel was not satisfied that these discussions amounted to conduct which could have been sexually motivated.

Allegation 3 related to Pupil B and by [REDACTED] own evidence Pupil B did not feel that Miss Worboys’ contact with [REDACTED] both in person and on social media was sexualised. Therefore, the panel felt that, on balance, there was insufficient evidence to show that Miss Worboys’ conduct in allegation 3 towards Pupil B was sexually motivated.

Accordingly, the panel found allegations 1 and 6 to be sexually motivated in their entirety and that allegations 3 and 4 not to be sexually motivated.

Allegation 5 was found to be not proven.

The panel therefore found allegation 7 proven for the reasons set out above.

8. Your conduct, as set out in Allegation 2a and/or 2b was dishonest.

In reaching its decision on this, the panel considered the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd t/a Crockford*.

The panel firstly sought to ascertain the state of Miss Worboys actual knowledge or belief as to the facts.

The panel considered the oral evidence of [REDACTED] who confirmed that Miss Worboys was aware of safeguarding protocols and of the need to report any concerns about a close relationship forming with a pupil. The panel also noted that [REDACTED] felt that Miss Worboys had tried to influence [REDACTED] decision making and the school during the investigation which [REDACTED] found to be manipulative. The panel heard oral evidence from Pupil B in that Miss Worboys was “*manipulative*” or “*super manipulative*” with her actions.

The panel found that Miss Worboys had attempted to cover up her contact with Pupil A and had encouraged Pupil A to conceal this by deleting messages. The panel

considered that Miss Worboys' conduct in doing so had been dishonest according to the standards of ordinary decent people.

The panel found allegation 8 proven.

9. At the time of your alleged conduct in respect of Pupil A outlined above, you were aware that Pupil A was vulnerable.

Miss Worboys was part of a small team of teachers who were there to support Pupil A after Pupil A had disclosed to the School a serious safeguarding matter concerning [REDACTED] as was explained by [REDACTED] in [REDACTED] statement. The safeguarding matter caused Pupil A to be categorised by the School as [REDACTED].

The panel found allegation 9 proven.

10. At the time of your alleged conduct in respect of Pupil B outlined above, you were aware that Pupil B was vulnerable.

The panel had seen no evidence which confirms that Pupil B was categorised as vulnerable by the School. The panel heard evidence of only one of Pupil B's [REDACTED] and the panel was not satisfied that the evidence is enough for them to be able to say that Pupil B was categorised as a vulnerable student. Further, the panel had no evidence that Miss Worboys knew of Pupil B's vulnerability.

The panel found allegation 10 not proven.

The panel therefore found allegations 1 a) to f), 2, 3, 4, 6 a) to i), 7, 8 and 9 proven. The panel found allegations 5 and 10 not 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 Miss Worboys, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Miss Worboys 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 Miss Worboys amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel also considered whether Miss Worboys' 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 sexual activity 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 a number of the allegations took place outside the education setting. However, Miss Worboys was Pupil A's teacher, and the panel believed that Miss Worboys' conduct undoubtedly touched upon her profession as a teacher.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Miss Worboys 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 Miss Worboys' actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Having found the facts of allegations 1a) to f), 2 a) to b), 3, 4, 6 a) to i), 7, 8 and 9 proved, the panel further found that Miss Worboys 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 was 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 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; 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 Miss Worboys, which involved engaging in inappropriate contact with Pupil A, including contacting [REDACTED] via Facebook Messenger and discussing things of a sexual nature, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils, given the serious findings of inappropriate relationships with children.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Miss Worboys 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 Miss Worboys 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 Miss Worboys. 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 Miss Worboys. The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours of a teacher have been proved. In the list of such behaviours, those that were relevant in this case were:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- any abuse of any trust, knowledge or influence gained through their professional position in order to advance a romantic or sexual relationship with a pupil or former pupil;
- sexual misconduct, for example, involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature and/or that use or exploit the trust, knowledge or influence derived from the individual's professional position;
- violating of the rights of pupils;
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions or purposeful destruction of evidence, especially where these behaviours have been repeated or had serious consequences, or involved the coercion of another person to act in a way contrary to their own interests; and
- collusion of concealment including:
 - failure to challenge inappropriate actions, defending inappropriate actions or concealing inappropriate actions;
 - lying to prevent the identification of wrongdoing.

The panel considered what weight to attach to Miss Worboys' behaviours regarding online misconduct; facilitating online abuse; or facilitating inappropriate relationships (including both online only relationships and where online relationships move into contact relationships).

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

There was no evidence that Miss Worboys actions were not deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Miss Worboys was acting under extreme duress, and, in fact, the panel found Miss Worboys actions to be calculated and motivated.

The panel considered that Miss Worboys had failed to meaningfully engage with either the School's investigation or the TRA process. Miss Worboys had in the panel's view tried to divert attention away from herself by saying that the messages were sent by a third party due to her phone accounts having been hacked and therefore implied that it could not have been her that sent the messages. However, the panel found (for the reasons set out above) that there was sufficient evidence and content in the messages to support the contention that Miss Worboys had sent the messages in question herself.

The panel considered the supplementary witness evidence in reaching its conclusions which included a statement that Pupil A had contacted Miss Worboys in March 2023. Whilst there had been contact made from Pupil A's account, the panel considered that Miss Worboys had significantly exaggerated the nature of the contact that had been made through Pupil A's phone and that she had done this to divert attention from the allegations being made against her. The panel accepted Pupil A's evidence on this point which was that a friend had used [REDACTED] phone without [REDACTED] permission in March 2023 in order to make this contact.

No mitigation evidence was provided. Therefore, the panel was unable to assess the extent of Miss Worboys' remorse or insight into her actions.

No evidence was submitted which demonstrates exceptionally high standards in both personal and professional conduct or that Miss Worboys contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel did not find that Miss Worboys had shown any insight or remorse into her actions.

The panel then 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 Miss Worboys of prohibition.

The panel found that if Miss Worboys were permitted to teach in the future there would be a significant risk of recurrence with an associated safeguarding risk to pupils.

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 Miss

Worboys. The serious nature of the sexual misconduct and Miss Worboys' attempt to conceal these actions 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. These behaviours include serious sexual misconduct, such as where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons, particularly where the individual has used her professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons. The panel found that Miss Worboys was responsible for engaging in inappropriate contact with Pupil A, including discussing things of a sexual nature, which the panel had found was sexually motivated.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended without provisions for a review period.

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 - 1a) to f), 2 a) to b), 3, 4, 6 a) to i), 7 , 8 and 9 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. I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Miss Worboys should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Miss Worboys 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 Miss Worboys fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include inappropriate relationships with children, conduct found to be sexually motivated and dishonest.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself, whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Miss Worboys, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children and/or safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, "In the light of the panel's findings against Miss Worboys, which involved engaging in inappropriate contact with Pupil A, including contacting [REDACTED] via Facebook Messenger and discussing things of a sexual nature, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils, given the serious findings of inappropriate relationships with children." 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 did not find that Miss Worboys had shown any

insight or remorse into her actions.” In my judgement, the lack of 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 Miss Worboys was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of sexually motivated conduct involving children 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 Miss Worboys herself and the panel comment “No evidence was submitted which demonstrates exceptionally high standards in both personal and professional conduct or that Miss Worboys contributed significantly to the education sector.”

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments concerning the lack of insight or remorse. The panel has said, “No mitigation evidence was provided. Therefore, the panel was unable to assess the extent of Miss Worboys’ remorse or insight into her actions.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding that “The panel found that if Miss Worboys were permitted to teach in the future there would be a significant risk of recurrence with an associated safeguarding risk to pupils.”

I have also placed weight on the following “The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Miss Worboys. The serious nature of the

sexual misconduct and Miss Worboys' attempt to conceal these actions was a significant factor in forming that opinion."

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Miss Worboys 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 that no provision should be made for a review period.

I have considered the panel's comments "The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. These behaviours include serious sexual misconduct, such as where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons, particularly where the individual has used her professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons. The panel found that Miss Worboys was responsible for engaging in inappropriate contact with Pupil A, including discussing things of a sexual nature, which the panel had found was sexually motivated."

In this case, factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the seriousness of the findings involving inappropriate and sexually motivated relationships with children and the risk of recurrence.

I consider therefore that allowing for no review period is necessary to maintain public confidence and is proportionate and in the public interest.

This means that Miss Georgie Worboys is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. Furthermore, in view of the seriousness of the allegations found proved against her, I have decided that Miss Worboys shall not be entitled to apply for restoration of her eligibility to teach.

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

Miss Worboys 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', with a stylized, cursive-like script.

Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey

Date: 27 September 2023

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