



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Ms Louise Pearson 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	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	11
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	14

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

Teacher:	Ms Louise Pearson
Teacher ref number:	0610548
Teacher date of birth:	14 February 1976
TRA reference:	19105
Date of determination:	19 September 2023
Former employer:	Noel-Baker Academy, Derby

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ('the panel') of the Teaching Regulation Agency ('the TRA') convened on 18 to 19 September 2023 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Ms Louise Pearson.

The panel members were Miss Louisa Munton (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Kristen Hughes (lay panellist) and Mr Richard Young (lay panellist).

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

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr David Collins of Capsticks LLP solicitors.

Ms Pearson 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 allegation set out in the notice of proceedings dated 4 July 2023.

1. It was alleged that Ms Pearson was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that while employed at Noel-Baker Academy as a teacher she:
 - a) In or around June 2019, caused or allowed OCR coursework to be submitted that was based, wholly or in part, on Pupil E's coursework for:
 - i. Pupil A ("Coursework A")
 - ii. Pupil B ("Coursework B")
 - b) Her conduct at 1, above, was dishonest in that she knew:
 - i. Pupil A had not, in whole or part produced, Coursework A;
 - ii. Pupil B had not, in whole or part produced Coursework B

Ms Pearson provided no response to the allegations.

Preliminary applications

Application to proceed in the absence of the teacher

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

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

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

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

The panel noted that Ms Pearson had not sought an adjournment to the hearing and the panel did not consider that an adjournment would procure her attendance at a hearing. There was no medical evidence before the panel that Ms Pearson 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 witness of any delay.

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

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

- Section 1: Chronology, anonymised pupil list and list of key people – pages 3 to 6
- Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 7 to 18
- Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 19 to 28
- Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 29 to 282

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the hearing.

Witnesses

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

- Witness A– [REDACTED] ('the School')

Decision and reasons

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

Ms Pearson commenced employment as a teacher of social sciences at the School on 1 January 2007.

In June 2019, Ms Pearson's class took the R020 Understanding Development Needs of a Child and R019 Understanding Equipment and Nutritional Needs exams.

On 5 June 2019, OCR received a report from their assessor with information of similar and identical work within a cohort who were undertaking unit R020 in the Child Development qualification.

On 14 June 2019, the School were notified of the suspected malpractice in assessments and a report of their investigation was requested by OCR. On 17 June 2019 the School instigated a full investigation into the suspected malpractice and interviewed Ms Pearson regarding the allegations.

The School interviewed 4 students identified by the exam board and 3 students from the wider cohort on 18 June 2019. On 19 June 2019 Ms Pearson was suspended pending further disciplinary investigation. A disciplinary hearing with Ms Pearson took place on 12 July 2019.

On 26 July 2019 OCR concluded that a malpractice offence had been committed and on 10 February 2020 the matter was referred to the TRA.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

Ms Pearson did not attend the hearing and did not provide a witness statement or any other evidence for the panel to consider when determining the allegations.

The panel found the following particulars of the allegation(s) against you proved, for these reasons:

1. It is alleged that you are guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that while employed at Noel-Baker Academy as a teacher you:

a) In or around June 2019, caused or allowed OCR coursework to be submitted that was based, wholly or in part, on Pupil E's coursework for:

- i. Pupil A ("Coursework A")**
- ii. Pupil B ("Coursework B")**

b) Your conduct at 1, above, was dishonest in that you knew:

- i. Pupil A had not, in whole or part produced, Coursework A;**
- ii. Pupil B had not, in whole or part produced coursework B**

In reaching its decision, the panel considered the written and oral evidence of Witness A [REDACTED] and the documentation within the bundle (including statements made by Pupil A and B and associated interview notes).

The panel considered the hearsay evidence contained in the bundle from Pupil A and B to be relevant to the allegations. The panel closely scrutinised the evidence to determine

its reliability and compatibility with factors presented in other evidence. The panel decided the hearsay evidence should be admitted and determined the weight which it should be given in accordance with section 4 of the Civil Evidence Act 1995 as follows:

- the statements and related interview notes were made contemporaneously;
- there was no evidence of either pupil having a motive to conceal or misrepresent matters, and in Pupil B's case the panel noted their evidence was detrimental to themselves (an admission they had not completed the relevant coursework);
- the evidence does not include multiple hearsay; and
- the hearsay evidence is consistent with other contemporaneous documentary evidence included in the bundle.

During the School's investigation process Pupil A and Pupil B were questioned and were presented with the coursework submitted to the exam board in their names. Both pupils independently denied ever having seen the work during interviews on the 18 June 2019. Both pupils also denied having seen the work in their written statements and interviews. Pupil B stated in their interview that they had not finished that section of the coursework, and Pupil A stated during their interview that they had done their coursework on their nieces, not a child called [REDACTED] (as was the case in the submitted coursework).

On 18 June 2019, Pupil A and Pupil B located the coursework they had written and printed it off in the presence of Witness A. It was not the coursework submitted to the exam board.

The panel noted the witness statement from Witness A. In her witness statement dated 26 February 2021, she stated she had an interview with Ms Pearson on the 18 June 2019 following her interviews with the pupils. She stated that she asked Ms Pearson whether she recognised the coursework as Pupil B's work, and stated that Ms Pearson reviewed the piece of work for around 5 minutes. Witness A stated that Ms Pearson did the same when presented with Pupil A's work.

Witness A submitted that Ms Pearson confirmed that the work belonged to Pupil B, but she appeared unsure as she looked uncomfortable and was struggling to get her words out. Witness A stated that in this meeting it was established that Ms Pearson had marked the submitted coursework as her handwriting was on the papers, but Ms Pearson did not know which student produced this work. Witness A submitted that after mentioning to Ms Pearson that it was odd Pupil B had received marks for her assessment despite not completing it, Ms Pearson was unable to offer an explanation.

The panel further noted that Witness A confirmed in her witness statement that the coursework submitted for Pupil A and Pupil B, was identical to the R020 coursework of

Pupil E, except for a change in the dates. Pupil E was a former student at the School who left in 2018.

The panel considered the School's investigation report and interview notes of meetings with Ms Pearson. The panel noted that Ms Pearson is recorded as confirming that she marked and made annotations on the coursework submitted for Pupil A and B and that she submitted the coursework. During a meeting with Witness A on 21 June 2019, Ms Pearson stated that the marks submitted for Pupil A and Pupil B were for the work provided as evidence to the exam board, not for the work the students had identified as their own. Ms Pearson confirmed that no one else had access to her user area and she did not offer any explanation as to why she had printed Pupil E's coursework.

The panel was referred to a document titled "Logs from Papercut" which recorded Ms Pearson's printing history. On two occasions, 21 and 23 May 2019, Ms Pearson is recorded as printing off copies of a document titled "My Child [REDACTED]". The panel noted the printing of this document pre-dated the submission of Pupil A and B's coursework.

Upon considering the documentation submitted on behalf of the TRA, the panel considered it was clear from seeing the coursework Pupil B had written and the evidence they gave during the School's investigation, that they had not finished that section of the coursework. The panel also considered it clear from considering the coursework Pupil A had written and the evidence they gave during the School's investigation, that they had not written about a child called [REDACTED]. It was clear Pupil E had written about a child called [REDACTED].

On consideration of all the evidence, the panel found that Ms Pearson had caused or allowed OCR coursework to be submitted that was based on Pupil E's coursework for Pupil A and Pupil B.

The panel carefully considered the available evidence and concluded it was inconceivable that Ms Pearson could have been unaware that she was printing off Pupil E's coursework on two occasions and presenting it as the work of Pupil A and B to the exam board. The panel noted Ms Pearson had not put forward an alternative explanation for her actions. Therefore, the panel concluded that Ms Pearson's conduct in respect of allegations 1 (a) (i) and (ii) was dishonest.

The panel found allegations 1(a)(i) and (ii) and 1 (b)(i) and (ii) proven.

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

Having found all the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether this conduct 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 Pearson involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that, by reference Part 2, Ms Pearson was in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach;
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Ms Pearson amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the teaching profession.

The panel considered that it is a basic expectation and essential requirement that teachers should not cause or allow coursework to be submitted to an exam board that was wholly or in part based on another pupil's coursework. Further, the panel considered it a basic and essential requirement that teachers act honestly, especially with regards to pupil assessment where teachers are placed in a significant position of trust.

Ms Pearson had worked at the School for over 12 years and she would have been aware that her actions had been wholly unprofessional and wrong. The panel agreed that Ms Pearson's actions in June 2019 were extremely serious.

The panel also considered the standards set out in Part 1 of the Teacher's Standards, which reflected their knowledge and understanding of the standards expected of the teaching profession, and noted Ms Pearson's behaviour was contrary to those standards in the following respects:

- promote good progress and outcomes by pupils
- be accountable for pupils' attainment, progress and outcomes;
- make accurate and productive use of assessment

- know and understand how to assess the relevant subject and curriculum areas, including statutory assessment requirements.

The panel also considered whether Ms Pearson's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice and concluded that they did not.

Accordingly, due to the seriousness of the breaches of the Teachers' Standards, the panel was satisfied that Ms Pearson was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel considered that Ms Pearson's actions amounted to dishonesty of a serious nature. Ms Pearson caused or allowed coursework to be submitted that was based on Pupil E's coursework, for Pupil A and Pupil B. The panel considered that the potential consequences of Ms Pearson's conduct were very serious for the School and for Pupils A and B. The panel noted that while the exam board chose in this case to grade the pupils on the remaining modules of their qualification, this was not fair to those pupils who completed the coursework and may have negatively affected their overall grade.

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 considered it clear that the public would not expect or tolerate a teacher dishonestly causing or allowing coursework to be submitted to an exam board that was based wholly or in part on another Pupil's coursework.

The panel considered it would be likely that public trust in the teaching profession would be weakened if members of the public were aware of the proven facts.

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 panel considered that if pupils were aware of Ms Pearson's actions, it would set a bad example to pupils and suggest that it is acceptable to cheat and to be dishonest.

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 of the profession as a whole.

The panel therefore found that Ms Pearson's actions constituted unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Having found the facts of allegations 1(a) and (b) proved, the panel further found that Ms Pearson'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 was aware that prohibition orders should not be given 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:

- the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and 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 Ms Pearson, which involved exam misconduct and dishonesty, the panel was of the view that there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of protecting the wellbeing of pupils, as her actions risked (and may in some cases have caused) negative examination outcomes for her cohort of pupils and unnecessary anxiety about their final examination grading.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Pearson 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 Pearson was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated. The panel considered the ordinary intelligent and well-informed citizen would find Ms Pearson's conduct to be completely at odds with the interests of pupils.

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 Pearson. 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 Pearson. 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 safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity (including where these behaviours have been repeated);
- deliberate action in serious contravention of requirements for the conduct of an examination or assessment leading to an externally awarded qualification or national assessment (or deliberate collusion in or deliberate concealment of such action) particularly where the action had, or realistically had the potential to have, a significant impact on the outcome of the examination assessment.

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

Ms Pearson chose not to attend the hearing and did not submit any evidence for the panel to consider.

There was no evidence that Ms Pearson's actions were not deliberate.

The panel noted that Ms Pearson stated during the School's investigation that she "rushed" the submission of Pupil B's coursework. However, the panel noted there was no evidence to demonstrate Ms Pearson was under any undue pressure at the relevant time or to suggest that she was acting under extreme duress. The panel found Ms Pearson's actions to be deliberate, as she printed off Pupil E's coursework on two separate occasions within days of each other, amending the date only and marking both documents with different annotations before submitting them on behalf of Pupil A and B.

No mitigation evidence was provided. The panel was unable to assess the extent of Ms Pearson's remorse or insight into her actions. The panel noted and was disappointed by Ms Pearson's decision not to substantively engage with the regulatory proceedings.

There was no evidence that Ms Pearson demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both personal and professional conduct, nor that she had contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel first considered whether it would be proportionate to conclude this case with no recommendation of prohibition, considering whether the publication of the findings made by the panel would be sufficient.

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings would be sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Ms Pearson 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 Pearson. The findings of exam misconduct and dishonesty were significant factors in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate for it to decide to recommend a review period of the order. The panel was mindful that the Advice states that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances, in any given case, that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 2 years.

The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. The panel found that none of these behaviours were 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 Ms Pearson was responsible for causing or allowing OCR coursework to be submitted that was based wholly or in part on Pupil E's coursework for Pupil A and Pupil B, this conduct was dishonest in that Ms Pearson knew Pupil A had not in whole or part produced coursework A and Pupil B had not in whole or part produced coursework B.

In the panel's view, Ms Pearson's actions indicated a deep lack of appreciation as to the importance of the established requirements for the conduct of examinations and assessments. The panel noted, despite the passage of time, Ms Pearson had not sought

to share any information during the School's investigation or in these proceedings to demonstrate any insight into her behaviour or the impact it had on Pupil A and B, her cohort of pupils or her profession. The panel further noted she had not offered any explanation or reassurance that there would not be a repetition of her behaviour. In the panel's view, Ms Pearson would present an ongoing risk to the reputation of the profession and wellbeing of pupils.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a review period of three years.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

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

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

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

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

- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach;
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

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

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding of which involved exam misconduct and dishonesty.

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 Pearson, 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 Ms Pearson, which involved exam misconduct and dishonesty, the panel was of the view that there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of protecting the wellbeing of pupils, as her actions risked (and may in some cases have caused) negative examination outcomes for her cohort of pupils and unnecessary anxiety about their final examination grading." 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, "No mitigation evidence was provided. The panel was unable to assess the extent of Ms Pearson's remorse or insight into her actions. The panel noted and was disappointed by Ms Pearson's decision not to substantively engage with the regulatory proceedings." 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 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 Pearson was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated. The panel considered the ordinary intelligent and well-informed citizen would find Ms Pearson's conduct to be completely at odds with the interests of pupils." I am particularly mindful of the finding of exam misconduct and dishonesty in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

I have had to consider that the public has a high expectation of professional standards of all teachers and that the public might regard a failure to impose a prohibition order as a failure to uphold those high standards. In weighing these considerations, I have had to consider the matter from the point of view of an "ordinary intelligent and well-informed citizen."

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of unacceptable professional conduct, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Ms Pearson herself and the panel comment “There was no evidence that Ms Pearson demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both personal and professional conduct, nor that she had contributed significantly to the education sector.”

A prohibition order would prevent Ms Pearson 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 comment, “The panel considered that Ms Pearson’s actions amounted to dishonesty of a serious nature. Ms Pearson caused or allowed coursework to be submitted that was based on Pupil E’s coursework, for Pupil A and Pupil B. The panel considered that the potential consequences of Ms Pearson’s conduct were very serious for the School and for Pupils A and B. The panel noted that while the exam board chose in this case to grade the pupils on the remaining modules of their qualification, this was not fair to those pupils who completed the coursework and may have negatively affected their overall grade.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding “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 panel considered that if pupils were aware of Ms Pearson’s actions, it would set a bad example to pupils and suggest that it is acceptable to cheat and to be dishonest.”

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

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended a 3 year review period.

I have considered the panel’s comments “In the panel's view, Ms Pearson’s actions indicated a deep lack of appreciation as to the importance of the established

requirements for the conduct of examinations and assessments. The panel noted, despite the passage of time, Ms Pearson had not sought to share any information during the School's investigation or in these proceedings to demonstrate any insight into her behaviour or the impact it had on Pupil A and B, her cohort of pupils or her profession. The panel further noted she had not offered any explanation or reassurance that there would not be a repetition of her behaviour. In the panel's view, Ms Pearson would present an ongoing risk to the reputation of the profession and wellbeing of pupils."

In this case, factors mean that allowing a two-year review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the lack of insight and the risk of repetition.

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

This means that Ms Louise Pearson 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 26 September 2026, 3 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 Pearson remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Ms Louise Pearson 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 flourish at the end.

Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey

Date: 21 September 2023

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