



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Ms Harriet Coleman: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome**

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

**February 2024**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	10
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	13

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

<b>Teacher:</b>	Ms Harriet Katie Coleman
<b>Teacher ref number:</b>	1240520
<b>Teacher date of birth:</b>	12 September 1993
<b>TRA reference:</b>	21010
<b>Date of determination:</b>	27 February 2024
<b>Former employer:</b>	Wood Bank School, Halifax (the “School”)

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened by virtual means on 27 February 2024, to consider the case of Ms Harriet Coleman.

The panel members were Mr Chris Major (teacher panellist – in the chair), Ms Amanda Godfrey (teacher panellist) and Ms Emma Garrett (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Anna Marjoram of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP solicitors.

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Ms Harriet Coleman that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Ms Harriet Coleman provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct, conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and/or conviction of a relevant offence. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer Ms Louise Murphy-King of Kingsley Napley LLP, Ms Harriet Coleman or a representative on her behalf.

The meeting took place in private.

## **Allegations**

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 12 December 2023.

It was alleged that Ms Harriet Coleman was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, namely:

1. On or around 25 May 2022, she was convicted of assault of Child A by beating him, contrary to Section 39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988;

It was also alleged that Ms Harriet Coleman was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that whilst employed at the School:

2. she provided inaccurate accounts of the incident with Child A which occurred on 26 January 2022, including denying that she pushed Child A and/or kicked Child A and/or pulled Child A's hair, in:
  - a. her statement dated 26 January 2022;
  - b. her handwritten statement;
  - c. the meeting on 27 January 2022, until she was informed that there was CCTV evidence.
3. Her conduct as outlined in allegations 2a and/or 2b and/or 2c above:
  - a. was dishonest; and/or
  - b. displayed a lack of integrity.

Ms Coleman admitted the facts of the allegations. She also admitted that her conviction was a relevant offence, and her conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

## **Preliminary applications**

There were no preliminary applications.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section 1: Chronology and list of key people – pages 4 to 6

Section 2: Notice referral, response and notice of meeting – pages 7 to 19

Section 3: statement of agreed facts – pages 20 to 24

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 25 to 276

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 277 to 294

The panel were also separately provided with CCTV footage, the Notice of Meeting dated 12 December 2023, and a letter confirming a change in panellist dated 22 February 2024.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle and those sent separately above in advance of the meeting.

## **Statement of agreed facts**

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Ms Harriet Coleman on 11 September 2023.

## **Decision and reasons**

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

The panel carefully considered the case and reached a decision.

In advance of the meeting, the TRA agreed to a request from Ms Harriet Coleman for the allegations to be considered without a hearing. The panel had the ability to direct that the case be considered at a hearing if required in the interests of justice or in the public interest. The panel did not determine that such a direction was necessary or appropriate in this case.

Ms Coleman was employed as a Teacher at the School from 1 September 2021.

On 26 January 2022, an incident occurred between Ms Coleman and Child A. The School held an initial meeting with Ms Coleman and a statement was taken. The LADO and MAST were informed, and an investigation was commenced.

On 27 January 2022, Ms Coleman provided the School with a handwritten note, and later that day the School held another meeting with Ms Coleman. She was subsequently suspended.

In March 2022, the police conducted interviews with Ms Coleman and her colleagues.

On 23 May 2022, a disciplinary meeting was held. On 25 May 2022, Ms Coleman pleaded guilty to the offence of Assault with Battery at Bradford Magistrates Court.

On 14 July 2022, a disciplinary hearing was held by the School. The outcome of this hearing was communicated to Ms Coleman by letter dated 22 July 2022. Shortly after this, on 28 July 2022, the case was referred to the TRA.

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

The panel found the following particulars of the allegations against you proved, for these reasons:

**1. On or around 25 May 2022, you were convicted of assault of Child A by beating him, contrary to Section 39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988;**

This allegation was admitted by Ms Coleman in the Statement of Agreed Facts and supported by evidence presented to the panel, notably the memorandum of conviction. The panel accepted the memorandum of conviction as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction.

This allegation was therefore found proved.

**2. You provided inaccurate accounts of the incident with Child A which occurred on 26 January 2022, including denying that you pushed Child A and/or kicked Child A and/or pulled Child A's hair, in:**

**a. your statement dated 26 January 2022;**

Ms Coleman admitted this allegation in the Statement of Agreed Facts. The panel reviewed Ms Coleman's statement of 26 January 2022, taken as part of the School's initial investigation into the incident, which provided clear denials of kicking Child A and pulling Child A's hair. The panel were able to compare Ms Coleman's account of the incident to the CCTV footage and her other statements, and the panel noted a number of inconsistencies.

This allegation was therefore found proved.

**b. your handwritten statement;**

Ms Coleman admitted this allegation in the Statement of Agreed Facts. The panel reviewed Ms Coleman's handwritten statement, which had been provided by Ms Coleman to the School on 27 January 2022. This statement did not contain denials of kicking Child A or pulling Child A's hair; but there was no admission to this effect in the statement either. Despite the length of the statement, Ms Coleman's description of the incident itself is very brief. It was unnecessarily specific about irrelevant factors but lacked detail about the specific event. She presented a positive and caring demeanour in her statement obfuscating the true nature of the incident.

The panel were able to compare Ms Coleman's handwritten account of the incident to the CCTV footage and her other statements, and the panel noted a number of significant inconsistencies and omissions that relate to the core allegation.

This allegation was therefore found proved.

**c. the meeting on 27 January 2022, until you were informed that there was CCTV evidence.**

Ms Coleman admitted this allegation in the Statement of Agreed Facts. The panel reviewed notes of the meeting between the School and Ms Coleman on 27 January 2022. Ms Coleman clearly stated at the beginning of that meeting, "I promise I didn't kick him", and she denied pulling his hair. Once the existence of CCTV evidence was revealed, Ms Coleman states, "I may have kicked him...I remember kicking him". It was clear to the panel that Ms Coleman responded to being made aware of the existence of CCTV by changing her account.

The panel therefore found the allegation proved.

**3. Your conduct as outlined in allegations 2a and/or 2b and/or 2c above:**

**a. was dishonest; and/or**

On review of the available evidence, the panel was of the view that Ms Coleman's statements did change over time. Once it was presented to Ms Coleman that CCTV evidence was available, her account of the incident changed and she then began to acknowledge what had in fact occurred. Accordingly, the panel concluded that Ms Coleman must have known that her original accounts of the incident were not wholly correct and had significant omissions. Ms Coleman has since acknowledged that her actions were dishonest. The panel, in applying the standards of the ordinary honest person, therefore concluded that Ms Coleman's conduct was dishonest.

**b. displayed a lack of integrity.**

The panel acknowledged that Ms Coleman had provided a number of evolving statements through the course of the investigation into the incident, and that those statements changed significantly once she became aware that CCTV had captured the incident. The panel was of the view that teachers would be expected to honestly cooperate with an investigation into an incident, and that Ms Coleman knowingly provided statements that were incorrect and omitted key details. Ms Coleman has since acknowledged that her actions lacked integrity. The panel concluded that her conduct displayed a lack of integrity.

## **Findings as to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and/or conviction of a relevant offence**

Having found all the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of allegation 1 amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Ms Coleman in relation to allegation 1 involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that by reference to Part 2, Ms Coleman 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;

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

The panel noted that the Ms Coleman's conviction was relevant in the context of teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting, because it involved violence and specifically violence against a (REDACTED) child.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence would have been likely to have had an impact on the safety and/or security of pupils. The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Ms Coleman's behaviour in committing the offence would be likely to affect public confidence in the teaching profession, if Ms Coleman was allowed to continue teaching.

The panel noted that Ms Coleman's behaviour did not lead to a sentence of imprisonment, which was indicative that the offence was at the less serious end of the possible spectrum. However, this was an offence involving violence, with that violence being directed towards a (REDACTED) child in her care.

The Advice indicates that a conviction for any offence that relates to or involves such offences is likely to be considered "a relevant offence". The panel was of the view that it was particularly serious given that it involved a student in her care, and one who required some level of physical management.



The panel took into account of statements in the bundle which referred to Ms Coleman being under emotional pressure (REDACTED) immediately prior to the incident. However, the panel also noted that Ms Coleman had reflected and deemed herself fit to work on the day of the incident.

Although the panel found no compelling evidence to cast doubt on her abilities as a teacher, the panel also found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to her fitness to be a teacher. The panel considered that a finding that this conviction was for a relevant offence was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

The panel therefore found that Ms Coleman's conviction at allegation 1 was a relevant offence.

The panel then turned to consider whether the proved allegations 2 and 3 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 Coleman, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Ms Coleman 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;

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 Coleman, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the overall safeguarding principles of Keeping Children Safe In Education ("KCSIE").

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Ms Coleman fell significantly short of the standard of behaviour expected of a teacher.

The panel also considered whether Ms Coleman's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice. The panel found that the offence of serious dishonesty was relevant due to the panel's findings in respect of Ms Coleman's dishonesty. The Advice indicates that where behaviours associated with such an offence exist, a panel is likely to conclude that an individual's conduct would amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Ms Coleman was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel took into account the way the teaching profession is viewed by others, the responsibilities and duties of teachers in relation to the safeguarding and welfare of pupils 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 panel again considered whether Ms Coleman's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice. The panel found that the offence of serious dishonesty was relevant due to the panel's findings in respect of Ms Coleman's dishonesty.

The Advice states that where behaviours associated with such an offence exist, a panel is likely to conclude that an individual's conduct would amount to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel considered that Ms Coleman's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher. The panel therefore found that Ms Coleman's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Having found the facts of particulars 2 and 3 proved, the panel further found Ms Coleman's conduct amounted to both unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

## **Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State**

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct, conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and a conviction of a relevant offence, 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 is appropriate, the panel had to consider the public interest, the seriousness of the behaviour and any mitigation offered by Ms Coleman and whether a prohibition order is necessary and proportionate. 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; the protection of other members of the public; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In the light of the panel's findings against Ms Coleman, which related to a conviction for an act of violence against a child, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Coleman were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession – not just in relation to her conviction but also her dishonesty in providing her accounts of the underlying incident. 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 Coleman was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the behaviour, noting that the Advice states that the expectation of both the public and pupils, is that members of the teaching profession maintain an exemplary level of integrity and ethical standards at all times.

The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a panel will likely consider a teacher's behaviour to be incompatible with being a teacher if there is evidence of one or more of the factors that begin on page 15. In the list of such factors, those that were relevant in this case were:

serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;

the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are "relevant matters" for the purposes of the Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosure;

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 vulnerable pupils)

failure in their duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk or failing to promote the safety and welfare of the children (as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE)

dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions.

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, taking account of the public interest and the seriousness of the behaviour and the likely harm to the public interest were the teacher be allowed to continue to teach, the panel went on to consider whether there were mitigating circumstances.

The panel found that Ms Coleman's actions in obfuscating and omitting key details of the incident in her accounts were deliberate and dishonest.

There was some evidence within the bundle that suggested Ms Coleman was acting under difficult (REDACTED), however this did not excuse her violent actions towards a child. Whilst the panel acknowledged her (REDACTED) may have affected her reactions, the panel did not consider that Ms Coleman was acting under extreme duress.

There was insufficient evidence for the panel to reach a conclusion about Ms Coleman's record as a teacher, or whether this incident was out of character. The panel did have regard to the statements provided by Ms Coleman's (REDACTED) and Ms Coleman's friend which spoke to her good character. However, there were no references from colleagues that could attest to her abilities as a teacher.

Whilst the panel did accept that Ms Coleman has acknowledged her wrongdoing, for example by her guilty plea and her admissions in the TRA's investigation, the panel were concerned that little remorse or insight was shown, particularly in respect of the impact on the pupil involved. The panel also had regard to information within the bundle (REDACTED), which demonstrated there was an intention to understand and address her behaviour. However, based on the evidence available, the panel could not be confident that she had made sufficient progress in the time since the incident such that there was no longer a risk of her repeating this behaviour.

### **Proportionality**

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 Coleman 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 Coleman. The violent nature of the incident against a vulnerable pupil, and Ms Coleman's attempts to provide a false narrative that protected her, 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 cases involving certain conduct where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period. None of these were considered relevant.

The Advice indicates that there are cases involving certain conduct where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate. These cases include serious dishonesty and violence. The panel found that Ms Coleman was responsible for an assault on a (REDACTED) pupil, and for dishonestly providing statements that were incorrect or which omitted significant details of the incident.

As noted above, the panel were of the view that Ms Coleman demonstrated little insight into her actions, particularly in respect of the ongoing impact on the pupil involved, and little genuine remorse. On review of all the evidence before it, the panel were concerned that Ms Coleman's response to the child's behaviour was disproportionate, albeit she was operating under (REDACTED). In the context of a (REDACTED) in a specialist school, the child's behaviour did not appear exceptional and there was no evidence of appropriate strategies being used to de-escalate the situation. The panel found no evidence to give them confidence that there was no risk of repetition.

Given the seriousness of the issues taken together, 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 provision 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 all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct, conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and a relevant conviction.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Ms Coleman 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;

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 Coleman, involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE).

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a conviction for an act of violence against a child 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, conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute and a relevant conviction, 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 Coleman, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children/safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, "In the light of the panel's findings against Ms Coleman, which related to a conviction for an act of violence against a child,

there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils.” 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, “Whilst the panel did accept that Ms Coleman has acknowledged her wrongdoing, for example by her guilty plea and her admissions in the TRA’s investigation, the panel were concerned that little remorse or insight was shown, particularly in respect of the impact on the pupil involved. The panel also had regard to information within the bundle(REDACTED), which demonstrated there was an intention to understand and address her behaviour. However, based on the evidence available, the panel could not be confident that she had made sufficient progress in the time since the incident such that there was no longer a risk of her repeating this behaviour.” In my judgement, the lack of full insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, “The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence would have been likely to have had an impact on the safety and/or security of pupils. The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Ms Coleman’s behaviour in committing the offence would be likely to affect public confidence in the teaching profession, if Ms Coleman was allowed to continue teaching.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of a conviction of violence against a child 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, conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute and a relevant conviction, 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 Coleman herself and the panel comment “There was insufficient evidence for the panel to reach a conclusion about Ms Coleman’s record as a teacher, or whether this incident was out of character. The panel did have regard to the statements provided by Ms Coleman’s (REDACTED) and Ms Coleman’s friend which spoke to her good character. However, there were no references from colleagues that could attest to her abilities as a teacher.”

A prohibition order would prevent Ms Coleman 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 insight or remorse. The panel has said, "the panel were of the view that Ms Coleman demonstrated little insight into her actions, particularly in respect of the ongoing impact on the pupil involved, and little genuine remorse. On review of all the evidence before it, the panel were concerned that Ms Coleman's response to the child's behaviour was disproportionate, albeit she was operating under (REDACTED). In the context of a (REDACTED) in a specialist school, the child's behaviour did not appear exceptional and there was no evidence of appropriate strategies being used to de-escalate the situation. The panel found no evidence to give them confidence that there was no risk of repetition."

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that "The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Ms Coleman. The violent nature of the incident against a vulnerable pupil, and Ms Coleman's attempts to provide a false narrative that protected her, 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."

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

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended that no provision should be made for a review period.

I have considered the panel's comments "Given the seriousness of the issues taken together, 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 provision for a review period."

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 and the lack of full insight or remorse.



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 Ms Harriet Coleman 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 Ms Coleman 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.

Ms Coleman 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 'S Buxcey', with a horizontal line underneath.

**Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey**

**Date: 13 March 2024**

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