



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Ms Julie Morris: 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	5
Documents	5
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	10
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 Julie Morris
Teacher ref number:	9858390
Teacher date of birth:	17 July 1977
TRA reference:	21135
Date of determination:	19 February 2024
Former employer:	Tyldesley St George's Central CofE Primary School and Nursery, Manchester

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened virtually via Microsoft Teams on 19 February 2024 to consider the case of Ms Julie Morris.

The panel members were Mr Paul Hawkins (lay panellist in the chair); Mr Peter Barnsley (teacher panellist) and Ms Wendy Shannon (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Tom Walker of Blake Morgan 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 Morris that the allegations be considered without a hearing.

Both the TRA and Ms Morris signed a statement of agreed facts and admitted conviction of relevant offences.

The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of a presenting officer, Ms Morris or any representative appointed on his behalf.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 6 February 2024. It was alleged that Ms Morris was guilty of having been convicted of relevant offences, in that:

You were convicted at any time of a relevant offence in that you were convicted of the following offences:

1. Cause/Incite a girl under 13 to engage in sexual activity – No penetration on 26/08/18 Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.8 (1)
2. Cause/Incite a girl under 13 to engage in sexual activity – No penetration on 15/09/18 Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.8 (1)
3. Cause/Incite a girl under 13 to engage in sexual activity – No penetration on 20/10/18 Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.8 (1)
4. Cause/Incite a girl under 13 to engage in sexual activity – No penetration on 15/12/18 Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.8 (1)
5. Engage in sexual activity in presence of child aged under 13 offender 18 or over on 06/07/19 Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.11 (1) (a)
6. Rape a girl under 13 on 06/07/19 - Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.5
7. Cause/Incite a girl under 13 to engage in sexual activity – No penetration on 22/12/19 Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.8 (1)
8. Rape a girl under 13 on 14/06/20 - Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.5
9. Engage in sexual activity in presence of child aged under 13 offender 18 or over on 14/06/20 - Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.11 (1) (a)
10. Cause/Incite a girl under 13 to engage in sexual activity – No penetration on 21/06/20 Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.8 (1)
11. Cause/Incite a girl under 13 to engage in sexual activity – No penetration on 19/12/20 Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.8 (1)
12. Cause/Incite a girl under 13 to engage in sexual activity – No penetration on 23/12/20 Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.8 (1)
13. Cause/Incite a girl under 13 to engage in sexual activity – No penetration on 30/07/20 – 02/09/21 Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.8 (1)
14. Taking indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children on 14/09/18 – 03/09/21 Protection of Children Act 1978 s.1
15. Taking indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children on 14/09/18 – 03/09/21 - Protection of Children Act 1978 s.1
16. Taking indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children on 14/09/18 – 03/09/21 - Protection of Children Act 1978 s.1
17. Possessing an indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of a child on 14/09/18 – 03/09/21 - Criminal Justice Act 1988 s.160

18. Engage in sexual communication with a child on 01/05/19 –
30/08/21 - Criminal Justice Act 1988 s.160

Ms Morris admitted the facts of the allegations and that the offences amounted to a conviction for relevant offences.

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 anonymised individual list – pages 3 to 5

Section 2: Notice of referral, response and notice of meeting – pages 6 to 25

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 26 to 35

Section 4: TRA documents – pages 36 to 94

Section 5: Teacher Documents– pages 95 to 101

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

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Ms Morris on 16 November 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 Morris 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.

The panel proceeded to consider the case carefully, having read all of the documents, and reached a decision. It accepted the legal advice provided.

The panel notes that the allegations are based upon the Police National Computer (“PNC”) records, and there are slight differences in the wording of the offences between this document and the Certificate of Conviction. The panel regards these differences as immaterial as the documents relate to the same offences and convictions, albeit worded slightly differently in that the certificate of conviction refers to ‘child’ as opposed to ‘children’. There is no need to amend the allegations in these circumstances because the certificate of conviction confirms the conviction of each of the offences which are listed in the PNC record.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

You were convicted at any time of a relevant offence in that you were convicted of the following offences:

- 1. Cause/Incite a girl under 13 to engage in sexual activity – No penetration on 26/08/18 Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.8 (1)**
- 2. Cause/Incite a girl under 13 to engage in sexual activity – No penetration on 15/09/18 Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.8 (1)**
- 3. Cause/Incite a girl under 13 to engage in sexual activity – No penetration on 20/10/18 Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.8 (1)**
- 4. Cause/Incite a girl under 13 to engage in sexual activity – No penetration on 15/12/18 Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.8 (1)**
- 5. Engage in sexual activity in presence of child aged under 13 offender 18 or over on 06/07/19 Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.11 (1) (a)**
- 6. Rape a girl under 13 on 06/07/19 - Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.5**
- 7. Cause/Incite a girl under 13 to engage in sexual activity – No penetration on 22/12/19 Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.8 (1)**
- 8. Rape a girl under 13 on 14/06/20 - Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.5**
- 9. Engage in sexual activity in presence of child aged under 13 offender 18 or over on 14/06/20 - Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.11 (1) (a)**

- 10. Cause/Incite a girl under 13 to engage in sexual activity – No penetration on 21/06/20 Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.8 (1)**
- 11. Cause/Incite a girl under 13 to engage in sexual activity – No penetration on 19/12/20 Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.8 (1)**
- 12. Cause/Incite a girl under 13 to engage in sexual activity – No penetration on 23/12/20 Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.8 (1)**
- 13. Cause/Incite a girl under 13 to engage in sexual activity – No penetration on 30/07/20 – 02/09/21 Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.8 (1)**
- 14. Taking indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children on 14/09/18 – 03/09/21 Protection of Children Act 1978 s.1**
- 15. Taking indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children on 14/09/18 – 03/09/21 - Protection of Children Act 1978 s.1**
- 16. Taking indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children on 14/09/18 – 03/09/21 - Protection of Children Act 1978 s.1**
- 17. Possessing an indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of a child on 14/09/18 – 03/09/21 - Criminal Justice Act 1988 s.160**
- 18. Engage in sexual communication with a child on 01/05/19 – 30/08/21 - Criminal Justice Act 1988 s.160**

The panel was presented with a statement of agreed facts, signed by Ms Morris, in which all of the allegations were admitted.

Ms Julie Morris was [REDACTED] at St George's Central Church of England Primary School, Darlington Street, Tyldesley, Manchester ('the School'). Ms Morris held that position since September 2012. During that time Ms Morris was also safeguarding lead at the School. Ms Morris had been suspended by the School as soon as the matters giving rise to this case were brought to the School's attention on 7 September 2021, and she was dismissed on 10 September 2021. Ms Morris was an experienced teacher having worked in the field since 2005.

Between August 2018 and September 2021, Ms Morris and her partner, Individual A [REDACTED], engaged in the sexual abuse of Child A by sexually assaulting, and raping them. Ms Morris both facilitated and played an active role in this abuse.

The Teacher and Individual A also exchanged a number of WhatsApp messages, which included discussion and videos of them engaging in the conduct alleged. None of the offences that the Teacher was charged with relate to their employment at the School. However, in one case photographs of pupils at the School had been taken by Ms Morris and shared, albeit such photographs were not indecent.

The activity was extensive and sustained, as illustrated by the vast quantity of chat logs recovered by the police spanning a significant period of time. The offences involved acts of grave sexual depravity and a grave breach of the trust of Child A. The abuse of Child A started when [REDACTED]. The impact of this course of offending upon this child is yet to be determined, but likely to be significant.

On 22 December 2021, Ms Morris was sentenced, having pleaded guilty and been convicted of all of the offences set out above. Ms Morris was sentenced to 13 years 4 months imprisonment plus an extended 4 years on license. A Sexual Harm Prevention Order was imposed against Ms Morris and she was required to sign the Sex Offenders Register.

The panel was presented with the sentencing remarks of the presiding judge sitting at Court, summarising the offences and the reasons for the sentence imposed. The learned judge remarked as follows: *“As a Crown Court judge, I see many cases involving the dreadful abuse of children, but every now and again we see cases, the circumstances of which are almost beyond belief. This is one of those cases. Sadly, it demonstrates that human depravity really knows no depths.”*

The panel accepted the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of the commission of these offences by Ms Morris.

In light of this and Ms Morris’ admissions, it found the allegations proved.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

Having found the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of the proved allegations amount to convictions of relevant offences, which Ms Morris admitted.

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 Morris in relation to the facts it found proved involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considered that by reference to Part 2, Ms Morris 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.
- showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
- 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.

Further and in addition, the panel noted that, pursuant to the Advice it is likely that a conviction for any of the following would amount to a relevant offence:

- any offence that led to a term of imprisonment, including any suspended sentence;
- any offence that relates to, or involves, sexual communication with a child will be considered "a relevant offence";
- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or indecent pseudo photograph or image of a child, or permitting any such activity, including one off incidents;
- child cruelty and/or neglect;
- controlling or coercive behaviour.

Over and above these matters, the panel determined that Ms Morris' actions were clearly relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting. Each of these offences were very serious in nature and related to children.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Ms Morris' behaviour in committing these offences would undoubtedly affect public confidence in the teaching profession, particularly given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. Her conduct ran counter to what should be at the very core of the practice of a teacher with a duty of care towards children. The fact that Ms Morris was also the safeguarding lead at her School makes her offending all the more shocking in that, whilst the designated point of contact for welfare and safety concerns at the School, she herself was engaged in abusing a child, albeit not one at the School.

Ms Morris' behaviour ultimately led to a significant term of imprisonment, which demonstrated the public and child protection issues engaged by her actions together with the other aspects of the sentence imposed.

The panel did not consider there to be any relevant mitigating circumstances in relation to the commission of these offences. On the contrary the offences were at the most serious end of the sexual offending spectrum in terms of gravity, and had the potential to cause lasting harm to Child A.

In conclusion and for all these reasons, the panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was directly relevant to Ms Morris' ongoing suitability to teach.

The panel considered that a finding that this conviction was for relevant offences was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of conviction of relevant offences, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be made, the panel had to consider whether it would be an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it would be in the public interest to do so. Prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

The 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 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 nature of the offences for which Ms Morris was convicted and having regard to the specific context, with particular reference to the sentencing remarks, there was an extremely strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and other members of the public. Ms Morris' actions raised obvious and significant public and child protection concerns.

The panel considered that public confidence in the profession would be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Morris was not treated with the

utmost seriousness when regulating the profession. This was conduct that was extremely serious.

For the same reasons, the panel decided that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present.

Whilst no doubt had been cast upon Ms Morris' abilities as an educator, given the nature of the allegations in this case the panel concluded there was not a strong public interest consideration in retaining her in the profession.

Notwithstanding the clear public interest considerations that were present, the panel considered carefully whether or not it would be proportionate to impose a prohibition order, taking into account the effect that this would have on Ms Morris.

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 Morris. The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours of a teacher have been proved.

In the list of such behaviours, those that are relevant in this case are set out below:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of the Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- sexual misconduct, e.g. 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;
- 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;
- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing, or publishing any indecent photograph or image, or indecent pseudo photograph or image, of a child, or permitting such activity, including one-off incidents;
- failure to act on evidence that indicated a child's welfare may have been at risk e.g. failed to notify the designated safeguarding lead and/or make a referral to children's social care

- 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);
- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour

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

The panel considered that the following mitigating factors are present in this case:

- Ms Morris appeared to have had an otherwise unblemished record. There was evidence of good character prior to her conviction.
- The panel was presented with positive albeit historic employment references regarding her practice as a teacher.
- Ms Morris had engaged with the TRA and made full admissions expressing regret for her actions.

Weighed against this, the aggravating features in this case included that:

- Ms Morris' actions were deliberate and sustained, and there was no evidence that she was acting under duress;
- Ms Morris' actions amounted to a clear breach of the Teachers' Standards and raised serious public and child protection concerns;
- Ms Morris has been convicted of and sentenced for serious sexual offences involving a child, for which she received a custodial sentence of 13 years and 4 months, plus an extended 4 years on licence; and was subject to a Sexual Harm Prevention Order;
- Her actions involved actual harm and abuse to a child.

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

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings was sufficient would

unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Ms Morris of prohibition.

Ms Morris' actions were fundamentally incompatible with her being a teacher. This was conduct at the serious end of the spectrum. The nature and gravity of these offences were a matter of significant concern.

There were, accordingly, particularly strong public interest considerations in this case in terms of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and other members of the public, public confidence in the teaching profession and the declaring of proper standards of conduct in this case.

Ms Morris' behaviour led to her receiving a significant sentence, which is indicative of the seriousness of the offences. The panel was therefore of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Ms Morris. Accordingly, it made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate to recommend that a review period of the order should be considered.

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

The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period.

These behaviours include any sexual misconduct involving a child, which was directly applicable in this case. Indeed, as set out above, the sexual offences were very serious indeed, and were committed over a long period of time. Furthermore, the nature of the offending referred to in the sentencing remarks is indicative of the severity of the offending escalating in both scope and severity as regards both the number of children who could potentially be harmed, and the nature of the sexual abuse itself. Given this, the panel is satisfied that there is a real risk of Ms Morris repeating her offending behaviour and a review period is not appropriate.

In light of this and the panel's comments, above, regarding the seriousness of these offences, the panel decided its findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate.

The public interest considerations involved in this case were such that this was necessary, appropriate and proportionate.

Having regard to the nature of the offences and the sentence he received, Ms Morris' actions are fundamentally incompatible with her being a teacher.

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 a relevant conviction.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Ms Morris 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
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
- 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 Morris 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 Morris fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of a conviction for a number of offences of sexual abuse of a child including rape.

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 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 Morris, 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 safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, "Her conduct ran counter to what should be at the very core of the practice of a teacher with a duty of care towards children. The fact that Ms Morris was also the safeguarding lead at her School makes her offending all the more shocking in that, whilst the designated point of contact for welfare and safety concerns at the School, she herself was engaged in abusing a child, albeit not one at the School." 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. Although the panel has noted that "Ms Morris had engaged with the TRA and made full admissions expressing regret for her actions", it has also found that "there is a real risk of Ms Morris repeating her offending behaviour". It has also noted that "Ms Morris' actions were deliberate and sustained, and there was no evidence that she was acting under duress". 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 has observed that "Ms Morris' actions were fundamentally incompatible with her being a teacher. This was conduct at the serious end of the spectrum. The nature and gravity of these offences were a matter of significant concern." I am particularly mindful of the finding of a conviction for serious sexual offences involving a child which resulted in a significant custodial sentence.

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 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 Morris herself. The panel has commented, “Ms Morris appeared to have had an otherwise unblemished record. There was evidence of good character prior to her conviction.” The panel was also presented with positive but historic employment references about Ms Morris’ practice as a teacher.

A prohibition order would prevent Ms Morris from returning to 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 seriousness of the misconduct. The panel has commented, “The panel did not consider there to be any relevant mitigating circumstances in relation to the commission of these offences. On the contrary the offences were at the most serious end of the sexual offending spectrum in terms of gravity, and had the potential to cause lasting harm to Child A.” The panel notes that Ms Morris “received a custodial sentence of 13 years and 4 months, plus an extended 4 years on licence; and was subject to a Sexual Harm Prevention Order”.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Ms Morris 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, 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 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 any sexual misconduct involving a child, which was directly applicable in this case. Indeed, as set out above, the sexual offences were very serious indeed, and were committed over a long period of time. Furthermore, the nature of the offending referred to in the sentencing remarks is indicative of the severity of the offending escalating in both scope and severity as regards both the number of children who could potentially be harmed, and the nature of the sexual abuse itself. Given this, the panel is satisfied that there is a real risk of Ms Morris repeating her offending behaviour and a review period is not appropriate."

I have considered whether not allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the serious nature of the offences of which Ms Morris was convicted and the risk of Ms Morris re-offending.

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



Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 27 February 2024

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