



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Miss Vivienne Williams: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

February 2025

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	7
Documents	7
Witnesses	7
Decision and reasons	7
Findings of fact	8
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: Miss Vivienne Williams
Teacher ref number: 1671215
Teacher date of birth: 2 May 1994
TRA reference: 20088
Date of determination: 21 February 2025
Former employer: Elsley Primary School, Wembley

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 21 February 2025 via virtual means, to consider the case of Miss Williams.

The panel members were Mr Nigel Shock (lay panellist – in the chair), Mr Peter Whitelock (lay panellist) and Ms Samantha Haslam (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mrs Shanie Probert of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Kiera Riddy of Browne Jacobson LLP solicitors.

Miss Williams was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Proceedings dated 27 November 2024.

It was alleged that Miss Williams was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:

1. On or around 12 October 2023, she was convicted of the offences of:
 - a. One or more counts of ‘conspire to bring/throw/otherwise convey a list A article into/out of a prison’ contrary to section 40B(1)(a) of the Prison Act 1952;
 - b. ‘transmit/cause transmission of an image/sound from inside a prison for simultaneous reception outside’ contrary to section 40D(1)(b) of the Prison Act 1952;
 - c. ‘possess/control article(s) for use in fraud(s)’ contrary to section 6 of the Fraud Act 2006.

In the absence of a response from the teacher, the allegations were not admitted.

Preliminary applications

Proceeding in absence

The panel considered whether the hearing should continue in the absence of the teacher.

The panel was satisfied that the TRA had complied with the service requirements of paragraph 19(1) (a) to (c) of the Teachers’ Disciplinary (England) Regulations 2012 (the “Regulations”).

The panel was also satisfied that the Notice of Proceedings complied with paragraphs 5.23 and 5.24 of the Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession updated May 2020 (the “Procedures”).

The panel determined to exercise its discretion under paragraph 5.47 of the Procedures to proceed with the hearing in the absence of the teacher.

The panel took as its starting point the principle from *R v Jones* [2003] 1 AC1 that its discretion to commence a hearing in the absence of the teacher has to be exercised with the utmost care and caution, and that its discretion is a severely constrained one. In considering the question of fairness, the panel recognised that fairness to the professional is of prime importance but that it also encompasses the fair, economic,

expeditious and efficient disposal of allegations against the professional, as was explained in GMC v Adeogba & Visvardis.

In making its decision, the panel noted that the teacher may waive her right to participate in the hearing. The panel firstly took account of the various factors drawn to its attention from the case of R v Jones:-

- i) The panel had sight of the notice of proceedings addressed to the teacher dated 27 November 2024 in the hearing bundle. The panel noted that no response to the notice of proceedings had been provided. However, the panel also had sight of a separate 'proceeding in absence' bundle provided by the presenting officer. The bundle contained a proof of delivery document, which showed that the notice of proceedings had been delivered on 28 November 2024 and signed for by "MISS VIVIENNE" (which matches the teacher's first name). The panel also had sight of a letter from the presenting officer to the teacher dated 12 February 2025, asking the teacher to confirm that: (i) she voluntarily waived her right to attend the hearing, (ii) she was content for the panel to make a decision in her absence, and (iii) she understood that the panel may make findings against her, which may lead to the imposition of a prohibition order. The letter also stated that if the teacher did not respond, "the hearing may go ahead in [her] absence". The panel noted that the teacher did not appear to have responded to this letter, but the panel also had sight of a proof of delivery document which showed that the letter was delivered on 13 February 2025 and signed for by "V. WILLIAMS" (which matches the teacher's surname). Therefore, the panel was satisfied that the teacher was aware of the proceedings, and was also aware that the hearing would be proceeding in her absence. The panel therefore considered that the teacher had waived her right to be present at the hearing in the knowledge of when and where the hearing was taking place.
- ii) The panel did not consider that an adjournment would result in the teacher attending voluntarily.
- iii) The panel noted that the teacher did not appear to be legally represented, nor had she appeared to have expressed a wish to have legal representation at the hearing.
- iv) The panel considered the extent of the disadvantage to the teacher in not being able to give her account of events, having regard to the nature of the evidence against her. The panel noted that this case concerned an allegation that the teacher had been convicted of a relevant offence. The panel noted that there were no witnesses being called to give evidence, and the only evidence

to be relied upon was contemporaneous documentary evidence. The panel had not identified any significant gaps in the documentary evidence and considered that, were such gaps to arise during the course of the hearing, the panel would take such gaps into consideration in considering whether the hearing should be adjourned for such documents to become available, and in considering whether the presenting officer had discharged the burden of proof. The panel noted that it was also able to exercise vigilance in making its decision, taking into account the degree of risk of it reaching the wrong decision as a result of not having heard the teacher's account.

- v) The panel recognised that the allegations against the teacher are serious and that there was a real risk that if proven, the panel would be required to consider whether to recommend that the teacher ought to be prohibited from teaching.
- vi) The panel recognised that the efficient disposal of allegations against teachers is required to ensure the protection of pupils and to maintain confidence in the profession. The conduct alleged is said to have taken place whilst the teacher was employed at Elsley Primary School. The panel noted that the School would have an interest in this hearing taking place in order to move forwards.
- vii) The panel noted that there were no witnesses to be called, and therefore the effect of delay on the memories of witnesses was not a factor to be taken into consideration in this case.

The panel decided to proceed with the hearing in the absence of the teacher. The panel considered that in light of the teacher's waiver of her right to appear, and by taking such measures referred to above to address any unfairness that may be caused insofar as is possible; that on balance, these were serious allegations and the public interest in the hearing proceeding within a reasonable time was in favour of the hearing continuing as listed.

Amending the allegations

An application was made by the presenting officer to amend the Notice of Proceedings by amending the date of the alleged conviction from "12 October 2023" to "23 March 2023". The panel noted that it has the power to, in the interests of justice, amend an allegation or the particulars of an allegation, at any stage before making its decision about whether the facts of the case have been proved.

Before making an amendment, the panel was required to consider any representations by the presenting officer and by the teacher. The panel noted that it did not have any representations from the teacher. However, the panel had sight of a letter from the

presenting officer to the teacher dated 14 February 2025, setting out details of the proposed amendment and asking the teacher to provide any objections to the amendment by 20 February 2025. The panel also had sight of a proof of delivery document that had been signed for by a “V. WILLIAMS” (which is the teacher’s surname). As a result, the panel was satisfied that the teacher was aware of the application and proposed amendment, and had not responded.

The panel considered that the amendment proposed, being the correction of an incorrect date reference did not change the nature, scope or seriousness of the allegations. In particular, the panel noted that the amendment was to correct a factual inaccuracy in respect of the date of Miss Williams’ alleged convictions. The panel did not consider that there would be any prospect of the teacher’s case being presented differently had the amendment been made at an earlier stage, and therefore there was no unfairness or prejudice caused to the teacher. The panel decided to amend the allegations as proposed.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 3 to 8

Section 2: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 10 to 52

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

Witnesses

No witnesses were called to give evidence at the hearing.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

On 1 September 2016, Miss Williams commenced employment at Elsley Primary School (the “School”) as a Teacher.

On 8 June 2021, the School was informed that Miss Williams had been arrested and her property had been searched on 2 June 2021. On the same date, Miss Williams attended a meeting at the School.

On 10 June 2021, Miss Williams attended a second meeting at the School.

On 16 June 2021, Miss Williams resigned from her position at the School with immediate effect.

On 17 June 2021, Miss Williams 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 23 March 2023, you were convicted of the offences of:**
 - a. One or more counts of ‘conspire to bring/throw/otherwise convey a list A article into/out of a prison’ contrary to section 40B(1)(a) of the Prison Act 1952;**
 - b. ‘transmit/cause transmission of an image/sound from inside a prison for simultaneous reception outside’ contrary to section 40D(1)(b) of the Prison Act 1952;**
 - c. ‘possess/control article(s) for use in fraud(s)’ contrary to section 6 of the Fraud Act 2006.**

The panel had sight of the transcript of the Judge’s sentencing remarks, which set out the following background: Miss Williams obtained a number of solicitors’ stamps and a ‘rule 39 stamp’, and used these to send mail out to [REDACTED] and a number of other people at different prison locations, containing pieces of paper that were soaked in class B drugs. Miss Williams used the stamps that she had to give the appearance that the letters she was sending in were from solicitors, and contained privileged legal communications, with the belief that the prison would not be allowed to open or examine the contents of those letters. In addition, Miss Williams enabled those in custody to communicate with others they were not entitled to, acting as an intermediary on some calls, and receiving calls from illegally possessed phones on other occasions.

Miss Williams entered a guilty plea to all 3 offences, and on 23 March 2023, she was convicted at Nottingham Crown Court of the offences of: (i) ‘Conspire to bring/throw/convey a list ‘A’ prohibited article into/out of a prison’, (ii) ‘Possess/control article for use in fraud – Fraud Act 2006’, and (iii) ‘Without authority transmit/cause the transmission of an image/sound from a prison – Prison Act 1952’.

On 12 October 2023, Miss Williams was sentenced at Nottingham Crown Court to a total of 30 months' imprisonment.

The panel had sight of the certificate of conviction dated 24 September 2024 and accepted it as conclusive proof of the conviction at the facts necessarily implied by the conviction.

The panel found this allegation proven.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

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

In doing so, the panel had regard to the document Teacher Misconduct: The Prohibition of Teachers, which is referred to as "the Advice".

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Miss Williams, in relation to the facts it found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that by reference to Part 2, Miss Williams 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
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including ... the rule of law ...

The panel found that the individual's actions were not relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting. In particular, the panel noted that Miss Williams' actions were carried out in her personal life and not in an education setting, and had no impact on the pupils or children that she taught and/or worked with.

The panel did not consider that Miss Williams' actions had a potential impact on the safety or security of pupils, however they may have had a potential impact on members of the public.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Miss Williams' behaviour in committing the offences would be likely to affect public confidence in the teaching profession, if Miss Williams was allowed to continue teaching.

The panel noted that Miss Williams' behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment (which she had now served), which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed, and which the Advice states is likely to be considered "a relevant offence".

This was a case concerning an offence involving fraud or serious dishonesty. The Advice indicates that a conviction for any offence that relates to or involves such offences is likely to be considered “a relevant offence”.

This was also a case concerning offences which involved conspiring to send a ‘list A’ article (in this instance, drugs) into prison, and transmitting calls to and from the inside of a prison by illicit means. The panel noted that the advice is not intended to be exhaustive and there may be other offences that panels consider to be “a relevant offence”. The panel considered each of these offences to be “a relevant offence”, as they are particularly serious and grave offences which undermined the systems and safeguards put in place by prisons and had occurred over a long period of time. The panel also took into account the Judge’s sentencing remarks that, in light of the gravity of these offences, he had no choice but to impose a sentence of imprisonment.

The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Miss Williams’ fitness to be a teacher. The panel considered that a finding that these convictions were 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 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 Miss Williams 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 maintenance of public confidence in the profession, and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In the light of the panel’s findings against Miss Williams, which involved finding that she had been convicted of a relevant offence (namely, conspiring to send prohibited ‘list A’ articles (i.e., drugs) into prison, transmitting calls into and from prison contrary to the Prison Act 1952, and an offence under the Fraud Act 2006), the panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was present, as the conduct found against Miss Williams was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Miss Williams were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

The panel had not had sight of any evidence to attest to Miss Williams' ability as an educator or ability to make a valuable contribution to the profession. The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Miss Williams in the profession, since her behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.

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;
- actions or behaviours that ... undermine fundamental British values of democracy, the rule of law ...; and
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, ...

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 the mitigation offered by the teacher and/or whether there were mitigating circumstances.

Miss Williams' actions were deliberate. There was no evidence to suggest that Miss Williams was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation.

The panel did not have any evidence that Miss Williams was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings. However, the panel also did not have sight of sufficient evidence to demonstrate that Miss Williams had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both her personal and professional conduct and that she had contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel did consider the Judge's sentencing remarks, in which the Judge acknowledged that Miss Williams was previously of "positive good character", and that he had read "a series of references" from those who had known and worked with Miss Williams all of whom "spoke highly of [her] as a colleague, a friend and [REDACTED]". However, the panel also noted that these remarks were made prior to Miss Williams serving her custodial sentence. The panel also noted that no mitigating evidence had been adduced by Miss Williams, such as character statements, which could attest to Miss Williams' character, either more recently or at all. There were also no references provided from any colleagues that could attest to her ability as a teacher.

The panel also considered Miss Williams' level of insight and remorse. The panel noted from the sentencing remarks that Miss Williams "pleaded guilty at a very early opportunity", and that the Judge accepted her "remorse and regret expressed" as genuine. However, the panel noted that it did not have sight of any evidence adduced by Miss Williams which attested to her level of remorse or insight as a result of her opting not to engage with these regulatory proceedings. Therefore, the panel found that it had insufficient evidence to conclude that Miss Williams had any level of remorse or insight into her 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 Miss Williams 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 Miss Williams. The seriousness of the offences of which Miss Williams was convicted, the negative impact of Miss Williams' behaviour on public confidence in the profession, and the lack of evidence of insight and/or remorse, 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 specific cases were relevant.

The Advice also 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. One of these cases includes fraud or serious dishonesty.

However, the panel also noted that the lists of cases contained in the Advice were not exhaustive and that panels should consider each case on its individual merits taking into account all the circumstances involved. The panel noted that Miss Williams' conduct in this case involved her conspiring to send 'list A' articles (Class B drugs) into multiple prisons, and also assisting individuals in prisons to communicate with those outside of prison that they were not entitled to communicate with, by illicit means. The panel found this conduct to be extremely serious.

The panel noted from the Judge's sentencing remarks that there were a number of aggravating features present, in particular: (i) that Miss Williams facilitated a "commercial enterprise", (ii) that this activity took place over at least ten months, (iii) the number of individual supplies, (iv) the value of the pieces of paper soaked in drugs, (v) the number of calls that she participated in, (vi) the "level of sophistication and element of pre-planning" that was inherent in these offences, and (vii) the fact that she was "running two separate activities at the same time". In addition, the Judge noted that Miss Williams' actions "rode roughshod over the systems and protections put in place by the prison". The panel found this behaviour to be totally incompatible with being a teacher.

The panel also noted that it had very limited, if any, mitigating evidence. There was no evidence to attest to Miss Williams' insight into her actions (other than her guilty plea), her level of remorse, or to demonstrate that she had learnt from her behaviour. Taking this into account, the panel found it was unable to determine the risk of repetition. However, the panel also noted that no evidence had been adduced to demonstrate any steps that Miss Williams had taken since the convictions to address her behaviour and to facilitate a possible return to the teaching profession.

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 a relevant conviction

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

In particular, the panel has found that Miss Williams 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

- not undermining fundamental British values, including ... the rule of law ...

The panel finds that the conduct of Miss Williams fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include findings which involved conviction of a relevant offence (namely, conspiring to send prohibited 'list A' articles (i.e., drugs) into prison, transmitting calls into and from prison contrary to the Prison Act 1952, and an offence under the Fraud Act 2006).

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 Miss Williams, 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, "The panel did not consider that Miss Williams' actions had a potential impact on the safety or security of pupils, however they may have had a potential impact on members of the public." I have noted that Miss Williams' actions were not carried out in an education setting and had no impact on pupils she taught.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, "The panel also considered Miss Williams' level of insight and remorse. The panel noted from the sentencing remarks that Miss Williams "pleaded guilty at a very early opportunity", and that the Judge accepted her "remorse and regret expressed" as genuine. However, the panel noted that it did not have sight of any evidence adduced by Miss Williams which attested to her level of remorse or insight as a result of her opting not to engage with these regulatory proceedings. Therefore, the panel found that it had insufficient evidence to conclude that Miss Williams had any level of remorse or insight into her behaviour." In my judgement, the lack of remorse or insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk public confidence in the teaching profession. 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 also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Miss Williams' behaviour in committing the offences would be likely to affect public confidence in the teaching profession, if Miss Williams was allowed to continue teaching." I am particularly mindful of the serious convictions 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 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 Miss Williams herself and the panel comment "The panel did not have any evidence that Miss Williams was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings. However, the panel also did not have sight of sufficient evidence to demonstrate that Miss Williams had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both her personal and professional conduct and that she had contributed significantly to the education sector."

A prohibition order would prevent Miss Williams 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, "The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Miss Williams. The seriousness of the offences of which Miss Williams was convicted, the negative

impact of Miss Williams' behaviour on public confidence in the profession, and the lack of evidence of insight and/or remorse, were significant factors in forming that opinion."

In reaching my decision I have given specific weight to the following "The panel noted from the Judge's sentencing remarks that there were a number of aggravating features present, in particular: (i) that Miss Williams facilitated a "commercial enterprise", (ii) that this activity took place over at least ten months, (iii) the number of individual supplies, (iv) the value of the pieces of paper soaked in drugs, (v) the number of calls that she participated in, (vi) the "level of sophistication and element of pre-planning" that was inherent in these offences, and (vii) the fact that she was "running two separate activities at the same time". In addition, the Judge noted that Miss Williams' actions "rode roughshod over the systems and protections put in place by the prison". The panel found this behaviour to be totally incompatible with being a teacher. "

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Miss Williams 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 "the panel also noted that the lists of cases contained in the Advice were not exhaustive and that panels should consider each case on its individual merits taking into account all the circumstances involved. The panel noted that Miss Williams' conduct in this case involved her conspiring to send 'list A' articles (Class B drugs) into multiple prisons, and also assisting individuals in prisons to communicate with those outside of prison that they were not entitled to communicate with, by illicit means. The panel found this conduct to be extremely serious."

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 findings and the lack of either 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 Miss Vivienne Williams is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. Furthermore, in view of the seriousness of the

allegations found proved against her, I have decided that Miss Williams shall not be entitled to apply for restoration of her eligibility to teach.

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

Miss Williams 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 horizontal line underneath.

Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey

Date: 26 February 2025

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