



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mrs Lesley Beuscher: Professional conduct panel hearing outcome

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

April 2025

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	12
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	16

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

Teacher:	Mrs Lesley Beuscher
Teacher ref number:	0665637
Teacher date of birth:	19 June 1963
TRA reference:	22521
Date of determination:	17 April 2025
Former employer:	Mount Pleasant Lane School, Hertfordshire, via Randstad Recruitment Agency

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 15 to 17 April 2025 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mrs Lesley Beuscher (“Mrs Beuscher”).

The panel members were Mr Terry Hyde (former teacher panellist – in the chair), Ms Jan Stoddard (lay panellist) and Mr Brendan Stones (teacher panellist).

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

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Lee Bridges of Counsel.

Mrs Beuscher was present and was represented by Ms Emma Thomas of the National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers (NASUWT).

The hearing took place in public save that portions of the hearing were heard in private and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 21 January 2025.

It was alleged that Mrs Beuscher was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst working as a primary teacher at Mount Pleasant Lane (“the School”):

1. On or around 26 June 2023, she:

a) smelt of alcohol;

b) appeared to be under the influence of alcohol.

She has been convicted of a relevant offence, namely:

2. On 7 June 2021, she was convicted of being in charge of a motor vehicle with excess alcohol on 9 May 2021, contrary to the Road Traffic Act 1988, s.5(1)(b) and Schedule 2.

Mrs Beuscher admitted the facts of the allegations. In her statement of agreed facts dated 23 July 2024, Mrs Beuscher did not accept that her conduct in allegations 1(a) and 1(b) amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and did not provide a response in respect of whether her conduct in allegation 2 amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology and list of key people – pages 4 to 5

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 6 to 14

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 15 to 22

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 23 to 105

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 106 to 143

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

In the consideration of this case, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession 2020, (the “Procedures”).

Witnesses

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

- Witness A – [REDACTED], Former children’s support worker at the School
- Witness B – [REDACTED], former principal consultant at Randstad Recruitment Agency
- Mrs Beuscher also gave oral evidence and called the following witness:
- Witness C – [REDACTED]

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

Mrs Beuscher was employed by Randstad Recruitment Agency and was engaged as a teacher at the School.

On 26 June 2023, a staff member at the School raised concerns with another member of staff (Witness A) regarding the manner in which Mrs Beuscher was presenting in front of pupils and that she did not appear well enough to be teaching pupils.

Witness A observed Mrs Beuscher from the back of the classroom. Witness A’s view was that Mrs Beuscher appeared to be under the influence of alcohol, as she was unsteady on her feet and her speech was slurred.

Witness A sat down with Mrs Beuscher in the staff room shortly after where she could smell alcohol on Mrs Beuscher. The School organised a taxi to take Mrs Beuscher home.

Randstad Recruitment Agency conducted an investigation meeting with Mrs Beuscher on 5 July 2023. Mrs Beuscher is no longer employed by Randstad Recruitment Agency.

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 26 June 2023, you:

a) smelt of alcohol;

Mrs Beuscher admitted this allegation.

Mrs Beuscher stated in her written statement to the TRA dated 23 July 2024 that she “consumed a small amount of alcohol” on 26 June 2023. She also stated “Under normal circumstances the volume consumed would have no effect on my ability to move, teach or carry out my duties to the school and to the children. I had consumed the equivalent of one small glass of wine.”

Witness A stated in her witness statement that “on 26 June 2023, shortly after 9am, Individual A [REDACTED] informed me that she was concerned about Lesley Beuscher not being well enough to be teaching. Individual A did not explain why she thought this. Individual A told me that she had offered to take over the class, but that Lesley Beuscher had declined her offer. Individual A then asked if I was able to discreetly observe in the classroom.”

Witness A then observed Mrs Beuscher from the back of the classroom. Witness A stated that “Lesley Beuscher appeared to be struggling and confused. Once she managed to load the programme, I noticed that her speech was slurred. Initially, due to the time of the day, I was concerned that Lesley Beuscher was potentially suffering a stroke. However, when I got closer to Lesley Beuscher, I realised that it was more likely that she was under the influence of alcohol as I noticed the smell coming from her.”

Witness A stated that she asked the other member of staff to take over the teaching and spoke to Mrs Beuscher outside of the classroom. Witness A said “once we were in the staffroom and sat down, Lesley Beuscher began to apologise and say that the children deserved better. I noticed a smell of alcohol in the staff room which I had not noticed when I was in there a few minutes earlier and asked Lesley Beuscher whether she had drunk any alcohol. Lesley Beuscher confirmed that she had been drinking and appeared [REDACTED].”

Witness A was consistent when giving evidence at the hearing. She said when she observed Mrs Beuscher from the back of the classroom her speech was slurred and “it seemed like it was difficult for Mrs Beuscher to form a coherent sentence.”

Witness A also said that she could smell alcohol “only when she got close to me” and from recollection “from around two arms lengths away”.

Mrs Beuscher accepted in her oral evidence that she was smelling of alcohol on the morning of 26 June 2023 having consumed a “small Costa cup of wine” before the start of school, “across the road from the school.”

The panel therefore found allegation 1(a) proved on the balance of probabilities.

b) appeared to be under the influence of alcohol.

Mrs Beuscher admitted this allegation.

Mrs Beuscher stated in her written statement to the TRA dated 23 July 2024, “I strongly deny the consumption of excessive alcohol. I firmly believe that my appearance of being under the influence of alcohol was the result of the interaction of the small amount of alcohol consumed [REDACTED].”

Mrs Beuscher also stated in a statement dated 1 February 2025 that “Whilst I did consume a little alcohol in a cul-de-sac opposite the school, this amount would not have led to the behaviour that others observed. Having had alcohol issues in recent years, I am more than aware of the repercussions of drinking. I honestly do not know what caused the response that I had but suspect [REDACTED]. I have never previously gone and would never go into any school drunk and, as I do not believe, that this was the case that morning.”

The panel noted that Mrs Beuscher was consistent in her evidence about consuming alcohol before the start of the school day on a road opposite the School. Mrs Beuscher stated that she had consumed “a small Costa cup of wine” on that morning.

[REDACTED]

Witness A stated in her witness statement that when she observed Mrs Beuscher from the back of the classroom, “Lesley Beuscher appeared to be struggling and confused. Once she managed to load the programme, I noticed that her speech was slurred. Initially, due to the time of the day, I was concerned that Lesley Beuscher was potentially suffering a stroke. However, when I got closer to Lesley Beuscher, I realised that it was more likely that she was under the influence of alcohol as I noticed the smell coming from her.”

Witness A also stated that when she asked Mrs Beuscher whether she had been drinking alcohol “Lesley Beuscher confirmed that she had been drinking and appeared [REDACTED].”

When considering all of the relevant evidence, the panel found allegation 1(b) proved.

2. On 7 June 2021, you were convicted of being in charge of a motor vehicle with excess alcohol on 9 May 2021, contrary to the Road Traffic Act 1988, s.5(1)(b) and Schedule 2.

Mrs Beuscher admitted this allegation.

In her written statement to the TRA dated 23 July 2024, Mrs Beuscher said, “...The offence states that I was in charge of the vehicle. Having consumed alcohol I made the decision NOT to drive as I believed that I was not in a fit state. The engine was not

running and I had no intention of driving. My keys, however in the ignition and this therefore constitutes being 'in charge'. For which I received 10 penalty points on my licence. At no point was the vehicle driven."

The panel had sight of the Memorandum of Entry entered in the Register of the West and Central Hertfordshire Magistrates' Court dated 7 June 2021 which named Mrs Beuscher as the defendant, stated "On 09/05/2021 at Harpenden in the county of Hertfordshire were in charge of a motor vehicle, namely FORD index [REDACTED], on a road, namely AMBROSE ROAD, HARPENDEN, after consuming so much alcohol that the proportion of it in your breath, namely 78 microgrammes of alcohol in 100 millilitres of breath, exceeded the prescribed limit. Contrary to section 5(1)(b) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988."

Mrs Beuscher was fined £69, ordered to pay costs and a surcharge and her driving record was endorsed with 10 penalty points.

The panel also had sight of the Police National Computer record which detailed the aforementioned conviction.

The panel noted that in respect of a conviction of a criminal offence, the panel must not re-examine the facts of the case and were required to accept the conviction as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction, unless exceptional circumstances apply.

The panel found allegation 2 proved.

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 of the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations 1(a) and 1(b) 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 first considered whether the conduct of Mrs Beuscher, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mrs Beuscher 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 Mrs Beuscher, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education ("KCSIE").

The panel considered that Mrs Beuscher was in breach of the following provision:

- All staff have a responsibility to provide a safe environment in which children can learn.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mrs Beuscher, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Working Together to Safeguard Children.

The panel considered that Mrs Beuscher was in breach of the following provision:

- Everyone who works with children has a responsibility for keeping them safe.

The panel also considered whether Mrs Beuscher's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

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.

The panel found that the offence of serious offences involving alcohol was relevant.

The panel noted that Mrs Beuscher made a conscious decision to consume alcohol before the start of the school day on 26 June 2023 in knowledge that she would be teaching young, impressionable children. The panel considered that Mrs Beuscher's conduct in allegations 1(a) and 1(b) exposed pupils to a risk of harm. The panel noted that by smelling and appearing to be under the influence of alcohol, Mrs Beuscher did not provide a safe environment for those pupils in her care, in particular, Mrs Beuscher limited her ability to prevent any harm to pupils and increased the chance of inadvertently causing harm to pupils.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mrs Beuscher amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mrs Beuscher was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Mrs Beuscher's actions amounted to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, the panel took into account the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. It 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.

In considering the issue of disrepute, the panel also considered whether Mrs Beuscher's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice.

As set out above in the panel's findings as to whether Mrs Beuscher was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that the offence of serious offences involving alcohol was relevant.

The panel considered that Mrs Beuscher's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher.

The panel again noted that Mrs Beuscher made a conscious decision to consume alcohol before the start of the school day on 26 June 2023 in knowledge that she would be teaching young, impressionable children. The panel noted that by smelling and appearing to be under the influence of alcohol, Mrs Beuscher did not model behaviour expected of a teacher. The panel considered that it was likely that parents and colleagues would take a dim view of Mrs Beuscher's conduct on 26 June 2023. Witness B described Mrs Beuscher's behaviour as *"not very professional."* The panel considered that Mrs Beuscher did not act as a role model to pupils on 26 June 2023 nor did she place the pupils at the forefront of mind when she decided to consume alcohol before the start of the school day.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mrs Beuscher's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel first considered whether the conduct of Mrs Beuscher, in relation to the fact found proved in allegation 2, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel was not satisfied that the conduct of Mrs Beuscher in allegation 2 involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel noted that Mrs Beuscher was not employed as a teacher at the time of the conviction, however, she has since returned to the profession.

Whilst the panel noted the conviction for being in charge of a motor vehicle with excess alcohol was serious, the panel did not consider that Mrs Beuscher's conviction was

directly relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting. The panel again noted that Mrs Beuscher was not employed as a teacher at the time of her conviction and had declared her conviction with Randstad Recruitment Agency when she returned to the profession as a supply teacher.

The panel considered the nature of the offence and noted that the vehicle was stationary despite the keys being in the ignition. The panel was not provided with any evidence to suggest that Mrs Beuscher had driven a vehicle whilst under the influence of alcohol and was not convicted for driving under the influence of alcohol. Therefore, the panel did not consider that Mrs Beuscher's actions had a potential impact on the safety or security of pupils or members of the public in circumstances where the vehicle was stationary.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mrs Beuscher's behaviour in committing the offence could affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community.

The panel noted that Mrs Beuscher'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.

The panel also considered the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

This was a case concerning an offence relating to serious offences involving alcohol which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel was of the view that the conviction of being in charge of a motor vehicle with excess alcohol on 9 May 2021 was serious by its very nature of being in charge of a vehicle having consumed so much alcohol that it considerably exceeded the legal limit. The panel also noted that the keys were in the ignition.

The panel was provided with three statements from individuals, (two former colleagues and a fellow mature student who undertook a degree alongside Mrs Beuscher). The panel noted that such evidence should only be used at this stage to establish the relevance to the teacher's ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that the three statements were relevant when considering Mrs Beuscher's ongoing suitability to teach and decided to admit the statements for the following reasons: there was no suggestion that the three individuals had reason to fabricate their written statements; no objection had been made on behalf of the TRA to their inclusion; the statements did not provide sole and decisive evidence in respect of the allegations and as they were statements of character. The panel also noted the seriousness of the allegations and that they could determine what weight, if any, to place on the statements.

The panel therefore took into account the written evidence that was adduced attesting to Mrs Beuscher's good record as a teacher. [REDACTED].

The panel also took into consideration Mrs Beuscher's account of the emotional difficulties she described at the relevant time. Mrs Beuscher stated in her written statement dated March 2024 that "on 8th May 2021, I visited a friend for dinner. Whilst I was there, she was [REDACTED]. This happened a few days [REDACTED]. On the way home, I drove to a petrol station in Harpenden and bought some wine. I then drove to [REDACTED] as I wanted to be alone (I had a house mate at the time) and drank the wine extremely quickly and fell asleep. [REDACTED] in Harpenden and had fully intended to walk home and pick up my car the next day. However, I unintentionally fell asleep in the car. I was woken by a police officer in the early hours of May 9th 2021. At no time did I drive whilst over the limit and had no intention of doing so."

The panel was sympathetic to Mrs Beuscher's circumstances.

Mrs Beuscher described the "safety net of support" that she has available through her close family and friends. The panel noted that Mrs Beuscher stated that she now has a granddaughter and is trying to live a more healthy lifestyle.

[REDACTED]

The panel noted that the efforts made by Mrs Beuscher to address her behaviour. Mrs Beuscher's subsequent decision to drink alcohol before the start of the school day in June 2023, approximately two years after her conviction for her alcohol related offence in June 2021, gave the panel considerable cause for concern.

In light of the fact that the panel considered that Mrs Beuscher's actions that led to her conviction did not have a potential impact on the safety or security of pupils or members of the public, the panel did not find the conviction to be relevant to the teacher's ongoing suitability to teach. The panel did not consider that a finding that this conviction was a relevant offence was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct or to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

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

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely, the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mrs Beuscher, which involved smelling and appearing under the influence of alcohol in front of young and impressionable pupils, 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 Mrs Beuscher was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Mrs Beuscher was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

In addition to the public interest considerations set out above, the panel went on to consider whether there was a public interest in retaining Mrs Beuscher in the profession. The panel decided that there was a public interest consideration in retaining the teacher in the profession, since no doubt had been cast upon her abilities as an educator.

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.

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

The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours of a teacher have been proved. In the list of such behaviours, those that were relevant in this case were:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- 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);

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

There was evidence that Mrs Beuscher's actions were deliberate. The panel noted that Mrs Beuscher made a conscious decision to consume alcohol before the start of the school day on 26 June 2023 in the knowledge that she would be teaching young, impressionable pupils.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mrs Beuscher was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation. [REDACTED].

The panel was provided with evidence which did show that Mrs Beuscher had a previously good history.

The panel had sight of four references in the hearing bundle which attested to Mrs Beuscher's good character.

Witness C, a friend of Mrs Beuscher, who also provided oral evidence at the hearing stated "I have no concerns regarding Lesley & her safety to practice in her role as a teacher."

A former colleague and friend provided a statement dated 31 January 2025, who stated "I always enjoyed working with Lesley as she made me feel like a valuable member of the class. Her lessons were engaging for the children, and she was a kind and caring teacher who often did more than was needed, such as coming in to prepare, staying late and attending parents' evenings. She was a good teacher and enjoyed her role of sharing knowledge and was dedicated to helping the children learn. She has been a conscientious teacher and very aware of her duty of care to a class of thirty primary school children and her safeguarding responsibilities. She cared deeply and gained the trust of each child and worked hard to support the needs of all the children in her class."

Another former colleague stated in a written statement dated 10 September 2024 that she "often observed Lesley teaching. I observed her to be a very competent, well prepared teacher who enthused the children and encouraged children of all abilities to do their best. Indeed, she was a popular teacher with the children, forming good relationships with the classes she taught due to her empathetic and caring approach to all the children. There was a feeling of mutual respect between Lesley and the children she taught. The wellbeing of the children was always at the core of Lesley's classroom management.

Lesley was always willing to take on extra-curricular activities such as after school clubs or extra duties when a member of staff was ill. She was a reliable and responsible member of the team."

A fellow student and friend of Mrs Beuscher stated in a written statement dated 2 February 2025 “I saw first-hand the rapport that Lesley has with children when I helped with her class river trip. She is witty, caring, capable and very creative. In my opinion, it would be a great loss if she was unable to continue working in primary schools or with children as she still has so much to offer.”

The panel considered that Mrs Beuscher was remorseful for her actions and did admit to the School and Randstad Recruitment Agency that she had consumed alcohol on the 26 June 2023. The panel noted that Mrs Beuscher apologised to her colleague on that day and said that she was very sorry to let the children down.

The panel considered that whilst Mrs Beuscher did show remorse, she lacked a sufficient level of insight in respect of the consequences of her conduct. The panel noted that Mrs Beuscher did not show an in depth understanding in respect of the impact her actions could have had on pupils, parents and her colleagues. The panel also noted that Mrs Beuscher has had ample opportunity to reflect on her conduct and take action to address her behaviour.

The panel was mindful that Mrs Beuscher had described herself as having an “unhealthy relationship with alcohol” and noted that she had taken some steps prior to 26 June 2023 and after this date to attempt to address her behaviour. [REDACTED]. The panel acknowledged the steps Mrs Beuscher had taken to date to address her unhealthy relationship with alcohol but was not convinced that any real stringent action had been put into place. [REDACTED].

The panel noted that there was no evidence to suggest that Mrs Beuscher had attended certificated training courses or programmes to assist her with her unhealthy relationship with alcohol.

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 Mrs Beuscher 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 Mrs Beuscher. The fact that Mrs Beuscher appeared under the influence of alcohol in front of young, impressionable pupils, together with the safeguarding risk was a significant factor

in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

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

The Advice indicates that there are certain types of cases where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period.

None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel's findings.

The Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases 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.

None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel's findings.

The panel noted that these lists are not intended to be exhaustive and panels should consider each case on its individual merits taking into account all the circumstances involved.

The panel again noted that Mrs Beuscher did not show an in depth understanding in respect of the impact her actions could have had on pupils, parents and her colleagues. The panel also noted that Mrs Beuscher has had ample opportunity since June 2023 to reflect on her conduct and take action to address her behaviour. Whilst the panel recognised that Mrs Beuscher has attempted to address her behaviour, the panel was not convinced that Mrs Beuscher had taken sufficient action to persuade the panel that she would not repeat this type of behaviour in the future. This was a considerable concern for the panel.

The panel considered that a review period of 2 years would be an appropriate length for Mrs Beuscher to demonstrate further remedial steps to alleviate the risk of repetition.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provision for a 2-year 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 some of those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. In this case, the panel has found allegation 2 does not amount to a relevant conviction and I have therefore put that matter entirely from my mind.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mrs Lesley Beuscher should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of 2 years.

In particular, the panel has found that Mrs Beuscher 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 Mrs Beuscher involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE) and involved breaches of Working Together to Safeguard Children.

The panel finds that the conduct of Mrs Beuscher fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding of appearing to be under the influence of alcohol whilst working as a teacher.

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 or conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Mrs Beuscher, 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:

“In the light of the panel’s findings against Mrs Beuscher, which involved smelling and appearing under the influence of alcohol in front of young and impressionable pupils, 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 has set out as follows:

“The panel considered that Mrs Beuscher was remorseful for her actions and did admit to the School and Randstad Recruitment Agency that she had consumed alcohol on the 26 June 2023. The panel noted that Mrs Beuscher apologised to her colleague on that day and said that she was very sorry to let the children down.

“The panel considered that whilst Mrs Beuscher did show remorse, she lacked a sufficient level of insight in respect of the consequences of her conduct. The panel noted that Mrs Beuscher did not show an in depth understanding in respect of the impact her actions could have had on pupils, parents and her colleagues. The panel also noted that Mrs Beuscher has had ample opportunity to reflect on her conduct and take action to address her 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 some 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:

“Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mrs Beuscher was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding that Mrs Beuscher had made a conscious decision to consume alcohol before the start of the school day 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 or conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, 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 Mrs Beuscher herself. The panel has commented that “no doubt had been cast upon her abilities as an educator” and that it was “provided with evidence which did show that Mrs Beuscher had a previously good history”. The panel has also noted 4 references which attested to Mrs Beuscher’s good character and teaching practice.

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s comment:

“There was evidence that Mrs Beuscher’s actions were deliberate. The panel noted that Mrs Beuscher made a conscious decision to consume alcohol before the start of the school day on 26 June 2023 in the knowledge that she would teaching young, impressionable pupils.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the panel’s finding about the lack of full insight and its concern about the extent to which Mrs Beuscher had taken action to address her behaviour. The panel has said:

“The panel acknowledged the steps Mrs Beuscher had taken to date to address her unhealthy relationship with alcohol but was not convinced that any real stringent action had been put into place.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Mrs Beuscher 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 insight,

does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended a 2-year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments:

"The panel again noted that Mrs Beuscher did not show an in depth understanding in respect of the impact her actions could have had on pupils, parents and her colleagues. The panel also noted that Mrs Beuscher has had ample opportunity since June 2023 to reflect on her conduct and take action to address her behaviour. Whilst the panel recognised that Mrs Beuscher has attempted to address her behaviour, the panel was not convinced that Mrs Beuscher had taken sufficient action to persuade the panel that she would not repeat this type of behaviour in the future. This was a considerable concern for the panel.

"The panel considered that a review period of 2 years would be an appropriate length for Mrs Beuscher to demonstrate further remedial steps to alleviate the risk of repetition."

I have considered whether a 2-year 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 I agree with the panel that allowing a 2-year review period is sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the safeguarding risk posed by Mrs Beuscher's conduct, the lack of full insight and the need for Mrs Beuscher to demonstrate that she has taken further action to mitigate the risk of repetition.

This means that Mrs Lesley Beuscher is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. She may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 27 April 2027, 2 years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If she does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Mrs Beuscher remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mrs Beuscher has a right of appeal to 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 'David Oatley', with a large, sweeping loop at the end.

Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 23 April 2025

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