



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Ms Lauren Jenkins: 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	13
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	16

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

Teacher: Lauren Jenkins

Teacher ref number: 0836490

Teacher date of birth: 20 December 1985

TRA reference: 21494

Date of determination: 30 April 2025

Former employer: Merlin Top Primary Academy, Keighley

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 29 and 30 April 2025 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Ms Lauren Jenkins.

The panel members were Mr Paul Hawkins (lay panellist – in the chair), Ms Wendy Shannon (lay panellist) and Ms Hannah Foster (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Ben Schofield of Blake Morgan LLP.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Alex Mullen, instructed by Kingsley Napley LLP.

Ms Jenkins was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public 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 12 February 2025 and as amended in the preliminary application.

It was alleged that Ms Jenkins had been convicted of a relevant offence, namely:

1. On or around 11 March 2022, she was convicted of driving a motor vehicle with excess alcohol on 20 February 2022, contrary to section 5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988.
2. On or around 23 September 2022, she was convicted of possessing, without good reason or lawful authority, in a public place, a bladed article, namely 2 knives, on 4 August 2022, contrary to section 139(1) and (6) of the Criminal Justice Act 1988.

It was further alleged that Ms Jenkins was also guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that whilst working as a Teacher at Merlin Top Primary School:

3. She failed to notify her employer that she was:
 - a. arrested on 4 August 2022, on suspicion of possession of a bladed article(s) and/or assault; and/or
 - b. convicted of the offence(s) as set out at paragraph 1 and/or 2.
4. By reason of her conduct at paragraphs 3a) and/or 3b) above she:
 - a. acted dishonestly; and/or
 - b. demonstrated a lack of integrity.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology and anonymised pupil list – pages 3 to 4

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 5 to 11

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 12 to 16

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 17 to 151

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 152 to 159

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

Witnesses

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

Witness A – [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.

Ms Jenkins was employed at Merlin Top Primary Academy (the “School”) since 2009 as a Key Stage 2 teacher. In 2022, a number of events occurred in Ms Jenkins life outside of the School, which involved interactions with the criminal justice system. As a result of those interactions, the School began its own internal investigation. That process did not conclude as Ms Jenkins resigned her position at the School in October 2022.

Following her resignation, the School made a referral to the TRA, which has resulted in this hearing.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

1. On or around 11 March 2022, you were convicted of driving a motor vehicle with excess alcohol on 20 February 2022, contrary to section 5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988.

Before the panel was a memorandum of conviction from West Yorkshire Magistrates’ Court. It showed that Ms Jenkins had pleaded guilty on 11 March 2022 to an offence of driving on a public road on 20 February 2022 whilst the proportion of alcohol in her breath was 101 microgrammes of alcohol in 100 millilitres of breath (the legal limit being 35 microgrammes).

The memorandum also recorded that Ms Jenkins was later sentenced to a 24 month driving disqualification, a 12 month community order (consisting of up to 15 days of rehabilitation activities) and costs/surcharges of £180.

Also before the panel were copies of evidence relied on in the criminal proceedings, including the police case summary, witness statements and exhibits. The evidence set out that Ms Jenkins was seen driving into a shop carpark by an off-duty police officer. He

was concerned by Ms Jenkins presentation and called 999 as he believed she may have been intoxicated. Ms Jenkins was arrested and provided a breath specimen which placed her around three times over the limit.

The panel took into account the document known as *Teacher Misconduct: The Prohibition of Teachers*, which is further referred to as “the Advice”. The Advice sets out (at paragraph 15):

“[T]he panel will accept the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction, unless exceptional circumstances apply.”

The panel saw no reason to depart from the advice and therefore in light of the memorandum in the evidence, the panel found this allegation proved.

2. On or around 23 September 2022, you were convicted of possessing, without good reason or lawful authority, in a public place, a bladed article, namely 2 knives, on 4 August 2022, contrary to section 139(1) and (6) of the Criminal Justice Act 1988.

Before the panel was a memorandum of conviction from North Yorkshire Magistrates’ Court. It showed that Ms Jenkins pleaded guilty on 23 September 2022 to an offence of being in possession of a bladed article in a public place on 4 August 2022.

The memorandum also recorded that Ms Jenkins was sentenced to a period of imprisonment of 12 weeks, suspended for a period of 12 months along with costs/surcharges of £239. It recorded that the court was of the view that the offence crossed the custody threshold as it was committed whilst Ms Jenkins was subject to a community order for the previous drink drive offence.

It further recorded that:

“The Magistrates stepped back from imposing an immediate custodial sentence because the knives were not brandished and were not found until the defendant’s bag was searched by the Police therefore no one at the scene was aware they were in the defendant’s possession. [REDACTED]”

Also before the panel were copies of evidence relied on in the criminal proceedings, including the police case summary, witness statements and exhibits. The evidence set out that police were called to a disturbance [REDACTED] address. [REDACTED]. However, due to Ms Jenkins being intoxicated, there was an altercation between her [REDACTED]. When the police searched her, two large kitchen knives were found in her bag.

The panel again took into account the Advice and saw no reason to depart from it and therefore in light of the memorandum in the evidence, the panel found this allegation proved.

3. You failed to notify your employer that you were:

a. arrested on 4 August 2022, on suspicion of possession of a bladed article(s) and/or assault; and/or

b. convicted of the offence(s) as set out at paragraph 1 and/or 2.

The panel heard evidence from Witness A, the [REDACTED].

Witness A explained that around 27 February 2022, he received a call from Ms Jenkins in which she was upset and told him she had done 'something silly' and had been working up the courage to tell him about the event. She explained that she had been caught drink driving and could no longer drive as a result.

Witness A stated that he had not taken any contemporaneous notes of the call with Ms Jenkins, nor had any related emails available, as all the School's emails are deleted after a 6 month period. Witness A explained in his evidence, he recalled receiving this call at the end of the half term, likely on the Sunday, which looking back at a calendar now, gave a date of 27 February.

Witness A's evidence was that Ms Jenkins was then absent from the School from that point [REDACTED]

On 17 August 2022, Witness A was called into a [REDACTED] meeting. [REDACTED]. During this meeting, Witness A was informed by [REDACTED] that there had been an event where Ms Jenkins had attended [REDACTED] address on 4 August 2022 with two large kitchen knives in her bag and the police were involved. Witness A confirmed that prior to learning this from the [REDACTED], he had not been aware of any incident. During this meeting, the [REDACTED] informed Witness A that an allegation of assault had also been made against Ms Jenkins.

Witness A explained that on 27 August 2022, Ms Jenkins texted him saying she was not returning to the School and to further communicate with her [REDACTED]. During this opportunity, Ms Jenkins did not make any mention of the incident.

As a result of the concern's raised, the School started its own internal investigation, however Ms Jenkins resigned from her position at the School on 21 October 2022, so this process was not completed.

Witness A stated that at no point did Ms Jenkins inform him of the arrest in August or the subsequent conviction in September. Witness A said that he first found out about the conviction through seeing it in a newspaper report.

Witness A produced a copy of the School's code of conduct, which set out:

"11. Conduct Outside of Work

11.1 Employees must not engage in conduct outside of work which has the potential to:

11.2 Affect or is likely to affect the suitability of the employee to undertake their job role or work with students.

11.3 Impact on the operation or reputation of the Trust.

11.4 Seriously undermine the trust and confidence that the Trust had in an employee to undertake their job role or with our students.

The above actions may be the subject of disciplinary action, which could lead to dismissal.

12. Duty to Disclose

12.1 Employees have a duty to immediately disclose to the nominated officer prior to the start of their employment, at the start of their employment or during the course of their employment, any change in their circumstances or any information which may affect or is likely to affect the suitability of the employee to undertake their job role or work with students.

12.2 Should an employee be unclear about whether it is appropriate to disclose a matter they are encouraged to seek guidance from their nominated officer at the earliest opportunity"

Witness A's evidence was that updates to the code were sent out to all staff by email, albeit he could not produce the specific email as a result of the School's retention policy.

Also before the panel, were copies of the Local Authority Designated Officer's meeting minutes which took place on 16 September 2022, in which a police officer in attendance at the meeting confirmed that Ms Jenkins had been arrested for both the bladed article and assault allegations. Furthermore, a witness statement (prepared for the criminal proceedings) by the arresting officer confirming she arrested Ms Jenkins on suspicion of possession of a bladed article and assault on 4 August 2022. Further documents before the panel showed that the police ultimately took no further action regarding the alleged assault.

Whilst there was no specific provision in the code of conduct relating to the disclosure of interactions with the criminal justice system, the panel was satisfied that the above quoted provisions created a duty to disclose in these circumstances. The panel took into account that code of conducts are regularly drafted with 'high-level' language and could

not be expected to cover every potential eventuality. The panel considered it would still be clear to any member of the profession, through their working knowledge of areas such as the Teachers' Standards, Keeping Children Safe in Education, Working Together to Safeguard Children, Safer Recruitment and the associated Disclosure and Barring Service checks, that a duty would arise in these circumstances to disclose. The panel noted its view on this duty was also shared by Witness A, himself an experienced practitioner in the profession.

The panel noted that Ms Jenkins was said to have made reference to having lost her driving licence in the call to Witness A. On the chronology advanced by the TRA's case, this call appeared to take place before the conviction took place and would be the first instance that any driving disqualification (whether interim or substantive) could be imposed. This meant that either Witness A was not right about the date (which the panel noted was based purely on Witness A's recollection and not any contemporaneous documentary evidence) or that Ms Jenkins was unclear or used slightly imprecise language when informing him of the issue. Furthermore, the panel noted that regardless of these points, Ms Jenkins had effectively informed Witness A of the core issue at hand.

Taking into account these factors, the panel was not satisfied that the TRA had discharged its burden with sufficiently cogent evidence in proving that Ms Jenkins had failed in her duty to disclose the drink drive conviction.

The evidence regarding the bladed article and assault was clear on Witness A's evidence, namely that there had been no communication from Ms Jenkins regarding the August incident. Whilst the panel noted that Ms Jenkins [REDACTED], Ms Jenkins was still able to fully participate in criminal proceedings and was able to communicate with the School (as seen on 27 August 2022). Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that that Ms Jenkins was still capable of providing the required disclosure to the School. Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that it was more likely than not that Ms Jenkins failed to disclose this information.

Therefore, the panel found paragraph 3(a) proved in full and 3(b) proved in so far as it applied to paragraph 2.

4. By reason of your conduct at paragraphs 3a) and/or 3b) above you:

a. acted dishonestly; and/or

b. demonstrated a lack of integrity.

The panel firstly considered what Ms Jenkins state of mind would have been at the time.

The panel noted the evidence showed that:

- Ms Jenkins had a full understanding of the police and court events as she was the central participant in that investigation and resulting proceedings.
- Ms Jenkins was an experienced teacher who must have understood the importance of a school's code of conduct and the requirement to follow it.
- As an experienced teacher, Ms Jenkins would have a developed understanding of areas such as the Teachers' Standards, Keeping Children Safe in Education, Working Together to Safeguard Children, Safer Recruitment and the associated DBS checks and the resulting duty on her to disclose.
- The evidence demonstrated that Ms Jenkins knew she had this obligation, as she had made relevant disclosures regarding the earlier drink driving incident in February of that year.
- The evidence that Ms Jenkins 'had to work up the courage' to disclose the drink drive incident showed that she was fully aware of the repercussions that such a disclosure would have.
- There was no evidence of any other explanation for Ms Jenkins actions either offered by Ms Jenkins or available in the evidence before the panel.

With those factors in mind, the panel was satisfied that the evidence demonstrated that Ms Jenkins actions were more likely than not to have been a purposeful decision not to inform the School. It was in effect actions which were taken to conceal this information from the School. The panel considered that the ordinary decent person would consider that a person purposefully failing in an obligation to disclose information which would have negative consequences to them as acting in a dishonest nature.

Having found dishonesty present, the panel recognised that such conduct was inherently lacking in integrity.

Therefore, the panel found this allegation proved in full.

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

Relevant conviction

The panel first considered whether the conduct of Ms Jenkins, in relation to the facts found proved at paragraphs 1 and 2, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Ms Jenkins 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 democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs

Criminal behaviour is a type of behaviour which our society deems to be such a significant wrongdoing that it allows the state to impose serious punishment in response. The panel noted Ms Jenkins actions had attracted censure in the criminal courts and therefore could not be said to be in keeping with fundamental British values.

The panel further noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offences could have had an impact on the safety and security of members of the public. The risks to the public in drink driving and being in possession of knives are self-evident and need little explanation in these reasons. Of some concern to the panel was the inconsistency in the various accounts in the evidence in which Ms Jenkins appeared to provide an explanation for the possession of the knives. These included: that she forgot they were in the bag, that she had intended to use them for [REDACTED] and that she intended to use them for damaging [REDACTED] car.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Ms Jenkins behaviour in committing the offences 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 Ms Jenkins behaviour in relation to the knife offence ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, albeit that it was suspended, which was indicative of the seriousness of the offence committed.

The panel also considered the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice. These were cases concerning offences involving:

- possession of prohibited firearms, knives or other weapons
- serious driving offences, particularly those involving alcohol or drugs

In considering those factors, the panel was satisfied that both offences would amount to relevant convictions.

Unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute

The panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations at paragraphs 3 and 4 amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2 of the Teachers' Standards, Ms Jenkins was in breach of the following:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - 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...

The panel considered that Ms Jenkins actions not to follow the code of conduct was a serious failing, falling far below the expected behaviour of a teacher. Ms Jenkins actions in not disclosing the knife offence significantly undermined the School's ability to risk assess and potentially take measures needed to safeguard pupils, albeit the panel recognised that Ms Jenkins did not present herself at the School to teach at any point following the knife incident.

The panel also considered whether Ms Jenkins 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 "*fraud or serious dishonesty*" was relevant.

In consideration of these factors the panel was satisfied that Ms Jenkins was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Ms Jenkins 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 Ms Jenkins 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 Ms Jenkins was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that "*fraud or serious dishonesty*" was relevant.

The panel considered that Ms Jenkins conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher. The panel was satisfied that such conduct would significantly undermine the trust placed in the profession by parents and community and a finding that such conduct would amount to disreputable conduct was required to re-affirm the standards of the profession and maintain confidence in it.

For these reasons, the panel found that Ms Jenkins actions also constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct, conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and convictions 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/the protection of other members of the public
- the maintenance of public confidence in the profession
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct

In the light of the panel's findings against Ms Jenkins, which involved offences which placed the public at a risk of physical harm, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and other members of the public. Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Jenkins were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession. The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Ms Jenkins 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 Ms Jenkins 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 and she is able to make a valuable contribution to the profession.

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

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;
- 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;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions or purposeful destruction of evidence, especially where these behaviours have been repeated or had serious consequences, or involved the coercion of another person to act in a way contrary to their own interests;
- possession of prohibited firearms, knives or other weapons;

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.

The panel reviewed the factors set out at page 18 of the Advice, but considered none of these factors were present.

The panel heard evidence from Witness A regarding Ms Jenkins abilities as a teacher. He described her as a 'fantastic' teacher and as a result of her abilities, he had assigned her to the later year groups in the School.

[REDACTED]

In the absence of any meaningful engagement in these proceedings, there was no evidence of Ms Jenkins remorse or insight into the concerns raised by her conduct. This left the panel in a position where it could not be satisfied to any meaningful degree that such conduct would not re-occur in the future.

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

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

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

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Ms Jenkins. The significant factors in forming this opinion were:

- There was an ongoing risk to pupils and the public.
- A need to re-affirm standards and maintain confidence in the profession.
- The multiple offending and dishonest behaviours.

Whilst there is some limited evidence that Ms Jenkins had ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed the interest in retaining Ms Jenkins 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 a high level of integrity and ethical standards at all times.

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 case where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period. None of the listed factors were engaged by the panel's findings.

The Advice also further 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. This included "fraud or serious dishonesty" which the panel considered a relevant factor.

The panel noted that three years had now passed in which Ms Jenkins did not appear to have been able to successfully manage the [REDACTED]. The panel did not consider that such [REDACTED] concerns were irremediable. However, the panel considered that there would have to be evidence of a significant period of time in which Ms Jenkins was able to demonstrate that those [REDACTED] concerns were managed to a degree which suggested the risk of repetition of similar misconduct was materially diminished.

Taking account of these factors, the panel considered that a 5 year review period was appropriate and proportionate.

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 some of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and a relevant conviction. The panel found allegation 3(b) proved in part, I have therefore put all other matters from my mind.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Ms Jenkins 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 democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs
 - 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.

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding which involved offences which placed the public at a risk of harm, and conduct found to be dishonest and that lacked integrity.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the

profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself, whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct, conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute and a relevant conviction, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Ms Jenkins, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children/safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, "In the light of the panel's findings against Ms Jenkins, which involved offences which placed the public at a risk of physical harm, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and other members of the public." A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, "In the absence of any meaningful engagement in these proceedings, there was no evidence of Ms Jenkins remorse or insight into the concerns raised by her conduct. This left the panel in a position where it could not be satisfied to any meaningful degree that such conduct would not re-occur in the future." In my judgement, the lack of evidence of insight or remorse means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, "The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Ms Jenkins behaviour in committing the offences could affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community." I am particularly mindful of the serious findings in this case and the impact that such findings have on the reputation of the profession.

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

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

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Ms Jenkins herself and the panel comment “The panel heard evidence from Witness A regarding Ms Jenkins abilities as a teacher. He described her as a ‘fantastic’ teacher and as a result of her abilities, he had assigned her to the later year groups in the School.”

A prohibition order would prevent Ms Jenkins 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 considered that Ms Jenkins actions not to follow the code of conduct was a serious failing, falling far below the expected behaviour of a teacher. Ms Jenkins actions in not disclosing the knife offence significantly undermined the School’s ability to risk assess and potentially take measures needed to safeguard pupils, albeit the panel recognised that Ms Jenkins did not present herself at the School to teach at any point following the knife incident.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that “Whilst there is some limited evidence that Ms Jenkins had ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed the interest in retaining Ms Jenkins 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 a high level of integrity and ethical standards at all times.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Ms Jenkins 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 evidence of remorse or insight, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended a 5 year review period.

I have considered the panel’s comments “The panel noted that three years had now passed in which Ms Jenkins did not appear to have been able to successfully manage the [REDACTED] The panel did not consider that such [REDACTED] concerns were irremediable. However, the panel considered that there would have to be evidence of a significant period of time in which Ms Jenkins was able to demonstrate that those

[REDACTED] concerns were managed to a degree which suggested the risk of repetition of similar misconduct was materially diminished.”

In this case, factors mean that allowing a lesser review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the seriousness of the finding, the dishonesty found and the lack of evidence of insight or remorse.

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

This means that Ms Lauren Jenkins 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 13 May 2030, 5 years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If she does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Ms Jenkins remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Ms Jenkins 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 'SABuxcey', with a stylized, cursive script.

Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey

Date: 6 May 2025

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