



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Ms Sarah Snewin: Professional conduct panel outcome**

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

**May 2025**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	11
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	15

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

**Teacher:** Ms Sarah Snewin

**Teacher ref number:** 1664260

**Date of determination:** 30 May 2025

**Former employer:** The Amicus School, Arundel

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 27 to 30 May 2025 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the joint case of Ms Sarah Snewin and Colleague A.

The panel members were Mrs Monique Clark (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Peter Whitelock (lay panellist) and Ms Mona Sood (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Lucy Churchill of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Mark Millin of Kingsley Napley LLP solicitors.

Ms Snewin was present and was represented by Mr Colin Henderson of the Reflective Practice.

[REDACTED]

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 Ms Snewin was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst working as a teacher at the Amicus School ('the School'):

1. On or around 22 August 2022, she submitted an employer reference to a potential future employer that;
  - a) Was signed by Colleague A purporting to be signed on behalf of the School when she knew or ought to have known they were not authorised to do so; and/or
  - b) She wrote to the future employer purporting to be Colleague A; and/or
  - c) She included two referees that she knew or ought to have known were not authorised to give a reference; and/or
  - d) Omitted her line manager as a referee.
2. On or around 18 October 2022, in relation to an employer reference for Colleague A, she signed the reference form purporting to be signed on behalf of the School when she knew or ought to have known she was not qualified or authorised to do so.
3. Her conduct at paragraphs 1a)-1d) and/or 2:
  - a) Was dishonest; and/or
  - b) Lacked integrity

Ms Snewin admitted allegations 1(a), 1(b), 1(c), 1(d), 2, 3(a) and 3(b), save that in respect of allegation 1(b) she did not admit writing directly to the prospective employer, as set out in her written witness statement dated 28 April 2025.

## 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 9 to 10

Section 2: Notice of hearing and response – pages 11 to 19

Section 3: TRA witness statements – pages 20 to 28

Section 4: TRA documents – pages 29 to 214

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 215 to 269

Skeleton submissions from the presenting officer.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, and the skeleton submissions provided by the presenting officer 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]

The panel also heard oral evidence from Ms Snewin.

## **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 Snewin commenced employment as SEN class teacher at the Amicus Community (‘the School’) on 4 January 2022.

On 22 August 2022 Ms Snewin allegedly submitted a reference to a potential future employer signed by Colleague A (referred to as Colleague A in the allegations) on behalf of the School, who was her colleague, and not “authorised” to have given the reference as an employer. There was allegedly a second referee listed, who was another colleague, rather than her line manager.

On 18 October 2022, Ms Snewin allegedly completed a reference for Colleague A, for him to send to a potential future employer, when she was not “qualified or authorised” to do so.

On 5 January 2023, the matter was referred to the TRA.

## Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

The panel found the following particulars of allegation 1 against you not proved, for these reasons:

- 1. On or around 22 August 2022, you submitted an employer reference to a potential future employer that;**
  - a) Was signed by Colleague A purporting to be signed on behalf of the School when you knew or ought to have known they were not authorised to do so; and/or**
  - b) You wrote to the future employer purporting to be Colleague A; and/or**
  - c) You included two referees that you knew or ought to have known were not authorised to give a reference; and/or**
  - d) Omitted your line manager as a referee.**

The panel heard that Ms Snewin submitted an application form for employment via [REDACTED] (an employment agency) on 25 July 2022.

The panel considered the [REDACTED] employer reference, and noted the following:

- The employer reference form was provided by [REDACTED] (not the employing school).
- Colleague A was listed as the referee name.
- The employer reference form was signed by Colleague A and dated 22 August 2022.

The panel considered an email from Individual A of [REDACTED] to Colleague A dated 22 August 2022, confirming Ms Snewin had given [REDACTED] permission to contact him for a reference and asked him to complete it as soon as possible so that Ms Snewin could start work in September.

The panel noted that the bundle did not contain, and it was not taken to, any contemporaneous documentary evidence to demonstrate who sent the employer reference to [REDACTED] on or around 22 August 2022.

The panel considered Colleague A's written response to the TRA's notice of referral in June 2023, in which he "confessed" to affixing his signature on the reference for Ms Snewin and subsequently sending it to [REDACTED].

The panel noted the content of Ms Snewin's written statement prepared on 24 November 2022 responding to the School's disciplinary allegations. She stated that the reference provided on 22 August 2022 was provided by her colleague (Colleague A) and was sent by her colleague.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Ms Snewin, who stated that due to her experience with the School, she deliberately omitted Witness A as a reference on the forms because she was sure she would get an unsatisfactory reference from her and instead put Colleague A's name down as they had agreed on or around 22 July 2022, as he was also looking for a job at the time.

Ms Snewin stated that [REDACTED] sent Colleague A a reference request on 22 August 2022 and he texted her to say he did not know some of the details such as her date of birth, salary, start date, disciplinary record, safeguarding record and her reason for leaving the School. Ms Snewin provided him with the information so that he could complete the form. Ms Snewin clarified that she did not write to the future employer herself, but gave Colleague A these details so that he could complete the reference request. She stated that these details were information that only her line manager would know and not her colleague.

The panel considered the [REDACTED] application form completed by Ms Snewin on 25 July 2022 which asked her to provide "*two professional references*" with one from her "*most recent employment*" within a school. The panel noted that Ms Snewin included Colleague A and a former colleague from her previous employment as referees. The panel noted that the employer reference, which is the subject of allegation 1, did not contain details of two referees.

The panel concluded based on the evidence that Colleague A submitted the employer reference to a potential future employer on or around 22 August 2022, and therefore due to the construction of allegation 1 (which stated that Ms Snewin had submitted the reference), it was not open to the panel to find any part of the allegation proven.

The panel found allegations 1(a), 1(b), 1(c) and 1(d) not proven.

The panel found the following particulars of allegations 2 and 3 against you proved, for these reasons:

**2. On or around 18 October 2022, in relation to an employer reference for Colleague A, you signed the reference form purporting to be signed on behalf of the School when you knew or ought to have known you were not qualified or authorised to do so.**

The panel considered the reference form completed by Ms Snewin for Colleague A.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Witness A who stated that on 24 November 2022, she was contacted by [REDACTED] and informed that Ms Snewin had provided a reference for Colleague A. Witness A stated that this was an employer reference and should not have been provided to [REDACTED] by Ms Snewin as she was not the employer of Colleague A.

Witness A stated that Colleague A was a colleague of Ms Snewin and explained that it was discovered that Ms Snewin had provided a reference for Colleague A in the capacity of an employer. She stated that Ms Snewin completed this reference on 18 October 2022, and responded ‘*employer*’ to the question ‘*in what capacity are you providing this reference.*’

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Ms Snewin, who stated that in September 2022, Colleague A asked if she would provide a reference for him which she agreed to do. She explained that she was limited to options from a drop-down box when responding to the question: ‘*In what capacity are you providing this reference?*’ and completed it as the employer. She explained that she confirmed her position as SEN therapeutic class teacher on the reference.

Ms Snewin admitted that she made no attempt to contact the prospective employer at any time to advise them she was not providing the reference for Colleague A as his employer.

The panel noted Ms Snewin’s evidence that she knew that she was not authorised to provide a reference on behalf of the School, and was not in a position to do so, because as a colleague of Colleague A’s she was unaware of his disciplinary and safeguarding record. Ms Snewin was solely reliant on information provided by Colleague A to complete these fields.

Ms Snewin explained that the reference was completed via an on-line portal, and the panel was satisfied that, by providing the reference in this manner and confirming that the information provided was true and factual to the best of her knowledge, she in effect “*signed*” the reference.

The panel found allegation 2 proven.

### **3. Your conduct at paragraphs 1a)-1d) and/or 2:**

**a) Were dishonest; and/or**

**b) Lacked integrity**

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Ms Snewin, who admitted that she was dishonest and that her conduct lacked integrity. She stated in her written and oral evidence that she had reached a mutual agreement with Colleague A to



provide one another with a reference to avoid their line manager potentially providing them with a poor reference. She stated that her conduct was out of character, and that she took full accountability for her mistake.

The panel firstly considered whether Ms Snewin had failed to act with integrity in relation to the proven facts of allegation 2.

The panel considered the case of *Wingate & Anor v The Solicitors Regulation Authority*.

The panel considered that Ms Snewin had failed to act within the higher standards expected of a teacher in that she completed and signed a reference form in the capacity of the employer for Colleague A when she was not qualified or authorised to do so.

The panel was mindful that pre-employment checks are an important part of the process in the education sector, particularly from a safeguarding perspective, and it is vital that an accurate reference should be provided.

The panel found that Ms Snewin had failed to act with integrity by deliberately completing a reference for a colleague as an employer when she was not qualified or authorised to do so.

The panel went on to consider whether Ms Snewin had acted dishonestly in relation to the proven facts of allegation 2. In reaching its decision on this, the panel considered the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd t/a Crockford*.

The panel firstly sought to ascertain the actual state of Ms Snewin's knowledge or belief as to the facts. The panel considered, that by her own admission, she had knowingly provided a reference for a colleague on behalf of the employer when she was not qualified or authorised to do so.

The panel considered whether Ms Snewin's conduct was dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people. The panel found that Ms Snewin's conduct was objectively dishonest.

The panel found allegations 3(a) and 3(b) proven.

### **Findings as to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute**

Having found allegations 2 and 3 proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations 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 Ms Snewin, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Ms Snewin 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
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel also considered whether Ms Snewin'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 none of these offences were relevant.

The panel considered that Ms Snewin's misconduct was at the lower end of the scale, involving an isolated incident whereby she sought to mislead a potential employer as to the capacity in which she provided a reference, the content of which was unreliable.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Ms Snewin in relation to her adverse personal circumstances which she stated clouded her judgement at that time. The panel accepted this evidence but did not consider that Ms Snewin was unaware of the impropriety of her actions.

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

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

In relation to whether Ms Snewin'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 Ms Snewin'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 Ms Snewin was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that none of these offences were relevant.

As set out above in the panel's findings as to whether Ms Snewin was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel considered the mitigation evidence of Ms Snewin.

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

For these reasons, the panel found that Ms Snewin's actions 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, 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 maintenance of public confidence in the profession;
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In light of the panel's findings against Ms Snewin in that she sought to mislead a potential employer as to the capacity in which she provided a reference, the content of which was unreliable, there was a strong public interest consideration in declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Snewin 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 Ms Snewin was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

In addition to the public interest considerations set out above, the panel agreed there was a public interest in retaining Ms Snewin in the profession. The panel noted the evidence of Witness A who stated that Ms Snewin was a good teacher who showed commitment to very challenging children. Further, in her oral evidence, Witness A confirmed that, putting the allegations to one side, she would re-employ Ms Snewin and that she “*could have been supported to flourish as a creative 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.

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 Snewin.

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:

- dishonesty or a lack of integrity; and
- collusion
  - failure to challenge inappropriate actions;
  - encouraging others to break rules.

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 no evidence that Ms Snewin’s actions were not deliberate.
- There was no evidence that Ms Snewin was acting under extreme duress.
- Ms Snewin did have a previously good history, having demonstrated high standards in her professional conduct and having contributed significantly to the

education sector. The panel accepted that the incident was out of character, and isolated in nature.

The panel considered that Ms Snewin showed a high level of remorse for and insight into her actions.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Ms Snewin where she explained her [REDACTED].

Ms Snewin explained that she was signed off work for a week from 11 July, and that Witness A's reaction and lack of support regarding her personal circumstances made her decide to look for a new role. In particular that:

- she received messages from Witness A that made her feel guilty for being absent from work due to illness and putting her own health first; and
- during an all-staff group session her certified sickness absence was challenged by her teaching assistants, and despite Witness A being present and aware of Ms Snewin's challenging personal circumstances she did not intervene as her line manager.

Ms Snewin stated that she has learnt a hard lesson, and understands that despite her personal circumstances, she undermined the transparency and trust of educators. She stated that she deeply regretted her misconduct and the impact it has had, and that she is committed to learning from her mistake.

The panel considered the character references by the following individuals, submitted on behalf of Ms Snewin. The panel noted that they positively attested to Ms Snewin's ability as a teacher, and all confirmed that they were aware of the allegations against Ms Snewin.

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]

- *“Based on my professional experience of Sarah, I have no reason to question her honesty or integrity. She always presented herself as trustworthy and professional in her role, and I never witnessed anything that would cause concern. While I did not work with her closely day-to-day, she was liked by colleagues and made a positive contribution to the school community. From what I know of her character and conduct, I believe she has the qualities to continue making a valuable contribution to the teaching profession.”*

[REDACTED]

- *“Sarah is a brilliant teacher. She is kind and so caring in the way she looked after my daughter; she has additional needs and so needed a lot of her time.”*

[REDACTED]

- *“Sarah is a compassionate, dedicated, and highly capable teacher/ leader who brings warmth, structure, and professionalism to her role and her classroom. As a teacher, she shows a supportive learning environment where students feel safe, valued, and encouraged to reach their full potential. She demonstrates strong leadership qualities. Sarah continues to have the upmost respect from ex colleagues with who she has worked with over the years in multiple settings.”*

[REDACTED]

- *“She would be present with her students and they all looked to her as a positive figure, even on days when they were not behaving the best.”*

[REDACTED]

- *“Sarah is a hard working individual, she takes pride in her work and teaching abilities with young children. At her time at the Farm Sarah worked in the classroom with children, where she would give her full attention to the students she was working with and encourage them to try their best and push themselves to achieve their best potential.”*

[REDACTED]

- *“Sarah has been honest as a teacher and asked for support when she has needed it. She has always acted professionally when I worked with her. She was able to take on responsibilities with a professional and successful attitude. When disclosing safeguarding concerns, she worked with the safeguarding leads whilst maintaining her professionalism. I believe in the right supportive school environment Sarah will flourish and will be able to heal the negative wounds that she may have due to previous teaching posts and personal troubles she has suffered.”*

[REDACTED]

- *“I believe that Sarah should be retained in the teaching profession. I feel that she has much to offer in her role as a teacher and that she will continue to make a positive difference to the lives of children in her classes. I consider Sarah to be an honest person who usually demonstrates integrity, and I believe that this incident is completely out of character. I know that she deeply regrets the mistake that she has made and has learnt from this experience.”*

[REDACTED]

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, the recommendation of no prohibition order would be both a proportionate and an appropriate response.

Given that the nature and severity of the behaviour were at the less serious end of the spectrum and, having considered the mitigating factors that were present, the panel determined that a recommendation for a prohibition order would not be appropriate in this case. The panel was satisfied that Ms Snewin had shown insight and remorse for her actions, that the incident was an isolated one which she would not repeat and therefore did not pose a risk to pupils or the profession.

The panel considered that the publication of the adverse findings it had made was sufficient to send an appropriate message to the teacher as to the standards of behaviour that are not acceptable, and the publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession.

## **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 sanction.

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. In this case, the panel has found some of the allegations not proven, including allegations 1(a), 1(b), 1(c) and 1(d). I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Ms Snewin should not be the subject of a prohibition order. The panel has recommended that the findings of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, should be published and that such an action is proportionate and in the public interest.

In particular, the panel has found that Ms Snewin 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
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

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

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 and 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 Ms Snewin 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 was mindful that pre-employment checks are an important part of the process in the education sector, particularly from a safeguarding perspective, and it is vital that an accurate reference should be provided." 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, "The panel considered that Ms Snewin showed a high level of remorse for and insight into her actions." 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 considered that public



confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Snewin was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of dishonesty and lack of integrity in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

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

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of unacceptable professional conduct and 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 Ms Snewin and the panel comment “the panel agreed there was a public interest in retaining Ms Snewin in the profession. The panel noted the evidence of Witness A who stated that Ms Snewin was a good teacher who showed commitment to very challenging children. Further, in her oral evidence, Witness A confirmed that, putting the allegations to one side, she would re-employ Ms Snewin and that she *“could have been supported to flourish as a creative teacher”*.”

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments concerning the lack of insight or remorse. The panel has said, “Ms Snewin stated that she has learnt a hard lesson, and understands that despite her personal circumstances, she undermined the transparency and trust of educators. She stated that she deeply regretted her misconduct and the impact it has had, and that she is committed to learning from her mistake.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding that “The panel was satisfied that Ms Snewin had shown insight and remorse for her actions, that the incident was an isolated one which she would not repeat and therefore did not pose a risk to pupils or the profession.”

I have given weight in my consideration of sanction to the contribution that Ms Snewin has and could continue to make to the profession. Supported by the panel’s view of the character references “The panel noted that they positively attested to Ms Snewin’s ability

as a teacher, and all confirmed that they were aware of the allegations against Ms Snewin.”

For these reasons, I have concluded that a prohibition order is not proportionate or in the public interest. I consider that the publication of the findings made would be sufficient to send an appropriate message to the teacher as to the standards of behaviour that were not acceptable and that the publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'SABuxcey', with a stylized, cursive script.

**Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey**

**Date: 5 June 2025**

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