



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Ms Julie White-Zamler: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

June 2025

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	6
Findings of fact	7
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	23
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	27

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

Teacher: Ms Julie White-Zamler

TRA reference: 22009

Date of determination: 13 June 2025

Former employer: University Technical College Oxfordshire, Oxfordshire; Aureus Secondary School, Oxfordshire

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 9 June 2025 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Ms Julie White-Zamler (“Ms White-Zamler”).

The panel members were Ms Jo Palmer-Tweed (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Ian McKim (lay panellist) and Mr Stephen Chappell (lay panellist).

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

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Leah Redden of Browne Jacobson LLP Solicitors.

Ms White-Zamler was present and was represented by Ms Lorraine Mensah of Counsel.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 24 January 2025.

It was alleged that Ms White-Zamler was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that:

1. Whilst employed as a Special Educational Needs Coordinator at UTC Oxfordshire and/or Deputy Headteacher Pastoral at Aureus Secondary School, she engaged in and/ or developed an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A, by;
 - a. Sending inappropriate messages to Pupil A on his personal mobile phone by:
 - i. Sending love heart(s) and/or emojis;
 - ii. Stating she loved Pupil A;
 - iii. Referring to Pupil A as 'babe' or using words to that effect;
 - iv. Stating 'NO MF is replacing me...I am still going to be 100% in your fucking life. Drug dealer or not' or using words to that effect;
 - v. Stating 'you've done drugs exploitation now you can try sex exploitation' or using words to that effect;
 - vi. Stating 'so WTF was today all about? I'm not sure I get where you are at currently so feeling a bit confused. It'd be nice to spend some actual (quality) time together' or using words to that effect
 - vii. Sending pictures of her and Pupil A
 - b. Messaging Pupil A on Facebook Messenger;
 - c. Calling Pupil A on his mobile number;
 - d. Meeting with Pupil A outside of school hours;
 - e. Driving Pupil A in her car alone to his and/or the care home
 - f. Allowing Pupil A to stay in contact with her after she had left her role at UTC Oxfordshire;
2. Whilst employed as a Deputy Headteacher Pastoral at Aureus Secondary School she engaged in inappropriate and/or unprofessional behaviour towards Pupil B by making a comment that Pupil B had big 'boobs' or making a comment to that effect.

Ms White-Zamler admitted the facts of the allegations and that some of her conduct was inappropriate but denied that her conduct met the threshold for unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Anonymised pupil list – page 7

Section 2: Chronology – page 9

Section 3: Notice of referral, proceedings and response – pages 11 to 42

Section 4: Statement of Agreed and Disputed Facts – pages 44 to 48

Section 5; Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 50 to 70

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 72 to 285

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 288 to 397

The panel also received two video recordings from Ms White-Zamler's interview with the police.

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

- Statement of Agreed and Disputed Facts – pages 398 to 402
- Witness Statement of Ms White-Zamler dated 3 June 2025 – pages 403 to 427
- Photographs – pages 408 to 409
- Character Reference – page 410

The panel members confirmed that they had read all the documents within the bundle and viewed the videos in advance of the hearing and the additional documents that the panel decided to admit.

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]

Witness B – [REDACTED]

Witness C – [REDACTED]

Witness D – [REDACTED]

Ms White-Zamler also gave oral evidence and called the following witnesses:

Witness E – [REDACTED]

Witness F – [REDACTED]

Witness G – [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 White-Zamler commenced employment at University Technical College Oxfordshire (“the College”) in September 2018. Ms White-Zamler was employed as a member of the senior leadership team and as part of her role she was the Special Educational Needs and Disabilities Coordinator (“SENDCo”).

Pupil A joined the College in September 2020. Pupil A was considered to be a vulnerable pupil. Ms White-Zamler was a member of the multi-agency safeguarding team that worked to support Pupil A and his family.

In around February 2022, Pupil A [REDACTED]. Pupil A requested that Ms White-Zamler be a ‘family and friend’ contact [REDACTED]. Ms White-Zamler was contacted by Pupil A’s parents [REDACTED] in respect of the request and Ms White-Zamler agreed to the being a designated ‘family and friend’ contact. Following Ms White-Zamler’s designation as a ‘family and friend’ contact, she was vetted by staff [REDACTED] and informed that Pupil A could communicate with her by phone as needed. [REDACTED]. At this point, Ms White-Zamler’s personal telephone number was provided to Pupil A [REDACTED], and Ms White-Zamler received Pupil A’s contact number from [REDACTED] Pupil A later returned to the College.

Ms White-Zamler later ceased employment with the College, and her last day on site was 27 May 2022. She later commenced employment at Aureus Secondary School (“the School”) immediately afterwards in June 2022. Ms White-Zamler was employed as the Deputy Head Pastoral which included acting as the Designated Safeguarding Lead (“DSL”).

Before Ms White-Zamler's departure from the College, Pupil A requested whether he could remain in contact with Ms White-Zamler after she had left the College.

[REDACTED] raised no objection and Pupil A's parents were supportive of Ms White-Zamler remaining a designated contact point, notwithstanding her departure from the College, as they considered her a 'friend of the family'. The headteacher at the School was made aware of this arrangement. The role of a 'friend of the family' was not defined.

On 22 February 2023, the Local Authority Designated Officer ("LADO") service was contacted by Thames Valley Police who informed the team that they had accessed and viewed text messages between Ms White-Zamler and Pupil A as part of Pupil A being arrested by the police about an unrelated matter. Pupil A's phone was seized by the police and the police found around 1700 messages between Ms White-Zamler and Pupil A. The text messaging commenced when Pupil A was a pupil at the College and whilst Ms White-Zamler was employed by the College and continued during her employment by the School.

A position of trust meeting was held on 23 February 2023. Ms White-Zamler was arrested on the same day under the Sexual Offences Act. Ms White-Zamler was later released on bail.

Ms White-Zamler ceased employment with the School in or around April 2023.

On 19 May 2023, the police decided that no further action would be taken.

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. Whilst employed as a Special Educational Needs Coordinator at UTC Oxfordshire and/or Deputy Headteacher Pastoral at Aureus Secondary School, you engaged in and/ or developed an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A, by:

a. Sending inappropriate messages to Pupil A on his personal mobile phone by:

ii. Stating you love Pupil A;

Ms White-Zamler admitted that she stated that she loved Pupil A. The panel found Ms White-Zamler to be consistent when providing her evidence in relation to this allegation.

In a written statement provided to the TRA on 24 September 2023, Ms White-Zamler stated *"This happened on 31/05/2022 on my last day at the UTC and two other UTC Year*

11 pupils ([REDACTED]) finished their science GCSE exam at around 10:30 and came to see me to say goodbye. [Pupil A] came at the same time. We sat and talked and then [Pupil A] stood up to leave and told me had bought me a present. He said the card was from his Mum and Dad, but that the present was from him. He then left. I opened the present in front of the girls and cried as it was very moving, thanking me for what I had done for him (I have attached a photo). One of the girls ([REDACTED]) said I deserved it and that he would probably be dead if it was not for me and the help I had given him. I said that was not true, but I have tried to care about him. The pupil said that I have cared for them all and that they 'love me'. I thanked her. I sent [Pupil A] the message saying I love you then."

Ms White-Zamler stated in her oral evidence that *"I wish I hadn't written that. I said it to reassure a little boy who I believed was worried about me. I wish I hadn't said that in all my heart."*

The panel had sight of the text communications. The panel observed that Ms White-Zamler may have been mistaken as to the date of her last day at the College. There was no text message from Ms White-Zamler to Pupil A on 31 May 2022. However, on 27 May 2022, which was a Friday, Ms White-Zamler did send a message saying *"I love you man child."*

At this time, Ms White-Zamler was the SENDCo and Pupil A was a pupil at the College. The panel considered that it was inappropriate to state that she loved Pupil A. The panel noted that this type of language could blur the professional teacher-pupil boundary.

As the panel found this sub particular proved, it went on to consider whether this amounted to Ms White-Zamler engaging in and/ or developing an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A. This determination was made after considering all of the sub particulars of 1(a) and is set out below.

iv. Stating 'NO MF is replacing me...I am still going to be 100% in your fucking life. Drug dealer or not' or using words to that effect;

Ms White-Zamler admitted that she used the wording as alleged to Pupil A.

The panel had sight of the text message which was sent by Ms White-Zamler on 20 May 2022 which stated *"...NO MF is replacing me and that not [sic] vacancy exists. I am still going to be 100% in your fucking life. Drug dealer or not..."*

In a written statement provided to the TRA on 24 September 2023, Ms White-Zamler stated *"This was a statement of reassurance to [Pupil A]. As you know from previous statements, it had been agreed that I would stay in contact with [Pupil A]. He was concerned how this would work, for example if he went to prison, or had problems and I [sic] this statement attempted to reassure him that I would be 'in his life'. The use of language was hyperbole for emphasis and reflected vernacular language."*

The panel had sight of the police interview recording whereby Ms White-Zamler was referred to a number of messages. This text message was included in those messages identified by the police.

When questioned, Ms White-Zamler stated in oral evidence that the “*MF*” reference in this message meant “*motherfucker*”. Ms White-Zamler explained that she sent this message as Pupil A “*was raging*” because he didn’t want her to be replaced when she left her role at the College. Ms White-Zamler stated “*to be clear, I don’t think I could have been replaced. I had done a lot of things that a lot of people couldn’t replace.*”

Witness B was referred to this message during her evidence. She stated that she was not aware of this message and that it was a potential concern as it questioned whether Ms White-Zamler was sharing everything with the relevant individuals. Witness B later agreed with the teacher’s representative that the context of the messages between Ms White-Zamler and Pupil A is absolutely everything.

The panel found Witness B to be a consistent and balanced when providing her evidence.

The panel heard evidence from Witness G who was called on behalf of the teacher. Witness G explained that [REDACTED], including Pupil A. Witness G explained that as part of working in this environment “*you would have to differentiate yourself to build rapport*” with the children. This would include “*reflecting their language as it builds trust and rapport*”. Witness G stated that it is “*really hard to engage with the most disengaged people*” and that “*part of that is using colourful language.*”

The panel found that Witness G provided an honest account when describing his involvement with challenging youth behaviour.

The panel acknowledged that this message was sent when Ms White-Zamler was the SENDCo and Pupil A was a pupil at the College. The panel also recognised that Ms White-Zamler was also considered to be a ‘friend of the family’ during this time.

The panel did not consider that the use of language was appropriate when considering her professional role, especially as it was referencing criminality without any criticism. The panel also recognised that Witness G was not a teacher and would have more freedom in the types of language he adopted. In contrast, Ms White-Zamler was subject to the regulatory framework of the teaching profession which puts limits on a teacher’s behaviour. The panel considered that the gratuitous swearing, in this instance, was not appropriate in Ms White-Zamler’s professional role.

As the panel found this sub particular proved, it went on to consider whether this amounted to Ms White-Zamler engaging in and/ or developing an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A. This determination was made after considering all of the sub particulars of 1(a) and is set out below.

v. Stating ‘you’ve done drugs exploitation now you can try sex exploitation’ or using words to that effect;

Ms White-Zamler admitted that she used the wording as alleged to Pupil A.

The panel had sight of the text message which was sent by Ms White-Zamler on 18 June 2022 which stated *“Actually thinking about it that is not a bad new idea for a business model for you. You’ve done drugs exploitation now you can try sex exploitation.”*

In a written statement provided to the TRA on 24 September 2023, Ms White-Zamler stated *“As I told the Police in my interview, this was said as a joke. I should not have made it. This followed a comment made by a professional to him that he might get into other types of exploitation and that he was vulnerable to that. He had laughed about the fact that due to his background he would not be vulnerable to that. My comment was ironic and a private joke based around this. Its purpose was to reinforce with humour that I knew he would not be involved in that type of crime. People involved in dealing with tricky mental health often use ‘black’ humour to make light of tough comments and experiences and situations. I am no different.”*

Witness C was questioned about this text message during the hearing. She said that she *“didn’t know where the sexual exploitation”* came from. This is what give rise to concern in the police.

The panel considered that Ms White-Zamler’s reference to drug and sex exploitation was clearly inappropriate. The panel understood from Ms White-Zamler’s oral evidence that this text message was in reference to a [REDACTED] Pupil A. Ms White-Zamler explained that this she her attempt to use humour to make him aware that he was at risk of potentially exploiting her. This further narrative provided by Ms White-Zamler was not wholly consistent with her written evidence in respect of this allegation.

The panel noted that, looking at the context of this message and the conversation that they were engaging in, the suggestion of [REDACTED] was raised spontaneously by Ms White-Zamler in response to a message from Pupil A to the effect that he was short of funds. None of the surrounding messages appeared to the panel to have anything to do with the risk of Pupil A indulging in sexual exploitation of others. The panel considered that the text messages exchanged in the hours preceding this message were largely appropriate until Ms White-Zamler introduced this particular topic.

The panel noted that the text message was ill-judged and demonstrated a complete disregard for her professional responsibilities. Whilst Ms White-Zamler was no longer a member of staff at the College where Pupil A was a pupil, she was still employed in the teaching profession as a senior member of staff at a different school.

As the panel found this sub particular proved, it went on to consider whether this amounted to Ms White-Zamler engaging in and/ or developing an inappropriate

relationship with Pupil A. This determination was made after considering all of the sub particulars of 1(a) and is set out below.

vi. Stating ‘so WTF was today all about? I’m not sure I get where you are at currently so feeling a bit confused. It’d be nice to spend some actual (quality) time together’ or using words to that effect

Ms White-Zamler admitted that she used the wording as alleged to Pupil A.

The panel had sight of the text message sent by Ms White-Zamler on 19 May 2022 which stated *“so WTF was today all about? I’m not sure I get where you are at currently so feeling a bit confused. It’d be nice to spend some actual (quality) time together as I haven’t seen you much this week.”*

In a written statement provided to the TRA on 24 September 2023, Ms White-Zamler stated *“When I was seeing him at the UTC regularly i.e. when he attended school full time and before he went on study leave we saw each other at least once a week for a face to face check in and he also met with other staff daily. [REDACTED]. When I no longer had a framework for seeing him i.e. a regular slot the only way for me to check in was text. At that time he had stopped reliably answering messages and his parents were experiencing the same. I was concerned ‘where he was at’ ie [REDACTED]. I wanted to see him to check this out and feed back.”*

During oral evidence, Ms White-Zamler stated that the use of the term ‘quality time’ had minimal significance as this was the type of language she would use with anybody she might have been arranging to see. However, the panel was concerned that, in this instance, the use of the term reflected a potential departure from the professional oversight which she ought to have been providing at this time.

The panel considered that as this message was sent when Ms White-Zamler was still employed at the College where Pupil A was a pupil, it was inappropriate to have sent a message to suggest that she would like to spend quality time with him.

As the panel found this sub particular proved, it went on to consider whether this amounted to Ms White-Zamler engaging in and/ or developing an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A. This determination was made after considering all of the sub particulars of 1(a) and is set out below.

vii. Sending pictures of you and/or Pupil A

Ms White-Zamler admitted that she sent pictures to Pupil A.

In the Statement of Agreed and Disputed Facts, signed by Ms White-Zamler on 7 May 2025, it stated that *“Ms White-Zamler accepts that she sent one picture of her and Pupil A (together with 4 other people) (in December 2022 whilst employed at Aureus School)”*.

The panel noted that this was made in response to the unamended allegation. The panel accepted that this was the only photograph in which she and Pupil A appeared together. Following the panel's determination that the amendment be permitted, the teacher then identified three further photographs within its scope.

On 17 May 2022, Ms White-Zamler sent a picture of a year group photograph which she took when she attended her induction day at (Aureus) School, before commencing employment as it was on a wall in the School. The panel was informed by Ms White-Zamler that the year group photograph included Pupil A in the image. Following this, she said *"And are (of course) gorgeous."*

On 3 June 2022, Ms White-Zamler sent two photographs to Pupil A of a group photograph of herself with friends dressed up on holiday, one wearing comedy masks and the other with the masks removed. The panel had sight of these photographs as they were admitted as late evidence.

The fourth photograph, as she had previously admitted, was sent by Ms White-Zamler to Pupil A in December 2022. Ms White-Zamler stated that the photo was taken by another adult on the evening of the College prom, in June 2022, and forwarded to her later. There was a group of people in the photograph, including Ms White-Zamler and Pupil A.

The panel considered that sending the photographs of Pupil A's year group and her holiday pictures referred to above were inappropriate to send to Pupil A as there was no reason for sending these images. The panel noted that Pupil A [REDACTED] in a safe environment when she sent the photographs from her holiday and this occurred a few days after she had left the College. The panel noted that this was an ideal opportunity for Ms White-Zamler to draw a professional boundary which she appeared not to have taken. The panel considered that the photographs were sent on Ms White-Zamler's own volition to engage in communication with Pupil A, when there was no need to do so.

The panel did not consider that the sending of the prom photograph was inappropriate when considering the context of the messages.

As the panel found this sub particular proved, it went on to consider whether this amounted to Ms White-Zamler engaging in and/or developing an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A. This determination was made as follows, after considering all of the sub particulars of 1(a).

The panel considered whether the proven sub particulars (a)(ii), (a)(iv), (a)(v), (a)(vi) and (a)(vii) amounted to Ms White-Zamler engaging in and/or developing an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A.

The panel firstly noted that there was no evidence to suggest that the messages were sent to engage in and/or develop a romantic or sexual relationship, nor was she seeking to exploit her position.

The panel noted the context of the messages and concluded that Ms White-Zamler was, in many concerning cases, instigating the messaging as opposed to Pupil A initiating the communications. The panel recognised that Ms White-Zamler was undoubtedly in a position of trust whilst employed by the College. The panel acknowledged that following her departure from that position, her relationship with Pupil A was less formally defined; however, the panel's view was nevertheless that her continued status as a senior teacher at another educational institution, and the fact that her relationship with Pupil A had originated out of a formal position of trust, required her to continue to have regard to appropriate professional boundaries. The panel noted that the relaxed, informal and inappropriate tone of the proven sub allegations blurred the professional boundary.

Witness B said during her oral evidence that *"it is harmful to have an inappropriate contact relationship with the child if you are a professional."*

This blurring of the professional boundary had the potential to give Pupil A a confused impression about how he should be engaging with professionals in the future. The panel therefore found allegation 1(a) proved in respect of sub particulars a(ii), (a)(iv), (a)(v), (a)(vi) and (a)(vii) in that she engaged in and/or developed an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A.

b. Messaging Pupil A on Facebook Messenger;

Ms White-Zamler admitted that she messaged Pupil A on Facebook Messenger.

In a written statement provided to the TRA on 24 September 2023, Ms White-Zamler stated *"This happened after I left the UTC, so when I was a friend of the family. I used FB messenger when I was away on holiday and did not want to text as it cost money. An example of this was when [Pupil A] called to tell me his GCSE results."*

In oral evidence, Ms White-Zamler explained that Pupil A had opened up the conversation on Facebook Messenger and she *"didn't think"* when she responded to congratulate him on his GCSE results.

The panel recognised that responding to a former pupil on Facebook Messenger, a social media platform, opened up another method of communication which had the potential to blur the professional boundary. This method of communication is widely regarded within the teaching profession as an inappropriate form of communication with pupils and/or former pupils. Ms White-Zamler acknowledged that this was generally the case, although she did not concede that she acted inappropriately. However, in the panel's view, whilst Ms White-Zamler was now employed by the School, she was still a member of the teaching profession and her conduct in using Facebook Messenger contributed to the development of an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A.

The panel found allegation 1(b) proved.

d. Meeting with Pupil A outside of school hours;

Ms White-Zamler admitted that she met with Pupil A outside of school hours.

In the Statement of Agreed and Disputed Facts, signed by Ms White-Zamler on 7 May 2025, it stated that *“When she was employed at the UTC this constituted going on a walk on two occasions (17/4/22, 31/5/22) with Pupil A ([REDACTED]) and when she was employed at Aureus School meeting him at his home (with parents present) and buying Pupil A take away meals from McDonalds including on one occasion (2/9/22) to celebrate his exam results... Ms White-Zamler accepts that allegation 1d occurred but does not accept that it contributed to developing an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A or that it was unacceptable professional conduct or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.”*

In a written statement provided to the TRA on 24 September 2023, Ms White-Zamler stated *“Before 05/06/2022 – I met with [Pupil A] once with his Dad in the Easter holidays. Parents [REDACTED]. I think I went once more during the Easter holidays. I picked him up from the Airbnb where he was housed and took him for a walk around [REDACTED].... After 06/06/2022 I met with [Pupil A] at his parents house except on one occasion (19/12/2022 at 2pm). On each occasion I took him to Mcdonalds, bought him food and brought him back home. We ate food, talked and played pool.... On 19/12/2022 I took him to a pub for Christmas lunch. We were there for 1.25 hours in total and ate in the family dining area. This was supposed to be a treat for Christmas.”*

The panel did not consider that the majority of Ms White-Zamler’s contact with Pupil A outside school hours developed an inappropriate relationship when considering the setting. The panel also accepted that other professionals and Pupil A’s parents were aware of Ms White-Zamler’s contact with Pupil A outside of school, given her role as ‘friend of the family’.

However, the panel did not consider that taking a former pupil to the pub for Christmas lunch was appropriate and by doing this she did contribute to the development of an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A. The panel acknowledged that if a colleague or member of Pupil A’s [REDACTED] had seen them together in a pub setting it may have caused questions to be raised about the appropriateness of their relationship. The panel noted the presence of alcohol in an adult pub setting, which was different to the other settings in which Ms White-Zamler had met with Pupil A outside of school.

The panel therefore found allegation 1(d) proved, solely in respect of the occasion when Ms White-Zamler took Pupil A to the pub on 19 December 2022.

2. Whilst employed as a Deputy Headteacher Pastoral at Aureus Secondary School you engaged in inappropriate and/or unprofessional behaviour

towards Pupil B by making a comment that Pupil B had big ‘boobs’ or making a comment to that effect.

Ms White-Zamler admitted that she had made a comment that Pupil B had big ‘boobs’ or made a comment to that effect.

In a written statement provided to the TRA on 24 September 2023, Ms White-Zamler stated *“this was an unfortunate choice of word. I was trying to be friendly (I had been in daily conflict with her since my arrival at Aureus as she was very high need and non compliant and unsafe for other students and her behaviour reflected that) and I was trying to be nicer. It was the wrong thing to say (she took off her hoodie at my request and her blouse was all over the place and I told her to correct it because of said appendages). She didn’t like my comment and it made her feel uncomfortable and I totally acknowledged that, had a restorative with a supportive adult (for her) and apologised. I was very cautious of her moving forward and always dealt with her with witnesses moving forward.”*

In another written statement to the TRA, Ms White-Zamler stated *“In a public corridor, I commented to Pupil B regarding her clothing, attempting to encourage her to adjust her attire appropriately. The comment was poorly worded, and she later reported feeling uncomfortable. I immediately apologised in a mediated conversation with her key worker. The headteacher reported the incident to the LADO for consultation. No further action was taken, and I accepted guidance on language choice.”*

In oral evidence, Ms White-Zamler stated that she was challenging Pupil B’s non-uniform clothing and requested that she take off her hoodie. When Pupil B took off her hoodie, Pupil B’s shirt was gaping, and her lingerie was revealed. Ms White-Zamler stated that she told her to *“sort yourself out”*. She said, *“I didn’t need to make the comment around big boobs.”*

Witness A described Pupil B as being *“vulnerable”* and having *“volatile behaviour.”*

Witness A was questioned by the teacher’s representative on whether she recalled any allegations made by Pupil B which had the reference to “boobs”. Witness A said *“I honestly don’t know. There had been an issue with bras and boobs and nothing was substantiated.”*

The panel noted that there was no evidence to suggest that there was any malice intended by Ms White-Zamler’s poor choice of words, but did consider that the use of language was inappropriate as Ms White-Zamler was an experienced member of staff in a senior position at the School. The panel noted that Ms White-Zamler should have been setting an example in her position and should have known better than to use this terminology when referring to a pupil’s dress.

The panel found allegation 2 proved.

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

- 1. Whilst employed as a Special Educational Needs Coordinator at UTC Oxfordshire and/or Deputy Headteacher Pastoral at Aureus Secondary School, you engaged in and/ or developed an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A, by;**
 - a. Sending inappropriate messages to Pupil A on his personal mobile phone by;**
 - i. Sending love heart(s) and/or emojis;**

Ms White-Zamler admitted that she sent love hearts and emojis to Pupil A. The panel found Ms White-Zamler to be consistent when providing her evidence.

In a written statement provided to the TRA on 24 September 2023, Ms White-Zamler stated *"I have until this point in my life, not attributed any significance to the use of emojis. They were (until my involvement in this process) something I used without too much thought of any deeper meaning. I used love heart emojis frequently and with a wide variety of people. I considered them to be a short cut. For me love heart meant like/love and I considered this to be vernacular language. Since I have been more aware of my emoji use (ie following this allegation) I have noted that emoji use is prolific and love hearts etc are used in place of 'like' and to show agreement."*

Witness C stated in her oral evidence that emojis will have *"different meanings"* to different people and that they can be open to interpretation.

The panel had sight of text messages in the bundle. The panel noted that Ms White-Zamler had sent various emojis to Pupil A, such as smiley faces, laughing faces and love heart emojis as part of her text communications.

The panel noted that the text messages containing the emojis were sent between May 2022 and February 2023 when Ms White-Zamler was employed as a member of the teaching profession in her roles at the College and School. Pupil A was a pupil and Ms White-Zamler was the SENDCo at the College during May 2022. The panel acknowledged that Ms White-Zamler was also considered to be a 'friend of the family' during this time (as explained in further detail above). Whilst she remained in contact with Pupil A as a 'friend of the family', the panel noted that she was still a member of the teaching profession between May 2022 and February 2023 and the use of emojis presented a lack of formality, which set an informal tone from the outset of the communications.

The panel acknowledged that the use of emojis can be open to interpretation. The panel considered that it was particularly unwise for Ms White-Zamler to use love hearts in her

communications with Pupil A when she was in a teacher-pupil relationship; however, considering the usage of the emojis in the round, the panel did not consider that the use of the emojis in the text messages was inappropriate. The panel noted that Ms White-Zamler may have been using the emojis to better engage with Pupil A who was from a younger generation.

Therefore, the panel did not find sub particular (a)(i) proved.

iii. Referring to Pupil A as ‘babe’ or using words to that effect;

Ms White-Zamler admitted that she referred to Pupil A as ‘babe’. The panel found Ms White-Zamler to be consistent when providing her evidence.

The panel had sight of several text messages where Ms White-Zamler had referred to Pupil A as babe. For example, on 11 May 2022 at 13:23, Ms White-Zamler stated *“It’s quarter past and your exam is next week babe.”* On 28 May 2022, she said *“I’ll take whatever I can get babe.”* On 13 June 2022 she said, *“How was interview babe”*.

The panel noted that the text messages containing the word babe were sent over a period of time when Ms White-Zamler was employed as a member of the teaching profession in her roles at the College and School. The panel acknowledged that Ms White-Zamler was also considered to be a ‘friend of the family’ during this time.

When questioned, Witness A described Ms White-Zamler as a *“very caring and sympathetic member of staff”*. Witness A was asked whether she would use the word babe and said, *“I wouldn’t be using that language.”*

The panel noted, considering its knowledge and experience of the teaching profession, that sometimes softer language is used to connect with pupils. The panel also considered this particular set of circumstances and noted that softer language may have been a suitable approach to engage Pupil A. The panel therefore considered that it was not inappropriate to refer to Pupil A as babe in these circumstances.

Therefore, the panel did not find sub particular (a)(iii) proved.

c. Calling Pupil A on his mobile number;

Ms White-Zamler admitted that she called Pupil A on his mobile number.

In a written statement provided to the TRA on 24 September 2023, Ms White-Zamler stated *“I tended to communicate mostly in person and by text. I used the phone call when he was not okay or needed to talk things through. Sometimes he called to ask for help. I had been given his number by [REDACTED] and my assumption was that I should use it to continue with the type of conversations we had been having when [REDACTED] ie him processing his day and its challenges, talking about difficulties and being real about*

where he was at. I understood that I was being allowed to have this as a result of my role in his support plan...

The panel did not consider that Ms White-Zamler's conduct in calling Pupil A developed an inappropriate relationship with him as other professionals were aware of her calls with Pupil A. Indeed, this line of communication was put in place as part of the overall support plan. The panel heard evidence from Ms White-Zamler that the calls made to Pupil A whilst he was in [REDACTED] were recorded. The panel did not have sight of the transcripts from the recorded calls.

The panel did not find allegation 1(c) proved.

e. Driving Pupil A in your car alone to his and/or the care home

Ms White-Zamler admitted that she drove Pupil A in her car alone to his home [REDACTED]

In the Statement of Agreed and Disputed Facts, signed by Ms White-Zamler on 7 May 2025, it stated that *"Ms White-Zamler accepts allegation 1e occurred but does not accept that it contributed to developing an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A and does not accept that it was unacceptable professional conduct or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute."*

In a written statement provided to the TRA on 24 September 2023, Ms White-Zamler stated *"Before 05/06/2022 – I drove [Pupil A] back [REDACTED] when the taxi did not turn up. In every case [REDACTED] and parents were aware of this and UTC HT also aware."*

The panel had sight of two letters dated 23 and 24 April 2024 from Pupil A. The panel considered that these letters contained relevant contextual information about Pupil A's contact with Ms White-Zamler and were fair to consider on the basis that no objection was raised as to their inclusion within the papers, they provided helpful context and did not contain sole and decisive evidence in respect of the allegations.

In his letter dated 23 April 2025, Pupil A stated *"While I was a student at the UTC, JWZ had my phone number and I had hers, [REDACTED]. On one occasion, when my taxi didn't arrive, she gave me a lift to [REDACTED]. My parents, the [REDACTED], and the UTC Headteacher were all aware of our communication and supportive relationship. It was understood that this contact was helpful for me, and no concerns were ever raised."*

In oral evidence, Ms White-Zamler gave evidence of various car journeys which was consistent with the previous written evidence.

Based on the evidence available, the panel did not consider that Ms White-Zamler's conduct in driving Pupil A in her car alone to his home or care home developed an

inappropriate relationship with Pupil A, in circumstances where this was sometimes a necessity and professionals were aware of this contact.

The panel did not find allegation 1(e) proved.

f. Allowing Pupil A to stay in contact with you after you had left your role at UTC Oxfordshire;

Ms White-Zamler admitted that she allowed Pupil A to stay in contact with her after she had left her role at the College.

In the Statement of Agreed and Disputed Facts, signed by Ms White-Zamler on 7 May 2025, it stated that *"Ms White-Zamler accepts that allegation 1f occurred but does not accept that it contributed to developing an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A or that it was unacceptable professional conduct or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute."*

In a written statement provided to the TRA on 24 September 2023, Ms White-Zamler stated *"...I had no understanding or awareness of that the fact [Pupil A] asked me to stay in his life during a [REDACTED] and that his parents actively wanted this was a concern. [REDACTED] called the HT of UTC in June 2022 and asked her how she was 'managing me leaving' and she told her (to my knowledge) that I intended to stay in contact with him as parents had said I was a friend of the family. As I was constantly giving intel to TVP and YJT I would have expected concerns to be raised if the relationship should not have continued. Yet again, no objection was raised and I had no reason to think there were any concerns around me being in contact with him. I attended a meeting in September 2022 with [Pupil A] and [REDACTED] from LADO. At this meeting I was 'a trusted adult' for [Pupil A] as he had requested I attend. My HT [REDACTED] was also aware of me attending this meeting. It was organised by a member of the YJT [REDACTED] and he invited me at [Pupil A's] request. All were aware of this and again no concerns were raised."*

The panel recognised that Ms White-Zamler was considered 'a friend of the family' and that Pupil A's parents, [REDACTED] and colleagues were aware of, in that capacity, Ms White-Zamler would continue to provide support to Pupil A after she had left her role at the College. The panel did not consider that this led to Ms White-Zamler engaging in or developing an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A.

The panel did not find allegation 1(f) proved.

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

Having found allegations 1(a), 1(b), 1(d) and 2 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.

The panel did not consider that proven allegation 2 met the threshold for unacceptable professional conduct as it was not misconduct of a serious nature, falling significantly short of the standard of behaviour expected of a teacher. The panel therefore considered whether the proven findings of fact in allegations 1(a), 1(b) and 1(d) amounted to unacceptable professional conduct.

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 White-Zamler, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Ms White-Zamler was in breach of the following standard:

- 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

The panel was not satisfied that the conduct of Ms White-Zamler, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education (“KCSIE”).

The panel was not satisfied that the conduct of Ms White-Zamler, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Working Together to Safeguard Children.

The panel also considered whether Ms White-Zamler’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 was relevant.

The panel noted that the conduct referred to in allegations 1(a), 1(b) and 1(d) primarily took place outside the education setting. The conduct in sending inappropriate text messages as found proven did have the potential to affect the way in which Ms White-

Zamler fulfilled her professional role at the College and the School. By communicating in an informal and unprofessional manner, using inappropriate language blurred the teacher-pupil boundary during her time at the College. The panel noted that even when Ms White-Zamler left the College, she was then employed at the School in a professional, senior position and still subject to the regulatory framework of the profession. Whilst Ms White-Zamler was considered to be a 'friend of Pupil A's family', this did not excuse the unprofessional and inappropriate language used in the text communications with Pupil A.

The panel recognised that Ms White-Zamler became emotionally involved with Pupil A and as a professional, in light of this, should have reflected on her professional duties and her ability to fulfil her various roles effectively. Ms White-Zamler in her oral evidence recognised that she needed to at least try and put some distance between herself and Pupil A, and this led to her applying for alternative jobs and possibly taking up her position at the School. However, this measure did not create sufficient distance and Ms White-Zamler went on to say "*I cannot imagine why I did not take myself away.*"

The panel also found that that responding to a former pupil on Facebook Messenger, a social media platform, opened up another method of communication which blurred the professional boundary. The panel also considered that that taking a former pupil to the pub for Christmas lunch was inappropriate and had blurred the professional boundary.

When considering the above conduct, it had the potential for Pupil A to have been exposed to or influenced by the behaviour in a harmful way. This was supported by evidence given by Witness B. The blurring of the professional boundary had the potential to give Pupil A a confused understanding about how he should be engaging with professionals in the future.

The panel recognised that Ms White-Zamler was an experienced professional, with 9 years of teaching experience. She was also the SENDCo at the College and DSL at the School. The panel recognised the high level of responsibility that comes with these roles.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the proven conduct of Ms White-Zamler 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 White-Zamler was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

Disrepute

The panel did not consider that proven allegation 2 met the threshold for conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute as it was not conduct that could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher, therefore bringing the teaching profession into disrepute. The panel therefore considered whether the proven findings of fact in

allegations 1(a), 1(b) and 1(d) amounted to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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

The findings of misconduct are serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher.

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

The panel acknowledged that if a colleague or member of Pupil A's [REDACTED] had seen Ms White-Zamler and Pupil A in a pub setting it may have raised concerns about their relationship.

The panel recognised that Ms White-Zamler's conduct did appear to be well intended, however she became emotionally involved with Pupil A and as a professional, should have reflected on her professional duties and adjusted her behaviour accordingly.

The panel recognised that none of Ms White-Zamler's proven conduct negates the significant positive impact she had on Pupil A, however the panel considered that Ms White-Zamler's proven conduct did have the potential to impact how Pupil A might engage with other professionals in the future. The blurring of the professional boundaries had the potential to give Pupil A a confused understanding about how he should be engaging with professionals going forwards.

For these reasons, the panel found that Ms White-Zamler'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 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, 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 Ms White-Zamler, which involved a finding that her conduct contributed to the development of an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A, through her inappropriate text communications and the other behaviour as set out above, 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 Ms White-Zamler 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 White-Zamler 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 White-Zamler in the profession.

The panel decided that there was a public interest consideration which weighed in favour of 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 contribution to the profession.

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 White-Zamler.

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;
- collusion ... including:
 - failure to challenge inappropriate actions...

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 Ms White-Zamler's actions were deliberate.

The panel noted the submissions made by the teacher's representative in that Ms White-Zamler was acting under extreme duress due to the fluctuating nature of the serious concerns she and others had for Pupil A, the way her involvement appeared to have been condoned by other professionals, and the emotional impact it had and has had on her. The panel acknowledged the pressures on Ms White-Zamler who worked to support Pupil A and his family, but there was no evidence to suggest that Ms White-Zamler was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation.

Ms White-Zamler did have a previously good history and was a well-respected colleague. The panel had sight of twenty character references for Ms White-Zamler. Three of the individuals who provided references (Witness E, Witness F and Witness G) gave evidence at the hearing.

Witness E, a former colleague, stated that he had worked alongside Ms White-Zamler for almost 6 years. Witness E taught Pupil A in Year 11 whilst he was at the College. He said that Pupil A *"benefitted enormously from his work and time with Julie. She held him to high standards, and he would follow rules and instructions for Julie that he wouldn't always follow for other members of authority. [Pupil A] needed Julie in his life at the most tumultuous of times, and Julie obliged with care and kindness above anything. Julie, in her role as SENCo and Assistant Principal, didn't prioritise [Pupil A] over other students, continuing to teach high quality lessons, and continuing to support high profile students in our school. [Pupil A's] time with Julie was restricted, which encouraged him to follow rules and tow the line like any other student would have had to in our school. In my*

professional and personal opinion, Julie did a truly outstanding job at protecting and supporting [Pupil A].

When Julie left UTC in Easter 2022, it was a difficult transition for [Pupil A]. With agreement from the [REDACTED], [Pupil A's] parents, [REDACTED] and external agencies, Julie continued to contact [Pupil A] via text, and would meet with him on an adhoc basis. This was in plain sight of the rest of the UTC, and neither Julie or [Pupil A] behaved in a secretive way as if this was something against the rules. Julie would meet with [Pupil A] at his house, continuing to support [Pupil A] parents and would always report safeguarding concerns to the relevant teams.

Julie is, and has always been, an exceptional pastoral leader. She is inspirational, committed and selfless, more so than any other person I have worked with. Julie is innovative and creative, and has set up groups of students that she worked with closely to better support their learning and life experiences. Julie embodies everything that a pastoral leader should be.”

Witness E stated in oral evidence that Ms White-Zamler “cared for every pupil that we ever worked with.”

Witness F, a former colleague of Ms White-Zamler at the School, stated “I have known Julie since she began her role as Deputy Head in charge of Behaviour and Safeguarding at Aureus in June 2022. In my six years at the school, Julie has been one of the best line managers I’ve had. From the start, I felt supported and listened to by her.

Upon joining Aureus, Julie immediately set to work improving the behaviour and safeguarding systems in what was a very challenging school environment. She took decisive actions that others, including myself, had been attempting for some time. Julie quickly made the school a safer place by streamlining and strengthening the CPOMS system—a development recognised in a recent Ofsted monitoring visit. She also took on the responsibility for addressing historical safeguarding cases that were still outstanding, showing a strong sense of leadership and accountability to cases that had not involved her in the first place.

Julie brought challenge and rigour to our leadership meetings, fostering greater accountability and driving forward actions that helped the school progress. This often met resistance from some who were reluctant to embrace change, but her approach was exactly what the school needed on its journey towards securing a ‘Good’ rating from Ofsted. Julie also helped the leadership team by encouraging us to recognise our own strengths and weaknesses, which proved invaluable in strengthening our collective efforts.”

In oral evidence, Witness F said that Ms White-Zamler “cared a lot for Pupil A...the family were very supportive and were calling on Julie to help with his challenging behaviour.”

Witness G, a [REDACTED] who had worked with Pupil A, stated *“Julie is a passionate and emotionally invested professional; I have no doubt that she wants the best for all of the students she has supported. Julie has a natural approach to supporting young people, which builds trust and empathy, and is non-judgemental; this was certainly the case with [Pupil A] and other similar YPs at UTC. As previously stated, [Pupil A] did take advantage of Julie's approach, which I do feel affected the relationship they had. It certainly created a greater sense of anxiety for Julie regarding how it would even be possible to keep [Pupil A] safe. I do remember that I was asked to provide [REDACTED] to the Police in regards to [Pupil A] at the time; I explained this to Julie and advised her to ensure she and the team were provided with supervision and support regarding these difficult times.”*

The panel was of the view that Ms White-Zamler was truly sorry and remorseful for her conduct. The panel considered that Ms White-Zamler's conduct, whilst inappropriate, was well-intended due to her concern for Pupil A, who was a vulnerable pupil with very challenging behaviour.

The panel also considered that Ms White-Zamler did show a level of insight in respect of the impact that her misconduct had on herself and others. In a written response to the TRA, Ms White-Zamler stated *“I now recognise that my judgement about what constituted appropriate professional behaviour was significantly affected by the dual relationship that had developed between myself and Pupil A. This was particularly evident in the tone and content of the text messages I sent during that period (Allegation 1a). I allowed myself to communicate in a manner that, while familiar and comforting to Pupil A, was not appropriate within the boundaries of a teacher–pupil relationship.*

My over-involvement, even when well-intentioned, undermined safeguarding principles and risked misinterpretation and the fact that as a teacher I had a responsibility to maintain the appropriate professional distance at all times.

Viewed in isolation—especially by a third party unfamiliar with the context, history, or multi-agency dynamics—the informality of my language and style of my texts could easily be misunderstood. I accept that such communication, although not harmful in content, reflected a blurring of roles and poor professional judgement on my part.”

The panel also noted that since Ms White-Zamler's referral to the TRA, she stated that she has *“voluntarily stepped away from teaching, undertaken [REDACTED], completed qualifications in therapeutic ethics and safeguarding, and reflected extensively on the implications of my conduct. I have not sought to return to the classroom until I was confident I had addressed the risks that contributed to the situation.”*

The panel had sight of a letter from Ms White-Zamler's [REDACTED].

The panel also had sight of an email from a distance learning assessor confirming Ms White-Zamler's completion of her Level 2 Certificate in Counselling Skills. The panel had sight of Ms White-Zamler's Level 3 Certificate in Counselling Skills.

The panel was satisfied that Ms White-Zamler had undertaken some steps to address her behaviour going forwards.

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 possible 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 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 and found that some allegations do not amount to unacceptable professional conduct or conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute. I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Ms Julie White-Zamler 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 White-Zamler 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

The panel finds that the conduct of Ms Julie White-Zamler 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 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 Ms Julie White-Zamler, 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 Ms White-Zamler, which involved a finding that her conduct contributed to the development of an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A, through her inappropriate text communications and the other behaviour as set out above, 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 remorse and insight. The panel has found that "Ms White-Zamler was truly sorry and remorseful for her conduct" and "did show a level of insight in respect of the impact that her misconduct had on herself and others." The panel has also commented that it "was satisfied that Ms White-Zamler had undertaken some steps to address her behaviour going forwards." I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel has observed that "public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms White-Zamler were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the

profession.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of engaging in an inappropriate relationship with a pupil 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 White-Zamler herself. The panel has commented, “Ms White-Zamler did have a previously good history and was a well-respected colleague.” The panel has also noted that it had sight of 20 character references. Three of those providing references gave evidence at the hearing and attested to Ms White-Zamler’s ability as a school teacher and pastoral leader.

A prohibition order would prevent Ms White-Zamler 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 level of remorse and insight shown by Ms White-Zamler and the steps she has taken to address her behaviour. The panel has also noted that “Ms White-Zamler’s conduct, whilst inappropriate, was well-intended due to her concern for Pupil A, who was a vulnerable pupil with very challenging behaviour.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the panel’s finding that, “Given that the nature and severity of the behaviour were at the less serious end of the possible 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.”

For these reasons, I have concluded that although there was a breach of professional boundaries in this case, 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 'David Oatley', with a large, sweeping loop at the end.

Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 23 June 2025

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