



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Ms Sian Hill: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

July 2025

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	8
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	11

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

Teacher: Ms Sian Hill

Teacher ref number: 2151693

Teacher date of birth: 21 October 1997

TRA reference: 23052

Date of determination: 25 July 2025

Former employer: Laurus Ryecroft, Manchester

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 25 July 2025 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Ms Sian Hill.

The panel members were Mr John Martin (former teacher panellist – in the chair), Ms Aruna Sharma (teacher panellist) and Mrs Emma Hendry (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Lara Small of Birketts LLP Solicitors.

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Ms Sian Hill that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Ms Hill provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted conviction of a relevant offence. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer Mr Jon Walters, Ms Hill or any representative for Ms Hill.

The meeting took place in private by way of a virtual meeting.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegation set out in the notice of meeting dated 16 April 2025.

It was alleged that Ms Hill was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:

1. On 2 April 2024 at Warrington Magistrates' Court, she was convicted of driving a motor vehicle on a road after consuming so much alcohol that the proportion of it in her breath exceeded the prescribed limit, contrary to Section 5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988.

Ms Hill admitted allegation 1 and that her conduct amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence, as set out in the statement of agreed facts, signed by Ms Hill on 25 January 2025.

Preliminary applications

There were no preliminary applications.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Notice of referral, response and notice of meeting – pages 1 to 16

Section 2: Statement of agreed facts – pages 17 to 18

Section 3: TRA documents – pages 19 to 25

Section 4: Teacher documents – pages 36 to 37

In addition, in advance of the hearing, the panel reviewed a copy of a police disclosure letter from Cheshire Constabulary dated 22 January 2024.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle and the police disclosure letter dated 22 January 2024, 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").

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Ms Hill on 25 January 2025.

In advance of the meeting the TRA agreed to a request from Ms Hill for the allegation to be considered without a hearing. The panel had the ability to direct that the case be considered at a hearing if required in the interests of justice or in the public interest. The panel did not determine that such a direction was necessary or appropriate in this case.

Decision and reasons

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

Ms Hill was employed as a teacher at Laurus Ryecroft High School ('the School').

In the early hours of 22 January 2024, Cheshire police were alerted to a broken-down vehicle. A National Highways traffic officer attended and found Ms Hill sat in the front passenger seat of a vehicle with a blown tyre. The traffic officer suspected Ms Hill may have been intoxicated.

Ms Hill moved into the driver's seat and drove a further 100 metres down the motorway. A police officer arrived, and Ms Hill informed the investigating police officer that she had drunk vodka that evening but only after the tyre had blown out.

Ms Hill was breathalysed at the roadside and provided a reading of 85ug per 100ml of breath. Ms Hill was arrested and at the police station was tested with an evidential breath tester, with the lower of the two readings being 88ug.

Ms Hill was convicted at Warrington Magistrates' Court on 2 April 2024, and in respect of the conviction was sentenced to pay a fine of £392.00 and was disqualified from holding or obtaining a driving licence for 21 months, to be reduced by 21 weeks if she satisfactorily completed a course approved by the Secretary of State by 7 June 2025.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

The panel found the following particulars of the allegation against you proved, for these reasons:

- 1. On 2 April 2024 at Warrington Magistrates' Court, you were convicted of driving a motor vehicle on a road after consuming so much alcohol that the proportion of it in your breath exceeded the prescribed limit, contrary to Section 5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988.**

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts, signed by Ms Hill on 25 January 2025. In that statement of agreed facts, Ms Hill admitted allegation 1. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the facts available to it.

The panel noted page 8 of the Teacher misconduct: the prohibition of teachers ('the Advice') which states that where there has been a conviction at any time, of a criminal offence, the panel will accept the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction, unless exceptional circumstances apply. The panel did not find that any exceptional circumstances applied in this case.

The panel had been provided with a copy of the certificate of conviction from Warrington Combined Court, which detailed that Ms Hill had been convicted of driving a motor vehicle on a road after consuming so much alcohol that the proportion of it in her breath exceeded the prescribed limit. The panel noted that Ms Hill pleaded guilty to the offence.

In respect of the offence, Ms Hill was sentenced to pay a fine of £392.00 and was disqualified from holding or obtaining a driving licence for 21 months, to be reduced by 21 weeks if she satisfactorily completed a course approved by the Secretary of State by 7 June 2025.

The panel found allegation 1 proven.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

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

The panel noted that in the statement of agreed facts, signed by Ms Hill on 25 January 2025, she admitted the facts of allegation 1 amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the facts available to it.

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 Hill, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Ms Hill was in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by:
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including...the rule of law.

The panel considered whether Ms Hill's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting. Although Ms Hill's driving offence took place outside of her working hours, the panel considered that it nevertheless touched upon her role as a teacher because it raised a potential safeguarding issue should she in future drive a vehicle carrying children.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety and/or security of members of the public. The panel noted in particular that Ms Hill had been almost three times over the prescribed alcohol limit, that she was on the motorway and had driven 100m down the road whilst under the influence of alcohol.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Ms Hill's behaviour in committing the offence could affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel considered that Ms Hill's actions were irresponsible and that as a teacher she was supposed to be a positive role model for pupils.

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

This was a case concerning a conviction of a serious driving offence involving alcohol, which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel considered that Ms Hill had committed a serious driving offence, noting that she had been almost three times over the prescribed alcohol limit, had had her driving licence revoked and had been convicted of a crime. The panel's view was that this was not a minor offence.

The panel took into account the reference letter from the headteacher of the School dated 17 October 2024 in relation to Ms Hill's proficiency as a teacher. However, the panel considered it showed Ms Hill to be a competent teacher rather than demonstrating any exceptional contribution to the profession.

The panel also found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Ms Hill's ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding of a conviction for a relevant offence was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

Having considered all the evidence before it, the panel was satisfied that Ms Hill had been convicted of a relevant offence.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of a conviction of a relevant offence, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order 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 protection of other members of the public; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In the light of the panel's findings against Ms Hill, which involved a serious drink driving conviction, there was a strong public interest consideration in the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Hill 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 Hill 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 Hill in the profession. Whilst there is evidence that Ms Hill had ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Ms Hill in the profession, since her behaviour fundamentally breached the standards of conduct expected of a teacher.

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the behaviour, noting that the Advice states that the expectation of both the public and pupils, is that members of the teaching profession maintain an exemplary level of integrity and ethical standards at all times.

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 Hill.

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; and
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction.

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 Hill's actions were deliberate. In fact, the panel noted that she had chosen to drive 100m down the road under the influence of alcohol, having already admitted to the traffic officer that she had been drinking.

There was no evidence to suggest that Ms Hill was acting under extreme duress.

The panel found no evidence before it that Ms Hill had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in her personal and professional conduct or had contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel noted that Ms Hill had indicated limited remorse and no insight. The only evidence before the panel was Ms Hill's email to the TRA on 20 October 2024 in which she stated *"I would ...like to reiterate my previous comments that I am truly sorry and bitterly regret my actions. I love teaching and the school and staff have been very supportive and understanding during this period, which has been very difficult. I have stayed professional and not allowed the impending case to affect my performance at school."*

The panel was not satisfied that this demonstrated sufficient insight or remorse. The panel noted in particular that Ms Hill had not suggested any ways in which she could learn from her mistake or prevent a similar incident occurring again in future.

The panel considered the character reference provided by Individual A, [REDACTED], on behalf of Ms Hill. The panel noted the following comments in particular:

- *"Sian's ability to relate to students and create purposeful, caring and wholly supportive lessons meant she has become a huge asset to the English department"*

- *“During this difficult period, Sian has conducted herself admirably, in and outside the classroom, continuing to deliver high quality lessons without missing a day of school.”*

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

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings would be sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Ms Hill of prohibition.

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Ms Hill. The seriousness of the conviction, the lack of insight or mitigation and the importance of maintaining public confidence in the profession were significant factors in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

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

The Advice indicates that there are certain types of case where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period. None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel’s findings.

The Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate. Whilst none of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel’s findings, the panel considered Ms Sian’s criminal conviction of a serious drink driving incident to be comparable and similar in seriousness to this list.

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

As detailed above, the panel considered that there was insufficient evidence before it that Ms Hill had shown insight into her actions in that she had not proactively offered any suggestions of how to prevent this from happening again in future.

The panel considered that a review period would be proportionate in this case, recognising the adverse impact on Ms Hill but balancing that with the public interest. The panel considered that a review period of three years would offer Ms Hill sufficient time and opportunity to put actions into place to bring evidence before a panel to demonstrate no risk of repetition of such conduct.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a 3-year review period.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

I have given very careful consideration to this case and to the recommendation of the panel in respect of both sanction and review period.

In considering this case, I have also given very careful attention to the Advice that the Secretary of State has published concerning the prohibition of teachers.

In this case, the panel has found the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to a relevant conviction.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Ms Hill is in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by:
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including...the rule of law.

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

The findings of misconduct are serious as they involved a serious drink driving conviction.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself, whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of a relevant conviction, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have

to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Ms Hill, 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 considered whether Ms Hill's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting. Although Ms Hill's driving offence took place outside of her working hours, the panel considered that it nevertheless touched upon her role as a teacher because it raised a potential safeguarding issue should she in future drive a vehicle carrying children." 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 noted that Ms Hill had indicated limited remorse and no insight. The only evidence before the panel was Ms Hill's email to the TRA on 20 October 2024 in which she stated *"I would ...like to reiterate my previous comments that I am truly sorry and bitterly regret my actions. I love teaching and the school and staff have been very supportive and understanding during this period, which has been very difficult. I have stayed professional and not allowed the impending case to affect my performance at school."* In my judgement, the lack of full insight or remorse means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of children and the reputation of the profession. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, "The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Ms Hill's behaviour in committing the offence could affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel considered that Ms Hill's actions were irresponsible and that as a teacher she was supposed to be a positive role model for pupils." I am particularly mindful of the finding of a serious drink driving conviction in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

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

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

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Ms Hill herself and the panel comment “The panel found no evidence before it that Ms Hill had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in her personal and professional conduct or had contributed significantly to the education sector.” The panel also considered a positive character reference from Individual A.

A prohibition order would prevent Ms Hill 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 full insight or remorse. The panel has said, “The panel was not satisfied that this demonstrated sufficient insight or remorse. The panel noted in particular that Ms Hill had not suggested any ways in which she could learn from her mistake or prevent a similar incident occurring again in future.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that “There was evidence that Ms Hill’s actions were deliberate. In fact, the panel noted that she had chosen to drive 100m down the road under the influence of alcohol, having already admitted to the traffic officer that she had been drinking.”

In reaching my decision I have given considerable weight to the panel’s comment “The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Ms Hill. The seriousness of the conviction, the lack of insight or mitigation and the importance of maintaining public confidence in the profession were significant factors in forming that opinion.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Ms Hill has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, that is not backed up by full remorse or insight, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended a 3 year review period.

I have considered the panel’s comments “The Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate. Whilst none of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel’s findings, the panel

considered Ms Sian's criminal conviction of a serious drink driving incident to be comparable and similar in seriousness to this list."

The panel also said "the panel considered that there was insufficient evidence before it that Ms Hill had shown insight into her actions in that she had not proactively offered any suggestions of how to prevent this from happening again in future." And that "a review period of three years would offer Ms Hill sufficient time and opportunity to put actions into place to bring evidence before a panel to demonstrate no risk of repetition of such conduct."

I have considered whether a 3 year review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a two-year review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the lack of sufficient insight or remorse to demonstrate no risk of repetition.

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

This means that Ms Sian Hill is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. She may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 31 July 2028, 3 years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If she does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Ms Hill remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Ms Sian Hill has a right of appeal to the High Court within 28 days from the date she is given notice of this order.

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

Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey

Date: 30 July 2025

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