



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Miss Emily Webber: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

August 2025

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Introduction	6
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	13
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	16

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

Teacher:	Miss Emily Webber
Teacher ref number:	375019
Teacher date of birth:	1 July 1987
TRA reference:	22459
Date of determination:	11 August 2025
Former employer:	St Martin's School, Northwood (the "School")

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ("the panel") of the Teaching Regulation Agency ("the TRA") convened on 11 August 2025 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Miss Emily Webber ("Miss Webber").

The panel members were Ms Antonia Jackson (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Alan Wells (former teacher panellist) and Mr Paul Burton (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Elizabeth Gilbert of Eversheds Sutherland (International) 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 Miss Webber that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Miss Webber provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted she had been convicted of a relevant offence and that her conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that might bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer or Miss Webber.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 2 April 2025.

Miss Webber was convicted, at any time, of a relevant offence, in that;

1. On or around 22 December 2023, she was convicted at the St. Albans Magistrates' Court for the offences of;
 - a) possessing a Class C controlled drug;
 - b) driving a motor vehicle when alcohol level above limit.

Miss Webber is guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that;

2. Whilst employed as an English Teacher at the St Martin's School between September 2019 and June 2023;
 - a) she placed one or more pupils at risk of harm in that she stored one or more medications and/or prescription medications on the School's premises without ensuring that such medications were secure and/or inaccessible to pupils;
 - b) she had delivered to the School premises an illegal drug, namely diazepam (Class C drug) on or around 27 May 2023.
3. Whilst applying for the role of Teacher at the Harefield School and/or following her appointment to the Harefield School, she provided false and/or misleading information, and/or failed to disclose relevant information, in that she;
 - a) suggested in her application form dated 13 July 2023 she had left the St Martin's School for 'career progression' when in fact she had been suspended prior to her resignation to the St Martin's School in or around June 2023;
 - b) suggested during her interview on or around 9 July 2023 with the Harefield School that she had left the St Martin's School as she was 'bored' and/or had been passed up for promotion or used a word/words to that effect, when in fact she had been suspended prior to her resignation to the St Martin's School in or around June 2023;
4. Miss Webber's conduct as may be found proven at allegation 3 above lacked integrity and/or was dishonest.

In the statement of agreed facts, Miss Webber admitted allegations 1 to 4. Miss Webber also admitted in the statement of agreed facts that allegation 1 amounted to convictions

of a relevant offence and allegations 2 to 4 amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology – pages 6 to 7

Section 2: Notice of referral, response and notice of meeting – pages 9 to 29

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 30 to 39

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 42 to 157

Section 5: Teacher documents – page 160

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

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 dated 3 February 2025, signed by Miss Webber.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

The panel carefully considered the case and reached a decision.

In advance of the meeting, the TRA agreed to a request from Miss Webber 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.

Introduction

Miss Webber was employed as a teacher at the School from 1 September 2019 until 18 June 2023.

Miss Webber was arrested on 27 May 2023. A referral was made to the TRA on 20 August 2023.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

- 1. On or around 22 December 2023, you were convicted at the St. Albans Magistrates' Court for the offences of;**
 - a) possessing a Class C controlled drug;**
 - b) driving a motor vehicle when alcohol level above limit.**

Miss Webber admitted the allegations in the statement of agreed facts dated 3 February 2025. Miss Webber accepted in the statement that, on 27 May 2023, she had in her possession a quantity of diazepam, a controlled Class C drug, in contravention of Section 5(1) of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971. Additionally, Miss Webber accepted that on 27 May 2023 she drove a motor vehicle on a road after consuming alcohol, with the proportion of it in her blood being 262 milligrams of alcohol in 100 millilitres of blood, which exceeded the prescribed limit of 80 milligrams of alcohol in 100 millilitres of blood.

The panel was presented with a certificate of conviction from St Albans Magistrates' Court, confirming that Miss Webber was convicted on 22 December 2023 of the offences particularised in these allegations.

In respect of the offence of possessing a Class C controlled drug, Miss Webber was sentenced as follows:

- fined £100; and
- diazepam to be forfeited under Section 27 of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971 and destroyed.

In respect of the offence of driving a motor vehicle when alcohol level above limit, Miss Webber was sentenced as follows:

- disqualified from holding or obtaining a driving licence for 24 months, to be reduced by 24 weeks if the course is completed; and

- fined £500.

Miss Webber was also ordered to pay a surcharge of £150 and costs of £85 to the Crown Prosecution Service.

The panel noted that Miss Webber entered a guilty plea to both offences.

The panel considered that Miss Webber had provided no further evidence to persuade the panel that there were any exceptional circumstances to call into question the facts necessarily implied by the convictions. The panel therefore accepted the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of the commission of these offences by Miss Webber.

The panel therefore found allegations 1(a) and 1(b) proven.

2. Whilst employed as an English Teacher at the St Martin's School between September 2019 and June 2023;

- a) you placed one or more pupils at risk of harm in that you stored one or more medications and/or prescription medications on the School's premises without ensuring that such medications were secure and/or inaccessible to pupils;**
- b) you had delivered to the School premises an illegal drug, namely diazepam (Class C drug) on or around 27 May 2023.**

Miss Webber admitted the allegations in the statement of agreed facts dated 3 February 2025.

Miss Webber accepted in the statement of agreed facts that she stored the following medications on the School's premises without ensuring such medications were secure and inaccessible to pupils: paracetamol, fexofenadine, acravastine, lemsip, Gaviscon, fybogel, buscopan, sinex decongestant, Andrews salts, co-codamol 30/500, diazepam and colpermin. Miss Webber also accepted that these medications were stored in the classroom desk pedestal unit which was unlocked.

Miss Webber also accepted in the statement of agreed facts that she ordered nine packs of diazepam containing 28 2mg tablets without prescription and without involvement of a doctor. Miss Webber admitted that she had the tablets delivered to the School address, and that when the diazepam tablets were delivered to the School they would have been placed in the staff pigeonholes and any pupil could have walked past the staff pigeonholes and gained access to the tablets.

The panel considered Person A's [REDACTED] witness statement, which stated that he found a number of drugs in unlocked drawers of a desk pedestal unit, during a search of Miss Webber's classroom on 5 June 2023. The panel noted that a supporting photograph was exhibited to the statement. The panel acknowledged that Person A's witness

statement was hearsay evidence, but determined to place weight on his evidence as other evidence before the panel corroborated his position.

The panel also noted two emails exhibited to Person A's witness statement, one from the LADO on 5 June 2023 and one from the police on 1 June 2023, both of which informed Person A that Miss Webber had ordered controlled drugs to be delivered to the School. The panel noted that the police had confiscated the controlled drugs, diazepam, from Miss Webber during her arrest on 27 May 2023 which led to the knowledge of their delivery to the School.

The panel was satisfied on the evidence, and Miss Webber's admission, that she stored medication on the School premises without ensuring that such medications were secure or inaccessible to pupils. In doing so, Miss Webber placed the pupils at the School at risk of harm. Whilst the panel noted that diazepam is not an illegal drug when properly prescribed, Miss Webber accepted in the statement of agreed facts that she ordered diazepam without prescription and without involvement of a doctor. In these circumstances, it was unlawful for Miss Webber to have diazepam (Class C and a controlled drug) delivered to the School's premises.

For the reasons set out above, the panel found allegations 2(a) and 2(b) proved.

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

- 3. Whilst applying for the role of Teacher at the Harefield School and/or following your appointment to the Harefield School, you provided false and/or misleading information, and/or failed to disclose relevant information, in that you;**
 - a) suggested in your application form dated 13 July 2023 you had left the St Martin's School for 'career progression' when in fact you had been suspended prior to your resignation to the St Martin's School in or around June 2023;**
 - b) suggested during your interview on or around 9 July 2023 with the Harefield School that you had left the St Martin's School as you were 'bored' and/or had been passed up for promotion or used a word/words to that effect, when in fact you had been suspended prior to your resignation to the St Martin's School in or around June 2023;**

Miss Webber admitted the allegations in the statement of agreed facts dated 3 February 2025.

Miss Webber confirmed in the statement of agreed facts that she was suspended from the School on 9 June 2023 in connection with the allegations set out within the letter from the School dated the same day.

The panel considered a letter from the School to Miss Webber dated 9 June 2023, which confirmed Miss Webber was suspended from her duty as a teacher to enable the School to investigate allegations made against her.

The panel also considered an email from Miss Webber to Person A on 18 June 2023 which provided Miss Webber's written resignation, citing her "[REDACTED]" as the grounds of her resignation.

The panel considered an email from Person B ([REDACTED]) of Harefield School to the presenting officer's firm dated 15 October 2024. Within this email, Person A confirmed that a meeting was held with Miss Webber on 9 July 2023 via teams due to Miss Webber being in Cyprus and an application form was completed upon her return home. Person A outlined that Miss Webber said she was "bored and had been passed up for promotion" when questioned about why she had already left her previous employment at the School.

The panel considered Miss Webber's application form for the position of English teacher at the Harefield School dated 13 July 2023, which was a document provided to the panel as evidence. The panel noted that Miss Webber outlined in this application that her reason for leaving the School was "career progression".

The panel was satisfied that Miss Webber informed Harefield School in her application form and in her interview that she resigned from the School for reasons relating to career progression and being passed up for promotion. However, the panel saw no evidence to suggest that this information was misleading or false. The fact that Miss Webber was suspended from her role at the School did not necessarily mean that her reasons for resigning were false. Additionally, whilst Miss Webber cited her [REDACTED] as a reason for resignation in her email of 18 June 2023, the panel considered that Miss Webber could have many reasons for resigning, including her [REDACTED], being bored and wanting career progression. The panel did not consider that providing one of these reasons to a potential employer was false or misleading.

The panel noted that the application form which Miss Webber completed did not ask her specifically whether she was suspended or subject to any disciplinary proceedings. Neither did the panel see any evidence that this was specifically asked of Miss Webber at interview. As such, the panel was not satisfied that Miss Webber failed to disclose this information, as this was not requested from Harefield school. If this information was relevant, Miss Webber should have been asked for this information within the application form or at her interview. It is the responsibility of Harefield school to set out exactly what information it requires from applicants during their recruitment process.

For the reasons set out above, the panel found allegations 2(a) and 2(b) not proved.

4. Your conduct as may be found proven at allegation 3 above lacked integrity and/or was dishonest.

The panel found allegation 3 not proved. As such, the panel found allegation 4 not proved.

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

Having found allegations 1(a), 1(b), 2(a) and 2(c) proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of 1(a) and 1(b) amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence and whether the facts of 2(a) and 2(b) amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In doing so, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: The prohibition of teachers, which is referred to as “the Advice”.

Unacceptable professional conduct

The panel first considered whether the conduct of Miss Webber, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards.

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils’ well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions.
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Miss Webber, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education (“KCSIE”).

The panel considered that Miss Webber was in breach of the following provisions:

- “All staff have a responsibility to provide a safe environment in which children can learn”; and

- “All staff should have an awareness of safeguarding issues that can put children at risk of harm. Behaviours linked to issues such as drug taking”.

The panel also considered whether Miss Webber’s conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

The Advice indicates that where behaviours associated with such an offence exist, a panel is likely to conclude that an individual’s conduct would amount to unacceptable professional conduct. The panel found that none of these offences were relevant.

Miss Webber placed the pupils at the School at risk of serious harm by storing controlled drugs on the premises without proper care. The panel was therefore satisfied that Miss Webber’s conduct amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Miss Webber was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

Conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute

In relation to whether Miss Webber’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 Miss Webber’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 Miss Webber was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found that none of these offences were 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 Miss Webber’s conduct could potentially damage the public’s perception of a teacher. The panel determined that the public would be concerned by a teacher having controlled drugs on the School premises which could have been accessed by children and had the potential to cause serious harm.

For these reasons, the panel found that Miss Webber’s actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute

Conviction of a relevant offence

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Miss Webber 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.
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offences could have had an impact on the safety of pupils and members of the public.

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

The panel noted that Miss Webber's behaviour did not lead to a sentence of imprisonment, which was indicative that the offences were at the less serious end of the possible spectrum.

The panel also considered the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice. This was a case concerning a serious driving offence, which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

This was also a case concerning personal use of class C drugs, which the Advice states is less likely to be considered a relevant offence if it is away from children and the education context. However, the panel noted that the use of drugs was not kept away from children as the police noted that this was delivered to the School and therefore was an aggravating factor in Miss Webber's case.

The panel took into consideration Miss Webber's account of the difficulties she described that she was suffering at the relevant time as a result of her [REDACTED]. In her written statement, Miss Webber stated the following: "[REDACTED]".

The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Miss Webber's ongoing suitability to teach, despite the mitigating circumstances in Miss Webber's case. The panel considered that a finding that these

convictions were for relevant offences was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct, conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and 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 safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public;
- the maintenance of public confidence in the profession;
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct; and
- the interest of retaining the teacher in the profession.

In the light of the panel's findings against Miss Webber, which involved storage of controlled drugs on the School premises, there was an extremely strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and protection of other members of the public.

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

The panel decided that there was a public interest consideration in retaining the teacher in the profession, since no doubt had been cast upon her abilities as an educator and she is able to make a valuable contribution to the profession.

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 Miss Webber.

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

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk; and
- failure in their duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk.

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors.

Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

The panel considered that Miss Webber's actions were deliberate. The panel acknowledged there was no evidence to suggest that Miss Webber was acting under extreme duress, such as due to a physical threat or significant intimidation.

The panel saw no evidence that Miss Webber demonstrated exceptionally high standards in her personal and professional conduct or having contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel also saw no character references to demonstrate that the incident was out of character or evidence that showed Miss Webber was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings/warnings.

The panel considered the following statements made by Miss Webber in her written statement:

- "I take full responsibility for my actions last year, and can only apologise. [REDACTED]; a mistake I will not be making again";
- "I am deeply ashamed of my behaviour and can only express regret and remorse for my actions; I put the wellbeing of children at risk, as well as my own life. I also put the school in an extremely difficult and challenging situation, when all they have done is

support my career. [REDACTED]. I made a series of extremely poor choices, as outlined in all of your documents. For which I am so sorry”; and

- “[REDACTED]. I would love to one day be able to teach, and I definitely feel that I have made huge progress this past year, learning huge amounts about myself and reflection time on mistakes.”

The panel noted that Miss Webber appreciated the seriousness of her conduct and took full accountability for her actions. Miss Webber also displayed regret for the impact her actions have had on others. As such, the panel was satisfied that Miss Webber had full insight into her conduct.

The panel took into account Miss Webber’s [REDACTED] as a factor which may have clouded her judgement at the time of her conduct. However, the panel considered that the potential harm that could have resulted from storing large quantity of drugs at the School and driving whilst over the alcohol limit were serious matters which outweighed any mitigation provided.

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 Miss Webber 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 Miss Webber. The significant child safeguarding concerns was a significant factor in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

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

The Advice indicates that there are certain types of 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. None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel's findings.

The panel was satisfied that Miss Webber had a high level of insight into her conduct, having shown remorse for the impact of her actions on others and accepting her wrongdoing. The panel noted that its findings related to a period in Miss Webber's life where she struggled with [REDACTED]. The panel was satisfied that Miss Webber has been taking appropriate steps to learn from her mistakes and improve her [REDACTED]. The panel therefore determined that Miss Webber was taking active steps to reduce the risk of repetition and Miss Webber could make a positive contribution to the teaching profession in the future. However, it is only with the passage of time that a panel could be satisfied that the risk of repetition has been appropriately mitigated.

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 some of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and/or a relevant conviction. In this case, the panel has found some of the allegations not proven (including Allegations 3a, 3b and 4), and I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Miss Emily Webber should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of 3 years.

In particular, the panel has found that Miss Webber is in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions

- not undermining fundamental British values, including the rule of law.
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Miss Webber involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE).

The panel finds that the conduct of Miss Webber fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding of a conviction for a serious driving offence and a finding of placing pupils at risk by storing controlled drugs on school premises without proper care.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct, conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute and a relevant conviction, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Miss Webber, 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 Miss Webber, which involved storage of controlled drugs on the School premises, there was an extremely strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and protection of other members of the public.”

A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel’s comments on insight and remorse, which the panel has set out as follows:

“The panel noted that Miss Webber appreciated the seriousness of her conduct and took full accountability for her actions. Miss Webber also displayed regret for the impact her actions have had on others. As such, the panel was satisfied that Miss Webber had full insight into her conduct.”

I have therefore given this element some weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel has observed:

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

I am particularly mindful of the finding that a teacher stored controlled drugs on school premises without proper care 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, conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute and a relevant conviction, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Miss Webber herself. The panel has commented:

“The panel saw no evidence that Miss Webber demonstrated exceptionally high standards in her personal and professional conduct or having contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel also saw no character references to demonstrate that the incident was out of character or evidence that showed Miss Webber was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings/warnings.”

A prohibition order would prevent Miss Webber 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 potential harm that could have been caused by Miss Webber's actions. The panel has said:

"The panel took into account Miss Webber's [REDACTED] as a factor which may have clouded her judgement at the time of her conduct. However, the panel considered that the potential harm that could have resulted from storing large quantity of drugs at the School and driving whilst over the alcohol limit were serious matters which outweighed any mitigation provided."

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that:

"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 Miss Webber. The significant child safeguarding concerns was a significant factor in forming that opinion."

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Miss Webber 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

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 panel was satisfied that Miss Webber had a high level of insight into her conduct, having shown remorse for the impact of her actions on others and accepting her wrongdoing. The panel noted that its findings related to a period in Miss Webber's life where she struggled with [REDACTED]. The panel was satisfied that Miss Webber has been taking appropriate steps to learn from her mistakes and improve her [REDACTED]. The panel therefore determined that Miss Webber was taking active steps to reduce the risk of repetition and Miss Webber could make a positive contribution to the teaching profession in the future. However, it is only with the passage of time that a panel could be satisfied that the risk of repetition has been appropriately mitigated."

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, whilst I have noted the steps that Miss Webber has taken to reduce the risk of repetition, factors mean that allowing a 2-year review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These

elements are the serious nature of the multiple allegations of misconduct found proven, the potential harm to pupils if there was a repetition of the misconduct, and the need to demonstrate that the risk of repetition has been mitigated.

I consider therefore that a 3-year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

This means that Miss Emily Webber 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 22 August 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, Miss Webber remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Miss Emily Webber 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 'D Oatley', with a large, sweeping loop at the end.

Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 14 August 2025

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