



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mrs Victoria Bisson: 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
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	14
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	17

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

Teacher: Mrs Victoria Bisson

TRA reference: 24253

Date of determination: 27 August 2025

Former employer: Ossett Academy and Sixth Form College, Ossett

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 27 August 2025 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mrs Victoria Bisson.

The panel members were Ms Jasmin Choudhury (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Beverley Montgomery (lay panellist) and Mr Adnan Qureshi (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mrs Samantha Cass 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 Mrs Bisson that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mrs Bisson provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer Mr Jon Walters of Brabners LLP, Mrs Bisson or any representative for Mrs Bisson.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 14 May 2025.

It was alleged that Mrs Bisson was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that, while a teacher at the Ossett Academy ('the School'):

1. During the 2022/2023 academic year she:
 - a) requested that one or more student(s) delete their email correspondence with her about their controlled assessment; and
 - b) asked one or more student(s) not to disclose that she had helped them with their controlled assessment.
2. Her conduct as outlined at Paragraph 1 above was intended to hide the maladministration of a controlled assessment.
3. During the 2022/2023 academic year she:
 - a) provided one or more student(s) with provisional marks to a controlled assessment;
 - b) provided one or more student(s) with feedback on how to improve their grade on the controlled assessment after she had graded it;
 - c) allowed one or more student(s) to resubmit the controlled assessment after implementing:
 - i. changes;
 - ii. which she had suggested;
 - iii. after providing a provisional grade.
 - d) changed the substance of controlled assessments after they had been (re)submitted by one or more student(s)
4. Her conduct as outlined at Paragraph(s) 1 and/or 2 and/or 3 above displayed a lack of integrity.
5. Her conduct as outlined at Paragraph(s) 1 and/or 2 and/or 3 above was dishonest.

Mrs Bisson admitted the particulars of allegations 1(a), 1(b), 2, 3(a), 3(b), 3(c), 3(d), 4 and 5, as set out in the statement of agreed facts signed by Mrs Bisson on 25 April 2025. Mrs Bisson further admitted that those admitted facts amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and 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 person list – page 3

Section 2: Statement of agreed facts – pages 4 to 8

Section 3: Notice of hearing – pages 9 to 13

Section 4: TRA documents – pages 14 to 189

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 190 to 193

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, 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 Mrs Bisson and the presenting officer on 25 April 2025.

Decision and reasons

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

In advance of the meeting, the TRA agreed to a request from Mrs Bisson for the allegations 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.

Mrs Bisson commenced employment as Head of Humanities at Ossett Academy (“the School”) on 1 May 2016.

During the 2022/2023 academic year, Mrs Bisson was responsible for administering a non-examination assessment, as part of the AQA A-level geography course taught by the School.

Following the final submission of students' Non-Exam Assessment ('NEA') in July 2023, it was alleged that Mrs Bisson made changes to the students' work without their knowledge or consent.

The amended NEAs were returned to students in September 2023, and on a date not shared with the panel, Pupil B reported that their coursework looked different from how they had left it before the summer holidays.

In September 2023, Mrs Bisson allegedly provided multiple opportunities for students to improve their NEAs under her guidance. She allowed students to view their marked scripts and offered feedback, highlighting areas for improvement and missed opportunities. Following this, Mrs Bisson recommended students to make amendments to their work based on her feedback.

Following her disclosure, on 13 December 2023, Pupil B sent an email to Person A, stating that, Mrs Bisson had instructed the class to delete emails she had sent to them regarding the suggestions and amendments of their assessments. Pupil B stated *"I sent my NEA off in July, in which I was told was the final deadline and I wasn't allowed to add any more to it. So I sent it off and she told us all to delete any emails she had sent to us during the NEA as she wasn't allowed to help us at all, and we weren't to tell anyone."*

Mrs Bisson allegedly told students that she was not allowed to help them with their assessments and that they should delete all emails to this effect and not tell anyone about the guidance she had provided. This was also presented to the panel in the statement of agreed facts.

On 9 August 2024, the case was referred to the TRA by Accord Multi Academy Trust.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

1. During the 2022/2023 academic year you:

- a) requested that one or more student(s) delete their email correspondence with you about their controlled assessment; and**
- b) asked one or more student(s) not disclose that you had helped them with their controlled assessment.**

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mrs Bisson on 25 April 2025.

In that statement of agreed facts, Mrs Bisson admitted that she had asked students during lessons to delete the emails that had been sent back and forth regarding the assessment as she was not meant to be giving them the help that she was giving them.

Notwithstanding Mrs Bisson's admission, the panel made a determination based on the evidence before it.

The panel considered the School's investigation interview notes from an interview carried out with Person A. These were signed by Person A on 22 January 2024.

The interview notes recorded that Person A had said that Pupil B made a comment about Miss Bisson telling the pupils in lessons to "*delete emails*" that she had sent back and forth to students, because she wasn't meant to be giving them additional help.

The panel considered the email from Pupil B to Person A, dated 13 December 2023. In this email, Pupil B stated that Mrs Bisson had said to "*delete any emails she had sent to us during the NEA as she wasn't allowed to help us at all, and we weren't to tell anyone*".

The panel noted that there was only evidence by way of a statement from Pupil B in support of these allegations. However, the panel was satisfied that Pupil B's evidence was sufficient corroboration - alongside Mrs Bisson's own admission and the School's investigation.

The panel also noted that the AQA's Irregularities and Appeals Committee ("IAC") examining board had also conducted its own investigation for which an outcome was provided on 17 July 2024. It determined that Mrs Bisson had "*provided improper assistance by assisting candidates...beyond the extent permitted by the regulations*."

The panel noted various emails in the bundle and that Mrs Bisson initially denied asking pupils to delete emails. The panel noted that there were no copies of the previously obtained coursework documentation but there were copies of emails. The panel noted one chain in particular where Mrs Bisson provided text for a pupil to include in their coursework. The panel also noted another email from Mrs Bisson sent to another student where Mrs Bisson claimed to have changed the document formatting and moved definitions. The panel considered that this evidence demonstrated that Mrs Bisson acknowledged having tampered with pupils' work.

The panel considered the notes from the School's investigation, in particular in response to being asked whether Mrs Bisson had asked pupils to delete email correspondence, she said "*I only ever asked them to delete those previous drafts..*".

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

2. Your conduct as outlined at Paragraph 1 above was intended to hide the maladministration of a controlled assessment.

The panel noted that Mrs Bisson admitted allegation 2. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the evidence it was provided with.

The panel noted the statement of agreed facts which set out that the Joint Council for Qualifications (“JCQ”) rules in place at the time of the allegation stated:

“Teachers must not provisionally assess work and then allow the candidate to revise it. In all subjects teachers must not provide any type of assistance which is explicitly prohibited in the awarding body’s specification. Assistance must not be given if there is no means to record it and to take account of it in the marking.”

The panel considered the disciplinary investigation interview notes from the interview with Mrs Bisson in February 2024. Mrs Bisson was informed during the meeting that failure to adhere to the exam board guidelines constitutes malpractice.

The panel considered the AQA IAC outcome letter and the committee’s findings which were consistent with both Mrs Bisson’s admissions, and the evidence of Mrs Bisson requesting pupils to delete email correspondence.

Having considered the evidence before it, the panel felt that it was more than likely that Mrs Bisson had asked pupils to delete email correspondence between her and the pupils concerned. The panel considered that Mrs Bisson, as an experienced teacher and leader of a humanities department, would have reasonably known that this was maladministration of the controlled assessment, as it is set out in the examination board’s guidance for exams.

The panel considered that it was more likely than not, on the balance of probabilities, that Mrs Bisson knew that her conduct amounted to maladministration of a controlled assessment. Furthermore, there was no evidence of her having shared these concerns with colleagues, the appropriate examining body and/or senior leaders at the School. The panel considered that Mrs Bisson would have received specialist training and would have had knowledge of the examination protocols in place and of the reporting requirements particularly as she was the Head of Humanities at the School.

The panel felt that there was no other reasonable explanation as to why Mrs Bisson would have asked students to delete these emails, and that, on the balance of probabilities, it was likely in an attempt to hide the maladministration of the assessments that had taken place.

The panel found allegation 2 proven.

3. During the 2022/2023 academic year you:

- a) **provided one or more student(s) with provisional marks to a controlled assessment;**
- b) **provided one or more student(s) with feedback on how to improve their grade on the controlled assessment after you had graded it;**
- c) **allowed one or more student(s) to resubmit the controlled assessment after implementing:**
 - i. **changes;**
 - ii. **which you had suggested;**
 - iii. **after providing a provisional grade.**

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mrs Bisson on 25 April 2025.

In the statement of agreed facts, Mrs Bisson admitted that she had returned some marked scripts to students, and recommended that they amend their coursework and improve it further after they had received a provisional mark and detailed feedback. Furthermore, the evidence before the panel indicated that Mrs Bisson gave those students the opportunity to resubmit their work. This was shared by Pupil B in their statement.

The statement of agreed facts set out that, in an email from Mrs Bisson to a student on 18 July 2023, Mrs Bisson provided the student with a section of text to insert into their work that had been previously marked. Mrs Bisson admitted that she had sent a second similar email to a student on 20 July 2023.

The panel referred to page 13 of the bundle within which demonstrated the extent of the support that Mrs Bisson gave to students. The panel noted that Mrs Bisson had *“allowed students to see their marked scripts and then supported them in making improvements, providing feedback, and highlighting missed opportunities for students to rectify their submissions.”*

Mrs Bisson further admitted in the statement of agreed facts that she had sent an email to another student on 18 July 2023, stating *“I’ve sorted out the formatting”* and *“I’ve moved the definition”*, before providing feedback on an almost page-by-page basis.

Notwithstanding Mrs Bisson’s admissions, the panel made a determination based on the evidence before it.

The panel considered the School’s disciplinary investigation interview notes carried out with Mrs Bisson. The notes set out that Mrs Bisson had said she had tried to make it clear where the marks were coming from in the students’ work. During the meeting, Mrs

Bisson admitted that she had returned the scripts to the students and they were given an opportunity to improve and act upon the feedback she had given.

The panel also noted Mrs Bisson's *"Additional commentary about the NEAs"* email sent to Person B, in February 2024, in which she states that *"before students submitted their drafts in July 2023, I did sometimes print earlier drafts sent and suggest changes they could make."*

The panel considered the evidence in the bundle, which demonstrated that Mrs Bisson had provided marked papers and had supported pupils to correct their work. However, the panel explored allegations 3(a) and 3(c)(iii) but came to the conclusion, after careful consideration, that there was no evidence provided before them that Mrs Bisson had actually given one or more students provisional marks for a controlled assessment.

The panel found allegation 3(a) and 3(c)(iii) not proven and 3(b) and 3(c)(i) and (ii) proven.

d) changed the substance of controlled assessments after they had been (re)submitted by one or more students

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mrs Bisson on 25 April 2025.

In that statement of agreed facts, Mrs Bisson admitted that she had changed students' coursework herself after it had been given to her before the summer holidays.

Mrs Bisson admitted that when changing the content of the work, she added to it and had also re-worded it. She admitted that, looking back at the guidance, she knew she should *"not have done this."*

When shown parallel versions of a student's work before and after her amendments, Mrs Bisson admitted that she had used vocabulary and syntax which, in some cases, were beyond the ability of the student, and that there were significant differences. She further accepted that the sentence structures had been amended and that further analysis had been added.

Notwithstanding Mrs Bisson's admission, the panel made a determination based on the evidence before it.

The panel considered the email from Pupil B to Person A, dated 13 December 2023. In the email, Pupil B stated that in September 2023, much of the content of her assessment had changed and included words that she would never use, and that to her knowledge this had happened to multiple people in the class.

The panel considered the School's disciplinary investigation interview notes which set out that Person A had said that Pupil B had sent her coursework off to Mrs Bisson before the

summer holidays, and that when her work came back to her in September 2023, it was markedly different.

The notes set out that Person A had seen Pupil B's work before the summer term ended and after summer. He observed that there were a few areas of differences when comparing the work and when discussing this with Pupil B. The notes state that he said it looked as though sections of the work had been rewritten, and that some of the words used, were not words that Pupil B would use. Pupil B confirmed this.

The panel found allegation 3(d) proven.

4. Your conduct as outlined at Paragraph(s) 1 and/or 2 and/or 3 above displayed a lack of integrity.

5. Your conduct as outlined at Paragraph(s) 1 and/or 2 and/or 3 above was dishonest.

The panel noted that Mrs Bisson admitted that her conduct at paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 was dishonest and lacked integrity, as set out in the statement of agreed facts.

Notwithstanding Mrs Bisson's admission, the panel made a determination based on the evidence before it in relation to the allegations it had found proven.

The panel considered whether Mrs Bisson had failed to act with integrity. In particular, the panel considered the case of *Wingate & Anor v The Solicitors Regulation Authority*.

The panel noted that there is no expectation on teachers that they must be paragons of virtue. However, the panel noted that "*integrity*" is a useful shorthand to express the higher standards which society expects from professional persons and which the professions expect of their own members.

The panel considered that Mrs Bisson had failed to act within those higher standards expected of a teacher in that she had made amendments to students' coursework on her own initiative. Furthermore, she had also encouraged students to amend their work and resubmit it after providing them with extensive feedback.

The panel felt that Mrs Bisson, as a Head of Humanities and an experienced teacher, would have been aware of the importance of following examination and assessment procedures surrounding the controlled assessment rigorously.

The panel concluded that Mrs Bisson's actions in these circumstances demonstrated a lack of integrity especially as she had not shared her actions either with the examination boards or with relevant staff at the School.

The panel considered whether Mrs Bisson had acted dishonestly in relation to the proven facts of allegations 1, 2 and 3. In reaching its decision on this, the panel considered the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd t/a Crockford*.

The panel first sought to ascertain the actual state of Mrs Bisson's knowledge or belief as to the facts. Having read the evidence before it, the panel found that Mrs Bisson had not followed the School's policies and procedures or the policies or procedures of the JCQ and AQA examination board.

The panel felt that it was more likely than not, on the balance of probabilities, that Mrs Bisson knew that she should not have provided the feedback or amended students work, and that she had told pupils to delete email correspondence regarding the matter, as she knew that it was wrong.

The panel found that based on the evidence and the statement of agreed facts, it appeared Mrs Bisson did understand the impact of her actions and admitted that she had knowingly assisted the students so that they could secure additional marks.

The panel then went on to consider whether Mrs Bisson's conduct was dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people. The panel found that the actions of Mrs Bisson were objectively dishonest. The panel considered that any reasonable person would consider that, knowingly amending students work, providing feedback and allowing for resubmission, after providing assistance, would undoubtedly be dishonest.

The panel found allegations 4 and 5 proven.

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

Having found the majority of the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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

The panel first considered whether the conduct of Mrs Bisson, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mrs Bisson 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

- treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position;
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions; and
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others.
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards...
 - Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel also considered whether Mrs Bisson'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 the offence of fraud or serious dishonesty was relevant.

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

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mrs Bisson was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Mrs Bisson'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 Mrs Bisson'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 Mrs Bisson was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found that the offence of fraud and/or serious dishonesty was relevant.

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

For these reasons, the panel found that Mrs Bisson's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct/conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be made, the panel had to consider whether it would be an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it would be in the public interest to do so. Prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely: the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In light of the panel's findings against Mrs Bisson, which involved requesting students to delete email correspondence or not disclose that she had helped them with their controlled assessments; providing them with extensive feedback; encouraging students to amend their work after it had been submitted; and changing students assessments, there was a strong public interest consideration in declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mrs Bisson was not treated with the utmost seriousness, when regulating the conduct of the profession.

The conduct found against Mrs Bisson 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 Mrs Bisson in the profession.

The panel was not provided with any evidence regarding Mrs Bisson's ability as an educator. It considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mrs Bisson in the profession, since her behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.

The panel considered the seriousness of the behaviour and noted 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. However, the panel felt that Mrs Bisson's behaviour was at the less serious end of the scale of seriousness.

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 Mrs Bisson.

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;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- violation of the rights of pupils;
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions or purposeful destruction of evidence, especially where these behaviours have been repeated or had serious consequences, or involved the coercion of another person to act in a way contrary to their own interests;
- deliberate action in serious contravention of requirements for the conduct of an examination or assessment leading to an externally awarded qualification or national assessment (or deliberate collusion in or deliberate concealment of such action) particularly where the action had, or realistically had the potential to have, a significant impact on the outcome of the examination assessment; and
- knowingly manipulating...exam results.

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors. Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

There was no evidence that Mrs Bisson's actions were not deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mrs Bisson was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation. However, the panel did note that Mrs Bisson had raised with the School the level of pressure that she was under at the time.

The panel noted that Mrs Bisson had recently returned from [REDACTED] and had a “*growing sense of isolation and pressure*” Mrs Bisson cited feeling [REDACTED] at this time. The panel considered therefore that it was likely that she was under significant pressure to attain good results and noted that she had requested to work fewer hours which was not granted by the School.

There was no evidence presented to the panel of Mrs Bisson’s experience as a teacher and/or the impact that she had had on the teaching sector. However, the panel did note that Mrs Bisson was in the position of Head of Humanities. The panel did not have any evidence to assess whether or not the incident was out of character. Although the panel did not have any evidence of Mrs Bisson’s ability as a teacher, from the investigation notes, it could see that she had regretted how she had acted during the examination assessment process. In addition, the panel considered how staff and leadership changes as well as coming back from [REDACTED] can impact on a teacher’s performance, even an experienced teacher.

The panel considered the statement of Mrs Bisson dated 10 July 2025, in which she set out that she wished she had been more vocal about needing support and that she had pushed back against the mid-course increase in students’ target grades which were wholly unrealistic. She stated that she deeply regrets that her actions may have tainted the reputation of her colleagues and admitted that she was operating beyond her reasonable limits.

Mrs Bisson stated that she was trying not to let people down but was desperately trying to manage an unsustainable situation. She recognised the impact of her actions on the students and their families and stated that she took full responsibility. The panel felt that Mrs Bisson had shown genuine regret and, in light of the IAC findings, acknowledged that she had made an error of judgment.

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 considered that Mrs Bisson had already received and completed a period of sanction from the IAC outcome which ended in July 2025.

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, the recommendation of no prohibition order would be both a proportionate and an appropriate response.

Given that the nature and severity of the behaviour were at the less serious end of the spectrum and, having considered the presence of mitigating factors such as the level of pressure that Mrs Bisson was under and the level of insight and remorse shown, the panel determined that a recommendation for a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate 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 (including 3.a and 3.c.iii), and I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mrs Victoria Bisson 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 Mrs Bisson 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;
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions; and
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others.
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel finds that the conduct of Mrs Bisson fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Mrs Bisson, 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 that the behaviour of “misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils” was relevant in this case. The panel has said that it “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.” However, the panel has found that Mrs Bisson asked students to delete email correspondence and not disclose that she had them with their controlled assessment. This exposed students to behaviour that was dishonest and lacked integrity. The actions of Mrs Bisson also had the potential to have a significant impact on the outcome of the students’ examination assessments. 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, “Mrs Bisson stated that she was trying not to let people down but was desperately trying to manage an unsustainable situation. She recognised the impact of her actions on the students and their families and stated that she took full responsibility. The panel felt that Mrs Bisson had shown genuine regret and, in light of the IAC findings, acknowledged that she had made an error of judgment.” 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 that “public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mrs Bisson was not treated with the utmost seriousness, when regulating the conduct of the profession.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of dishonesty and a lack of integrity in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

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

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

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mrs Bisson herself. The panel has commented, "There was no evidence presented to the panel of Mrs Bisson's experience as a teacher and/or the impact that she had had on the teaching sector. However, the panel did note that Mrs Bisson was in the position of Head of Humanities. The panel did not have any evidence to assess whether or not the incident was out of character. Although the panel did not have any evidence of Mrs Bisson's ability as a teacher, from the investigation notes, it could see that she had regretted how she had acted during the examination assessment process. In addition, the panel considered how staff and leadership changes as well as coming back from [REDACTED] can impact on a teacher's performance, even an experienced teacher."

A prohibition order would prevent Mrs Bisson 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 that "having considered the presence of mitigating factors such as the level of pressure that Mrs Bisson was under and the level of insight and remorse shown, the panel determined that a recommendation for a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate in this case."

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

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D Oatley', with a large, sweeping loop at the end.

Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 1 September 2025

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