



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mrs Louise Greaves: 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	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	4
Decision and reasons	4
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	7
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:	Mrs Louise Greaves
Teacher ref number:	0453832
Teacher date of birth:	22 February 1982
TRA reference:	22431
Date of determination:	11 August 2025
Former employer:	Springwell Community College, Staveley (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 Louise Greaves (“Mrs Greaves”).

The panel members were Mr Alan Wells (former teacher panellist – in the chair), Ms Antonia Jackson (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 Mrs Greaves that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mrs Greaves provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted she had been convicted of a relevant offence. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer or Mrs Greaves.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegation set out in the notice of meeting dated 7 May 2025.

Mrs Greaves was convicted of a relevant offence, namely:

1. On 13 June 2024, Mrs Greaves was convicted of one offence of engaging in sexual communication with a child on 30 November 2022 to 12 December 2022, contrary to s.15A(1) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003

In a statement of agreed facts, Mrs Greaves admitted the allegation and that it constituted a conviction of a relevant offence.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Notice of referral and response – pages 4 to 15

Section 2: Notice of meeting – 16 to 18

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 18 to 23

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 25 to 42

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 44 to 50

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 31 January 2025 and 10 February 2025, signed by Mrs Greaves.

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 Mrs Greaves 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.

Mrs Greaves was employed as a teacher at the School from 11 April 2016 until 22 August 2023.

Mrs Greaves was arrested on 12 December 2022.

A referral was made to the TRA on 24 August 2023.

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 13 June 2024, you were convicted of one offence of engaging in sexual communication with a child on 30 November 2022 to 12 December 2022, contrary to s.15A(1) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003.**

Mrs Greaves admitted the allegation in the statement of agreed facts dated 31 January 2025 and 10 February 2025.

The panel was presented with a court extract from Chesterfield Magistrates' Court, confirming that Mrs Greaves was convicted on 13 June 2024 of the offence particularised in this allegation and specifically related to email communication which made sexual references. Mrs Greaves was sentenced as follows:

- Registered on the sex offender register for 5 years;
- Restraining order against Mrs Greaves in relation to the victim for 5 years until 12 June 2029;
- Non-residential alcohol treatment for 30 days;
- Mental health treatment for 12 months;
- Rehabilitation activity requirement for 20 days;
- £100 fine;
- Costs to the Crown Prosecution Service of £375; and

- Victim surcharge £114.

Mrs Greaves entered a guilty plea. However, the panel noted the following statement in Mrs Greaves' written statement regarding her guilt:

"I was going to defend myself and hopefully be not guilty however on arrival at trial my barrister spoke to the judge who said he would convict me if I went to trial so it would be better if I pleaded guilty to receive a non-custodial sentence. I had no choice, I didn't want to risk this and therefore took the 'deal' which I didn't want to as I am not what they are labelling me as."

Mrs Greaves 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 conviction. The panel decided to accept the court extract as conclusive proof of the commission of the offence by Mrs Greaves.

The panel therefore 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 amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

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

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mrs Greaves 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;
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others; and
 - 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.
- 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 Mrs Greaves' actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting as Mrs Greaves' conviction related to sexual communication with a child.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety and security of pupils and members of the public given the harm caused by engaging in sexual communication with a child.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mrs Greaves' 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 noted that Mrs Greaves' behaviour did not lead to a sentence of imprisonment, which was indicative that the offence was 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 an offence involving sexual communication with a child, which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel determined that the offence was serious and raised significant concerns regarding child safeguarding.

The panel saw no evidence in relation to Mrs Greaves' previous ability as a teacher. Even had they done so, the panel found the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mrs Greaves' fitness to be a teacher. The panel considered a finding that this conviction is a relevant offences was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

The panel therefore found that Mrs Greaves was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence in respect of allegation 1.

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 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 Mrs Greaves, which involved a conviction of a relevant offence, 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. The serious findings relating to communication with a child against Mrs Greaves raises significant public and child protection concerns.

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

The panel concluded there was not a public interest consideration in retaining Mrs Greaves in the profession. The panel considered the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mrs Greaves in the profession, given the nature of the allegation in this case especially given that there was no evidence before it as to Mrs Greaves' teaching ability.

In carrying out the balancing exercise, the panel had regard to the public interest considerations both in favour of, and against, prohibition as well as the interests of Mrs Greaves.

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 Mrs Greaves.

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;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- sexual misconduct;
- failure in their duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk or failing to promote the safety and welfare of the children (as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE); and
- violation of the rights of pupils.

The panel attached appropriate weight and seriousness to the conduct found proven, given the conviction related to online behaviour including online misconduct.

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

Whilst Mrs Greaves stated in her written statement that her colleagues would say she would be a "loss to the profession", there was no evidence of Mrs Greaves having demonstrated exceptionally high standards in her professional conduct or of having contributed significantly to the education sector. Similarly, the panel saw no evidence that showed Mrs Greaves was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings or warnings.

Whilst the panel were not provided with any character references regarding Mrs Greaves to determine whether her behaviour was out of character, the panel noted that there was no evidence to suggest that Mrs Greaves had repeated her behaviour.

The panel considered the following statements made by Mrs Greaves in her written statement:

- "I'm a good person who would never go out to intentionally hurt anyone, I simply made a mistake";
- "With regards to the allegations, there was no complainant, as you are aware his mum found the e-mails and that's how it started";
- "I was going to defend myself and hopefully be not guilty however on arrival at trial my barrister spoke to the judge who said he would convict me if I went to trial so it would be better if I pleaded guilty to receive a non-custodial sentence. I had no choice, I

didn't want to risk this and therefore took the 'deal' which I didn't want to as I am not what they are labelling me as";

- "I did apologise after and tell the student that I was sorry and that it was inappropriate and we moved on. I had no intentions of anything towards him I just wanted him to do well";
- "I understand I was wrong in giving the student my personal e-mail address I was trying to send him extra work to push him, which he did, he was always looking for extra work, but things just spiralled and we chatted more than we should have as friends, which I know is another boundary I have crossed. I just thought it was harmless and obviously that I'd never find myself in such a stupid situation"; and
- "I deeply regret what I have done and if I could turn back the clock I would, I made a massive, silly mistake".

The panel noted that Mrs Greaves showed some accountability for her actions, as she was apologetic in the above referenced statements, showed regret and also pleaded guilty to the offence and to the allegation presented by the TRA. However, the panel was mindful that Mrs Greaves also sought to justify her conduct by explaining why she pleaded guilty to the offence due to a 'deal' arrangement and that the victim of the offence did not initiate the complaint. As such, the panel determined that Mrs Greaves lacked full insight into her conduct. The panel therefore determined that there remained a limited risk of Mrs Greaves repeating her behaviour.

The panel also considered that the seriousness of the offence 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 Mrs Greaves 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 Mrs Greaves. The seriousness of the conduct and the safeguarding concern for a child 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 panel considered the list of behaviours at paragraph 50 of the Advice. The Advice indicates that there are cases involving certain conduct where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period. These cases include sexual misconduct involving a child which the panel found to be relevant as Mrs Greaves had been convicted of sexual communication with a child.

Given the seriousness of the offence and the lack of full insight, the panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate. As such, the panel decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended without provision for a 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 allegation proven and found that those proven facts amount to a relevant conviction.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mrs Louise Greaves should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Mrs Greaves 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;
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others; and

- 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.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel took account of the Advice, which suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours of a teacher have been proved, including “failure in their duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk or failing to promote the safety and welfare of the children (as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE).”

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they related to a relevant offence involving sexual communication with a child.

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 Mrs Greaves, 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, “In the light of the panel’s findings against Mrs Greaves, which involved a conviction of a relevant offence, 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. The serious findings relating to communication with a child against Mrs Greaves raises significant public and child protection concerns.” 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 Mrs Greaves showed some accountability for her actions, as she was apologetic in the above referenced statements, showed regret and also pleaded guilty to the offence and to the allegation presented by the TRA. However, the panel was mindful that Mrs Greaves also sought to justify her conduct by explaining why she pleaded guilty to the offence due to a ‘deal’ arrangement

and that the victim of the offence did not initiate the complaint. As such, the panel determined that Mrs Greaves lacked full insight into her conduct.” In my judgement, the lack of full insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. 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 Mrs Greaves’ 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.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of a relevant conviction involving sexual communication with a child 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 Mrs Greaves herself and the panel comment “Whilst Mrs Greaves stated in her written statement that her colleagues would say she would be a “loss to the profession”, there was no evidence of Mrs Greaves having demonstrated exceptionally high standards in her professional conduct or of having contributed significantly to the education sector. Similarly, the panel saw no evidence that showed Mrs Greaves was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings or warnings.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mrs Greaves 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 public interest. The panel has said, “The panel concluded there was not a public interest consideration in retaining Mrs Greaves in the profession. The panel considered the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mrs Greaves in the profession, given the nature of the allegation in this case especially given that there was no evidence before it as to Mrs Greaves’ teaching ability.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding 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 Mrs Greaves. The seriousness of the conduct and the safeguarding concern for a child was a significant factor in forming that opinion.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mrs Greaves 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 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 that no provision should be made for a review period.

I have considered the panel’s comments “The panel considered the list of behaviours at paragraph 50 of the Advice. The Advice indicates that there are cases involving certain conduct where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period. These cases include sexual misconduct involving a child which the panel found to be relevant as Mrs Greaves had been convicted of sexual communication with a child.” The panel has also said “Given the seriousness of the offence and the lack of full insight, the panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate.”

In this case, factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the seriousness of the findings and the lack of full insight.

I consider therefore that allowing for no review period is necessary to maintain public confidence and is proportionate and in the public interest.

This means that Mrs Louise Greaves is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children’s home in England. Furthermore, in view of the seriousness of the allegations found proved against her, I have decided that Mrs Greaves shall not be entitled to apply for restoration of her eligibility to teach.

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

Mrs Greaves 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'.

Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey

Date: 15 August 2025

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