



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mrs Emma Taylor- Erwin: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

January 2026

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	15
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	18

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

Teacher:	Emma Taylor-Erwin
Teacher ref number:	9949361
Teacher date of birth:	21 September 1977
TRA reference:	24935
Date of determination:	20 January 2026
Former employer:	The Mount School, Huddersfield

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 20 January 2026 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mrs Emma Taylor-Erwin.

The panel members were Mrs Joanne Arscott (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Olayinka Oshoko (teacher panellist) and Mrs Alexandra Burton (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr James Corrish of Birketts LLP.

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 Taylor-Erwin that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mrs Taylor-Erwin provided a signed statement of agreed facts admitting all the allegations as well as admitting unacceptable professional conduct, conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and conviction of a relevant offence.

The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer Ms Sophie Allen, Mrs Taylor-Erwin, or any representative for Mrs Taylor-Erwin.

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

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 9 January 2026.

It was alleged that Mrs Emma Taylor-Erwin was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that whilst working as a Class Teacher and/or the Curriculum Lead for Geography and/or History at The Mount School (“the School”):

1. In or around June 2019, she drove a motor vehicle whilst under the influence of alcohol.
2. In or around April 2018, she attended the School and/or taught lessons:
 - a. Whilst under the influence of alcohol; and/or
 - b. Smelling of alcohol
3. On or around 17 November 2023, she attended the School and/or taught lessons:
 - a. Whilst under the influence of alcohol; and/or
 - b. Smelling of alcohol
4. As a result of her conduct at paragraph 2(a) and/or 2(b) and/or 3(a) and/or 3(b), she was incapable of carrying out her duties either solely or in part due to alcohol consumption.

It was further alleged that Mrs Emma Taylor-Erwin was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:

5. On 21 November 2024, she was convicted of two counts of failing to provide a specimen on 30 October 2024, contrary to section 7 of the Road Traffic Act 1988, in the course of an investigation into whether she had committed an offence under section 3A, 4, 5 or 5A.

The panel noted that Mrs Taylor-Erwin admitted allegations 1 to 5 and that allegations 1 to 4 constituted unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and that she admitted (in the case of allegation 5) having been convicted of a relevant offence, as set out in the statement of agreed facts signed by her on 27 November 2025. The panel also noted that Mrs Taylor-Erwin had admitted the allegations in her response to the Notice of Referral of 19 June 2025 although the wording of some of the allegations had since changed.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology, list of key people and anonymised pupil list – pages 4 to 7

Section 2: Notice of Referral and response – pages 8 to 18

Section 3: Statement of Agreed Facts – pages 19 to 24

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 25 to 89

Section 5: Teacher documents – page 90

In addition, the panel agreed to insert the Notice of Meeting of 9 January 2026, which it had sight of, as pages 91-92.

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 Taylor-Erwin on 27 November 2025 and subsequently signed by the presenting officer on 9 December 2025 (the “Statement of Agreed Facts”).

Decision and reasons

The panel carefully considered the case and reached the following decision and reasons:

In advance of the meeting the TRA agreed to a request from Mrs Taylor-Erwin 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.

On 1 September 2009, Mrs Taylor-Erwin commenced employment at The Mount School (the “School”) as a Year 1 class teacher.

In April 2018, two staff members at the School reported to the School that Mrs Taylor-Erwin allegedly had an alcoholic drink during school hours.

On 10 June 2019, the Local Authority Designated Officer (“LADO”) raised concerns to the School following disclosures which Individual A had raised in another school that Mrs Taylor-Erwin had allegedly driven under the influence of alcohol.

On 17 November 2023 Individual B entered a class in which Mrs Taylor-Erwin was looking after pupils. It was alleged that Mrs Taylor-Erwin was under the influence of alcohol and smelt of alcohol.

On 4 November 2024, Mrs Taylor-Erwin resigned from the School.

On 21 November 2024, Mrs Taylor-Erwin was convicted at Huddersfield Magistrates’ Court for failing to provide specimens on 30 October 2024.

On 18 December 2024, the matter was referred to the TRA.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

In its consideration of all allegations the panel noted Mrs Taylor-Erwin’s full admission of the allegations in the Statement of Agreed Facts and further noted her statement of 24 November 2025 that *“I admit to the allegations and understand that my conduct was unacceptable and will amount to serious misconduct”*.

In respect of all the allegations, the panel scrutinised the entire bundle including the TRA’s documents concerning the investigations and the meetings of the School surrounding these allegations.

The panel noted that the evidence within a lot of these documents was hearsay but considered that the evidence was relevant and formed part of the School’s investigations. The panel therefore admitted the hearsay evidence after careful consideration in each case but noted that the evidence should be considered carefully and cautiously, including in relation to the appropriate amount of weight to place on it.

In relation to weight, the panel placed reasonable weight upon the full contents of the bundle. The panel recognised that Mrs Taylor-Erwin had chosen to admit to all the allegations and had not called into question the validity of any of the evidence, her having had sight of it.

The panel carefully considered Mrs Taylor-Erwin’s statement dated 24 November 2025 in its consideration of all allegations.

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

Whilst working as a Class Teacher and/or the Curriculum Lead for Geography and/or History at The Mount School ('the School'):

1. In or around June 2019, you drove a motor vehicle whilst under the influence of alcohol.

Mrs Taylor-Erwin admitted to allegation 1 in the Statement of Agreed Facts and in her response to the Notice of Referral.

Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the facts available to it.

It was clear that Mrs Taylor-Erwin was carrying out the role described, as a class teacher, at the School at the relevant time for all the allegations.

The panel considered the chronological notes submitted by Individual B at the time which had been an attachment to the TRA referral. These notes set out that on 10 June 2019, the School received a call from Individual C that Individual A "*had raised concerns at her school re ETE [whom the panel understood to be Mrs Taylor-Erwin] alcohol and driving under the influence. School called the police. said [REDACTED] was in the car with ETE when she was drunk*" and that "*[REDACTED]. ETE denied and said [REDACTED] set Individual A up to say these things*". The LADO was recorded as advising that Mrs Taylor-Erwin was not suitable to be a DSL.

The notes continue that at the time Mrs Taylor-Erwin had denied, within the School's investigations, the allegation and said that there had been another witness in the car who could swear that she had not been drinking. Mrs Taylor-Erwin was recorded as confirming that "*she had once had a problem with drink in the past but had [REDACTED]*" and that "*[REDACTED]*".

It was further recorded that on 11 June 2019 the LADO had informed the School that "*[REDACTED]*".

The chronology recorded that the outcome of the LADO investigation into this matter was that the allegation was "*unsubstantiated*" which the School's TRA submission suggested meant that "*there was insufficient identifiable evidence to prove or disprove the allegation. The term, therefore, does not imply guilt or innocence*".

The panel had sight of a "*Low-Level Concern Reporting Form*" dated 17 November 2023 which was completed by Individual B. The form stated that in September 2019, Mrs Taylor-Erwin received a letter from the LADO regarding historic accusations relating to alcohol.

The panel took note of the fact that, in her now admitting this allegation, it was clearly implied that at the time, when she was recorded as having said that Individual A was

lying Mrs Taylor-Erwin in fact knew Individual A's account to be true and was, herself, lying.

The panel noted that it had no evidence either in the form of a witness statement from the other individual within the car or in terms of medical evidence to support Mrs Taylor-Erwin's assertions as made around the time of the event.

Given the evidence which it had seen and the contents of the Statement of Agreed Facts, the panel considered that the TRA had demonstrated, to the standard of the balance of probabilities, that Mrs Taylor-Erwin had, in or around June 2019, driven a motor vehicle whilst under the influence of alcohol.

The panel therefore found allegation 1 proven.

2. In or around April 2018, you attended the School and/or taught lessons:

a) Whilst under the influence of alcohol; and/or

b) Smelling of alcohol.

Mrs Taylor-Erwin admitted to allegation 2 in the Statement of Agreed Facts and in her response to the Notice of Referral.

Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the facts available to it.

The panel again considered the chronological notes submitted by Individual B as an attachment to the TRA referral.

This recorded that during the Easter holidays of 2018, "*Individual D and Individual E asked Individual F to go to Individual D's house for meeting.*" The notes stated that it was alleged that Mrs Taylor-Erwin "*had had drink in school on the afternoon of Sports Relief the day [the School] broke up. Individual E had seen open bottle in [Mrs Taylor-Erwin's] bag.*" and "*thought she could smell it on her*".

The notes also referenced that on "*16th April - 2018 Individual F spoke with ETE [Mrs Taylor-Erwin] re difficulties last term - erratic and abrupt, defensive etc. ETE said it was accumulation of things and she felt undervalued. Individual F said there had been a suggestion that alcohol had been involved. ETE did not agree nor did she deny. She was shaking badly*" and "*[REDACTED]*".

The panel again reviewed the "*Low-Level Concern Reporting Form*" dated 17 November 2023. This provided that in September 2019, Mrs Taylor-Erwin received a letter from the LADO regarding historic accusations relating to alcohol.

The panel noted that over and above Mrs Taylor-Erwin's admissions it did not appear to have any evidence that Mrs Taylor-Erwin taught lessons on the afternoon of the sports

relief day to which this allegation appeared to relate and therefore did not feel it had sufficient evidence to make a finding on that particular point.

Given the evidence which it had seen and the contents of the Statement of Agreed Facts, the panel considered that the TRA had demonstrated, to the standard of the balance of probabilities, that Mrs Taylor-Erwin had, in or around April 2018, attended the School whilst under the influence of alcohol and/or smelling of alcohol.

The panel therefore found allegations 2 (a) and 2 (b) proven on the balance of probabilities.

3. On or around 17 November 2023, you attended the School and/or taught lessons:

a) Whilst under the influence of alcohol; and/or

b) Smelling of alcohol.

Mrs Taylor-Erwin admitted allegation 3 in the Statement of Agreed Facts.

Notwithstanding Mrs Taylor-Erwin's admissions, the panel made its own determination as to the facts.

The panel again considered the "*Low-Level Concern Reporting Form*" dated 17 November 2023 as well as the TRA referral form which was signed by Individual B.

From these it noted that after assembly on Friday 17 November 2023 Individual B walked into the classroom and saw Mrs Taylor-Erwin with the pupils and that she led the pupils in a dance to celebrate his birthday.

Individual B stated that Mrs Taylor-Erwin's behaviour "*was unusual over the next half an hour as she was popping in and out of the classroom*" and it was "*something she has rarely done before*". Individual B stated that Mrs Taylor-Erwin walked past Individual B, pointed at the answer sheet, and "*said the answer was 55*". Individual B stated that "*there was the unmistakable smell of alcohol on [Mrs Taylor-Erwin's] breath*" when Mrs Taylor-Erwin spoke to him.

These documents set out that Mrs Taylor-Erwin then said that she needed to talk to Individual B. Individual B and Mrs Taylor-Erwin went to his office where he told Mrs Taylor-Erwin that she smelt of alcohol. Individual B's evidence was that Mrs Taylor-Erwin said she had "*fucked up' and had a couple of glasses of wine the night before*".

These documents set out that Mrs Taylor-Erwin then said that she [REDACTED] and that Individual B had also contributed to Mrs Taylor-Erwin's [REDACTED] as she had [REDACTED]".

The panel considered the minutes of a meeting of 24 November 2023 in which it was recorded that Mrs Taylor-Erwin had said she was [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Mrs Taylor-Erwin acknowledged within this meeting that she had consumed wine the night before [REDACTED].

Individual B was recorded as stating that he then asked Mrs Taylor-Erwin if she had only had a drink the night before. Individual B recorded that Mrs Taylor-Erwin “*was insistent that she had bought a bottle of wine last night and that was it.*”

Given the evidence which it had seen and the contents of the Statement of Agreed Facts, the panel considered that the TRA had demonstrated, to the standard of the balance of probabilities, that Mrs Taylor-Erwin had, on or around 17 November 2023, attended the School and/or taught lessons whilst under the influence of alcohol; and/or smelling of alcohol.

The panel therefore found allegations 3 (a) and 3 (b) proven on the balance of probabilities.

4. As a result of your conduct at paragraph 2(a) and/or 2(b) and/or 3(a) and/or 3(b) above, you were incapable of carrying out your duties either solely or in part due to alcohol consumption.

Mrs Taylor-Erwin admitted allegation 4 in the Statement of Agreed Facts.

Notwithstanding Mrs Taylor-Erwin’s admissions, the panel made its own determination as to the facts.

The panel noted that it had found allegations 2 (a) and 2 (b) and 3 (a) and 3 (b) proven and carefully review its findings in relation to those allegations.

The panel noted that it had found that Mrs Taylor-Erwin had attended the School smelling of alcohol and/or under the influence of alcohol on at least 2 occasions. The panel considered that these facts as found proven were, of themselves, sufficient demonstration that, on those days, Mrs Taylor-Erwin was incapable of carrying out her duties either solely or in part due to alcohol consumption given the high expectation of teachers as professionals at all times and the high level of safeguarding requirements for pupils especially pupils of the age for which Mrs Taylor-Erwin was responsible.

Given the evidence which it had seen and the contents of the Statement of Agreed Facts, the panel considered that the TRA had demonstrated, to the standard of the balance of probabilities, that on the times specified in its findings in allegations 2(a) and 2(b) and 3(a) and 3(b) above, Mrs Taylor-Erwin was incapable of carrying out her duties either solely or in part due to alcohol consumption.

Having considered the evidence before it, the panel found the particulars of allegation 4 proven on the balance of probabilities.

5. On 21 November 2024, you were convicted of two counts of failing to provide a specimen on 30 October 2024, contrary to section 7 of the Road Traffic Act 1988, in the course of an investigation into whether you had committed an offence under section 3A, 4, 5 or 5A.

In the Statement of Agreed Facts, Mrs Taylor-Erwin admitted to a conviction of a relevant offence and specifically admitted that on 21 November 2024, she was convicted at Huddersfield Magistrates' Court of two counts of failing to provide a specimen during an investigation into whether she had committed an offence under Section 3A, 4, 5 or 5A.

The panel also noted page 8 of the Advice, which states that where there has been a conviction, at any time, of a criminal offence, the meeting will not re-examine the facts of the case and the panel will accept the conviction as conclusive proof that establishes the relevant facts.

The panel was provided with a copy of a certificate of conviction that confirmed that on 30 October 2024 Mrs Taylor-Erwin had been "*suspected of being in charge of a vehicle*" and "*suspected of having driven a vehicle*" when "*required to provide a specimen of blood for a laboratory test and a specimen of urine for a laboratory test pursuant to section 7 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 in the course of an investigation into whether you had committed an offence under section 3A, 4, 5 or 5A thereof, failed, without reasonable excuse, to do so*". The certificate of conviction confirmed that Mrs Taylor Erwin was convicted on both counts on 21 November 2024.

On examination of the documents before the panel, the panel was satisfied that allegation 5 was proven.

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

Having found all 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 and/or conviction of a relevant offence.

In doing so, the panel had regard to the Advice.

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

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mrs Taylor-Erwin 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
 - 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 [...].
- 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 that Mrs Taylor-Erwin's conduct was a breach of KCSIE 2019 Part One, bullet points 2 and 7, and the equivalent bullet points in respect of the versions of KCSIE applicable in respect of allegations 2 and 3.

The panel also considered whether Mrs Taylor-Erwin'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 classes of offence of serious driving offences, particularly those involving alcohol and serious offences involving alcohol was relevant.

The panel carefully considered again the allegations that it had found proven.

The panel noted that it had found proven that Mrs Taylor-Erwin drove a car when she was under the influence of alcohol and failed to provide a specimen on another occasion when suspected of being under the influence of alcohol and in control of a car. The panel noted that there were some five years between those events. The panel separately noted that it had found that Mrs Taylor-Erwin has attended the School under the influence of alcohol and/or smelling of alcohol on at least 2 occasions and again noted that there were some five years between those two occasions. The panel considered that this appeared to illustrate a serious and prolonged failure to address matters which gave rise to serious safeguarding and professional concerns and which called into question Mrs Taylor-Erwin's suitability as a teacher. The panel considered that these were very serious matters.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mrs Taylor-Erwin amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession. The panel was satisfied that Mrs Taylor-Erwin's conduct as found proven could well have led to pupils being exposed to or influenced by her behaviour in a harmful way.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mrs Taylor-Erwin was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Mrs Taylor-Erwin'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 Taylor-Erwin'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 Taylor-Erwin was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found that the classes of offence of serious driving offences, particularly those involving alcohol and serious offences involving alcohol 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 also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mrs Taylor-Erwin's behaviour in attending the School under the influence of and/or smelling of alcohol as well as driving a car under the influence of alcohol and committing the offences for which she had been found guilty would be likely to affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel considered that parents would be extremely concerned were they to find out that their young children were in the care of an individual who was demonstrated to have taken this attitude towards their obligations and who had placed themselves in a position where they were, on occasion, incapable of carrying out their teaching role.

The panel considered that Mrs Taylor-Erwin's conduct was of a serious nature which would likely have a negative impact on the public's perception of the individual as a teacher (and teachers generally) therefore bringing the profession into disrepute.

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

In considering the issue of conviction for a relevant offence, the panel first considered whether the conduct of Mrs Taylor-Erwin, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mrs Taylor-Erwin was in breach of the standards set out above.

After careful consideration the panel were satisfied that Mrs Taylor-Erwin's actions were relevant to teaching and working with children and working in an education setting. The panel formed this view for reasons including that the offences were matters which related directly to integrity and abiding by the rule of law. The panel also noted that teachers should be role models for pupils.

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.

The panel again considered that Mrs Taylor-Erwin's behaviour in committing the offence could affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community.

The panel noted that Mrs Taylor-Erwin's behaviour did not lead to a sentence of imprisonment, rather a fine, a community order and a requirement for alcohol treatment and rehabilitation activity, 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 serious driving offences, particularly those involving alcohol, which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

[REDACTED]

The panel noted that the reason for Mrs Taylor-Erwin requesting a professional conduct panel meeting was because the case referred [REDACTED].

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

The panel concluded that the convictions were for a relevant offence.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute 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, the protection of other members of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mrs Taylor-Erwin, which involved smelling of and/or being under the influence of alcohol during school hours and as well as driving whilst having consumed alcohol and convictions for failure to provide a specimen in the course of being investigated for being in charge of a vehicle whilst under the influence of alcohol, there was a strong public interest consideration in 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 Taylor-Erwin 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 Taylor-Erwin 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 Taylor-Erwin in the profession.

The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mrs Taylor-Erwin in the profession, since her behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.

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

In view of the clear public interest considerations that were present, the panel considered carefully whether or not it would be proportionate to impose a prohibition order, taking into account the effect that this would have on Mrs Taylor-Erwin.

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 or caution [...];
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing 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 had no reason to doubt that Mrs Taylor-Erwin's actions were deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mrs Taylor-Erwin was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation.

The panel had no evidence that Mrs Taylor-Erwin demonstrated exceptionally high standards in her personal and professional conduct or had contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel had no evidence that the incidents were out of character.

[REDACTED].

The panel considered that it had relatively limited indications of insight or remorse by Mrs Taylor-Erwin noting in particular that there seemed to be little awareness of the level to which pupils may have been exposed to risk of harm or negative influence as a result of her actions.

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 Taylor-Erwin 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 Taylor-Erwin. The fact that it appeared that a course of conduct had been illustrated by her behaviour as found proven, her having driven whilst under the influence of alcohol, her conviction for a serious offence arising from circumstances where she had failed to provide a specimen when being assessed for drink related offences and the fact that she had on 2 occasions attended the School, where she had safeguarding responsibilities for pupils, whilst smelling of and/or under the influence of alcohol were significant factors in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate for it to decide to recommend a review period for 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 again considered the facts which it had found proven and again took into account the various matters which it had considered in relation to Mrs Taylor-Erwin's personal circumstances for which it was sympathetic.

The panel noted that it had found that the allegations appeared to demonstrate a course of conduct in relation to Mrs Taylor-Erwin's use of alcohol over a number of years. The panel noted her conviction was relatively recent.

The panel was highly concerned that there could be a repetition of the behaviour described within the allegations it had found proven and, whilst it noted some attempts by Mrs Taylor-Erwin to recognise and address her behaviours, did not consider that it had seen any adequate evidence of her endeavouring to recognise the triggers which had led to her behaviour or that she had put into place any adequate systems to deal with recognising those triggers and preventing a recurrence of that behaviour.

As stated above the panel did not consider that Mrs Taylor-Erwin had demonstrated sufficient levels of insight or remorse.

The panel noted that Mrs Taylor-Erwin did clearly recognise that she had a problematic relationship with alcohol and the panel, recognising that health conditions could derive from that relationship, again did not see sufficient evidence that Mrs Taylor-Erwin had sought to address these concerns.

The panel decided that, for reasons including its strong safeguarding concerns, 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 review period of 5 years. The panel considered that this would provide Mrs Taylor-Erwin with sufficient time amongst other things to develop necessary insight, ensure she fully understood and recognised her triggers and had appropriate mechanisms in place to ensure she took appropriate actions when they occurred. The panel also considered that this was an appropriate period for Mrs Taylor Erwin to be able to demonstrate a long term, consistent and sustainable recovery.

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 all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts (in relation to allegations 1-4) amount to both unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and (in relation to allegation 5) a relevant conviction.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mrs Taylor-Erwin should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of five years.

In particular, the panel has found that Mrs Taylor-Erwin 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 [...].
- 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 Mrs Taylor-Erwin 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 Mrs Taylor-Erwin 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, 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 Mrs Taylor-Erwin, 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, “... *this appeared to illustrate a serious and prolonged failure to address matters which gave rise to serious safeguarding and professional concerns and which called into question Mrs Taylor-Erwin’s suitability as a teacher. The panel considered that these were very serious matters*”.

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 considered that it had relatively limited indications of insight or remorse by Mrs Taylor-Erwin noting in particular that there seemed to be little awareness of the level to which pupils may have been exposed to risk of harm or negative influence as a result of her actions*”.

In my judgement, the lack of 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 considered that Mrs Taylor-*

Erwin's conduct was of a serious nature which would likely have a negative impact on the public's perception of the individual as a teacher (and teachers generally) therefore bringing the profession into disrepute".

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 Mrs Taylor-Erwin herself.

A prohibition order would prevent Mrs Taylor-Erwin from teaching. A prohibition order would also clearly deprive the public of her contribution to the profession for the period that it is in force.

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel's comments concerning the lack of insight or remorse. The panel has said that it, "...*did not consider that Mrs Taylor-Erwin had demonstrated sufficient levels of insight or remorse*".

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mrs Taylor-Erwin 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 remorse or insight, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

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

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

I have considered the panel's comments "*The panel was highly concerned that there could be a repetition of the behaviour described within the allegations it had found proven and, whilst it noted some attempts by Mrs Taylor-Erwin to recognise and address her behaviours, did not consider that it had seen any adequate evidence of her endeavouring to recognise the triggers which had led to her behaviour or that she had put into place any adequate systems to deal with recognising those triggers and preventing a recurrence of that behaviour.*"

The panel has also said that a five year review period would *“provide Mrs Taylor-Erwin with sufficient time amongst other things to develop necessary insight, ensure she fully understood and recognised her triggers and had appropriate mechanisms in place to ensure she took appropriate actions when they occurred. The panel also considered that this was an appropriate period for Mrs Taylor Erwin to be able to demonstrate a long term, consistent and sustainable recovery”*.

I have considered whether a five 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 all of the circumstances, I consider that a five year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

This means that Mrs Emma Taylor-Erwin 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 30 January 2031, five 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, Mrs Taylor-Erwin remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mrs Taylor-Erwin has a right of appeal to the High Court within 28 days from the date she is given notice of this order.



Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield

Date: 23 January 2026

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