



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Ms Jemma Kemsley: 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	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	10
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	13

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

<b>Teacher:</b>	Ms Jemma Kemsley
<b>Teacher ref number:</b>	0981537
<b>Teacher date of birth:</b>	3 September 1981
<b>TRA reference:</b>	21011
<b>Date of determination:</b>	16 January 2026
<b>Former employer:</b>	Sankey Valley St James Church of England Primary School, Warrington

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 16 January 2026 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Ms Jemma Kemsley.

The panel members were Mr Philip Thompson (teacher panellist – in the chair), Ms Emma Billings (lay panellist) and Mr Jack Davies (lay panellist).

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

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Ms Jemma Kemsley that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Ms Kemsley provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer Mr Jack Ashford, Ms Kemsley or any representative for Ms Kemsley.

The meeting took place in private.

## **Allegations**

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 3 October 2025.

It was alleged that Ms Kemsley was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that, while employed as a teacher at Sankey Valley St James CE Primary School ('the School'), Ms Kemsley:

1. On 10 September 2021:
  - a) Drank alcohol on the School premises;
  - b) Taught and/or were responsible for the teaching of pupils whilst under the influence of alcohol.
2. By her conduct at allegation 1(a) and/or 1(b) above, she presented a safeguarding risk to pupils.

Ms Kemsley admitted allegations 1(a), 1(b) and 2, and further admitted that her conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, as set out in the notice of referral form signed by Ms Kemsley on 19 May 2025, and the statement of agreed facts signed by Ms Kemsley on 31 July 2025 and subsequently signed by the presenting officer on 6 August 2025.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section 1: Chronology and list of key people – pages 3 to 5

Section 2: Notice of referral, response and notice of meeting – pages 6 to 23

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 24 to 27

Section 4: TRA documents – pages 28 to 136

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

- A bundle of documents starting with a written submission from Ms Kemsley's trade union representative dated 26 November 2025 – 8 pages
- A second bundle of documents starting with a [REDACTED] letter dated 22 November 2021 – 6 pages

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of these documents in advance of the hearing.

In the consideration of this case, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession 2020, (the “Procedures”).

## **Statement of agreed facts**

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Ms Kemsley on 31 July 2025.

## **Decision and reasons**

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

In advance of the meeting the TRA agreed to a request from Ms Kemsley 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 10 September 2021 staff became concerned with Ms Kemsley’s behaviour whilst she was teaching, as she appeared disorientated and was slurring.

The same day, Ms Kemsley was called into a meeting where she eventually admitted she had been drinking. She tested positive on two alcohol tests.

The matter was referred to the TRA on 22 July 2022.

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

### **1. On 10 September 2021:**

#### **a) Drank alcohol on the School premises;**

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts, signed by Ms Kemsley on 31 July 2025, and the response to notice of referral form, signed by Ms Kemsley on 19 May 2025 in which she admitted to allegation 1(a).

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

The panel had sight of the alcohol test results from Ms Kemsley's test taken on 10 September 2021. The panel noted that Ms Kemsley tested positive at 18:52 and 19:12, obtaining readings of 1.44% and 1.43%. The panel noted that these test readings had been taken late in the day on 10 September 2021, and that Ms Kemsley had been on the School premises throughout the day.

The panel considered the witness statement of Person A, who stated that on 10 September 2021 at 14:45 there was a whole school assembly held via Teams, and when Ms Kemsley spoke her voice sounded different and she sounded "off". She stated that she was over emphasising things and her voice was louder than usual, and she was mixing children's names up and her voice sounded slurred.

Person A stated that in a meeting with Ms Kemsley and two colleagues later that day, Ms Kemsley was asked if she had been drinking alcohol, to which she said she hadn't, and that she did not know why she was "off".

Person A stated that Ms Kemsley agreed to take an alcohol test, which Person B and Person C left the room to organise. She stated that as soon as they left the room Ms Kemsley told her she had been drinking alcohol, specifically wine in the morning before school but said she had not drunk anything since then.

Person A stated that she told Person B that Ms Kemsley said she had been drinking and when Person B then asked the same question about her drinking during the day she told her that she had drunk an alcoholic drink at lunch time. Person A stated that Ms Kemsley seemed disoriented and could not recall where her phone was, and was unable to organise herself or her belongings. The panel noted in Person A's witness statement that Person A referred to finding an empty half bottle of vodka in Ms Kemsley's bag.

The panel considered the witness statement of Person D, who stated that in the afternoon of 10 September 2021 she noticed that Ms Kemsley was *"not her normal self. She seemed to have deteriorated from when I had seen her earlier in the day. Her hair was untidy and dishevelled."*

The panel considered the witness statement of Person B, who stated that Ms Kemsley admitted to her in a meeting on 10 September 2021 that she had been drinking alcohol that day. Person B also stated that she saw the empty half bottle of vodka in Ms Kemsley's bag.

Based on the evidence available to it, the panel considered it was more likely than not that Ms Kemsley had been drinking alcohol on School premises on 10 September 2021.

The panel therefore found allegation 1(a) proven.

## **b) Taught and/or were responsible for the teaching of pupils whilst under the influence of alcohol**

The panel noted that Ms Kemsley had admitted to allegation 1(b) in the statement of agreed facts signed by her on 31 July 2025 and in the response to notice of referral form she signed on 19 May 2025.

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

The panel considered the witness statements of Ms Kemsley's colleagues which were consistent in stating that Ms Kemsley was teaching and/or responsible for teaching pupils on 10 September 2021. The panel noted the following extracts in particular:

- Person E's witness statement dated 16 November 2024: *"In the morning, Ms Kemsley gave me instructions...Ms Kemsley was teaching some of the children in the class."*
- Person D's witness statement dated 8 October 2024: *"I went into Ms Kemsley's reception class a few times on 10 September 2021.....Ms Kemsley was supposed to be looking after the children and working with them."*
- Person A witness statement dated 5 November 2024: *"On 10 September 2021, at 14:45 we had a whole school assembly on Teams...when Ms Kemsley spoke during the assembly, her voice sounded different and she sounded off. She was over emphasising things and her voice was louder than usual. Ms Kemsley is usually really poised and well presented, but she was mixing children's names up and sounded slurred."*

The panel noted that whilst it did not have a copy of Ms Kemsley's teaching timetable to verify that she had been teaching on 10 September 2021, the panel considered that the admission from Ms Kemsley and the consistency of her colleagues' witness statements was sufficient evidence that Ms Kemsley had been teaching and/or responsible for teaching pupils on 10 September 2021 whilst she had been under the influence of alcohol.

The panel therefore found allegation 1(b) proven.

## **2. By your conduct at allegation 1(a) and/or 1(b) above, you presented a safeguarding risk to pupils.**

As above, the panel noted that Ms Kemsley had admitted to allegation 2 in the statement of agreed facts signed by her on 31 July 2025 and in the response to notice of referral form she signed on 19 May 2025.

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

The panel noted that it had found allegations 1 (a) and 1 (b) proven and carefully reviewed its decision and reasons.

The panel considered the contents of the School's disciplinary investigation report dated 15 October 2021 which stated that *"During the afternoon of Friday 10<sup>th</sup> September a number of staff members independently reported and witnessed Jemma's behaviour as being erratic and uncharacteristic and led to them having concerns for her own wellbeing and also concerns from a safeguarding point of view for the children."*

The panel considered the witness statement of Person D who stated that *"At around 2.15pm on one of the occasions that I went into Ms Kemsley's classroom, I noticed that...half of the children in Ms Kemsley's class were left alone in the classroom. There was around 10 to 15 children in the [REDACTED] class. The children were aged between 4 and 5 years old....There were no other adults present inside. Ms Kemsley was supposed to be looking after the children and working with them, but she was not there. I looked for Ms Kemsley, and found her locked inside the staff toilet in her classroom."*

The panel considered that the age of the pupils was of particular relevance, as pupils aged 4 or 5 years old need a lot of guidance, safeguarding and support and should not be left alone.

The panel noted the witness statement of Person E in which she described how on 10 September 2021 a child fell over and that Ms Kemsley did not react to this.

The panel considered the alcohol test readings which had been over the legal driving limit and had been taken late in the day on 10 September 2021.

The panel considered the School's drug, alcohol and substance misuse policy provided within the bundle and noted that its findings indicated that Ms Kemsley had acted in contravention of the guidance in that policy and that she had caused a clear risk to pupils by leaving them unattended.

The panel considered that Ms Kemsley's behaviour in drinking alcohol on the School premises on 10 September 2021 and then teaching the pupils and being responsible for them whilst under the influence of alcohol presented a clear safeguarding risk to the pupils in her care.

The panel therefore found allegation 2 proven.

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

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.

The panel noted that Ms Kemsley had admitted in the statement of agreed facts signed by her on 31 July 2025 and in the response to notice of referral form she signed on 19 May 2025 that her conduct at allegations 1 and 2 amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the facts available to it and the circumstances of the case.

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

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

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by:
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils’ well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach.
- 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 Ms Kemsley’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 child neglect may be relevant. The panel considered that Ms Kemsley’s behaviour in leaving a number of pupils aged 4 or 5 years old unattended was negligent and neglectful. However, the panel noted that Ms Kemsley had not been prosecuted in respect of any offence and the panel took that into its consideration.

For the reasons set out above, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Ms Kemsley amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Ms Kemsley was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Ms Kemsley'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 Ms Kemsley'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 Ms Kemsley was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that the behaviours displayed by Ms Kemsley were akin to child neglect for the reasons set out above.

The panel considered that Ms Kemsley's conduct would damage the public's perception of a teacher. In particular, the panel considered that parents of pupils aged 4 or 5 years old would not expect a teacher to drink alcohol on School premises and be under the influence of alcohol whilst teaching and/or being responsible for their children.

For these reasons, the panel found that Ms Kemsley'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; and
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct within the teaching profession.

In the light of the panel's findings against Ms Kemsley, which involved drinking alcohol on the School premises and teaching and/or being responsible for pupils whilst under the influence of alcohol, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils.

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

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Ms Kemsley was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

In addition to the public interest considerations set out above, the panel went on to consider whether there was a public interest in retaining Ms Kemsley in the profession. The panel considered that it did not have any evidence before it of any significant contribution to the education sector by Ms Kemsley. The panel therefore considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Ms Kemsley 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. The panel considered that Ms Kemsley's actions as found proven by the panel were serious.

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

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;
- 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).

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 there was insufficient evidence that Ms Kemsley's actions on 10 September 2021 were not deliberate. The panel considered that whilst there was evidence showing that Ms Kemsley [REDACTED] at the time, the panel was of the view, on balance, that Ms Kemsley was still in charge of her own decision-making on 10 September 2021 when she consumed alcohol on School premises and whilst responsible for the safety and welfare of pupils.

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

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

The panel carefully considered Ms Kemsley's written statement which they had agreed to admit into evidence in which Ms Kemsley submitted that [REDACTED].

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

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

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

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Ms Kemsley. The panel's findings that Ms Kemsley did drink alcohol on School premises and was under the influence of alcohol whilst teaching and/or being responsible for pupils aged 4 or 5 years old, and thereby presenting a safeguarding risk, was a significant factor in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate for it to decide to recommend a review period of the order. The panel was mindful that the Advice states that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances, in any given case, that

may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 2 years.

The Advice indicates that there are certain types of case where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period.

As set out above, the panel considered that the category of child neglect may be relevant in this case. The panel had found that the behaviours displayed by Ms Kemsley were akin to child neglect for the reasons set out above.

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.

[REDACTED].

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a review period. The panel considered that a review period of three years would be appropriate in this case including in that this would allow Ms Kemsley an adequate period of time in which to demonstrate [REDACTED].

## **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 amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Ms Kemsley 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
- 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 finds that the conduct of Ms Kemsley 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, or a relevant conviction, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Ms Kemsley, 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 safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, "*The panel considered that Ms Kemsley's behaviour in leaving a number of pupils aged 4 or 5 years old unattended was negligent and neglectful.*" 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, "[REDACTED]" The panel has also commented that "[REDACTED]".

In my judgement, 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, "*...that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Ms Kemsley was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.*"

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 Ms Kemsley herself. The panel comment “*The panel had seen no evidence that Ms Kemsley had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in her personal and professional conduct or had contributed significantly to the education sector*”.

A prohibition order would prevent Ms Kemsley 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 Ms Kemsley’s insight and remorse.

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that “*The panel had found that the behaviours displayed by Ms Kemsley were akin to child neglect for the reasons set out above*”.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Ms Kemsley has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession.

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

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

I have considered the panel’s comments “[REDACTED]”

The panel has also said that a three year review period would “*would be appropriate in this case including in that this would allow Ms Kemsley an adequate period of time in which to demonstrate [REDACTED].*”

I have considered whether a three 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.

Taking all of the circumstances of this case into account, I consider that a three year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

**This means that Ms Jemma Kemsley 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 **5 February 2029**, three years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If she does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Ms Kemsley remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Ms Kemsley 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: 29 January 2026**

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