



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Ms Helena Eckles: Professional conduct panel outcome**

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

**April 2026**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Witnesses	4
Decision and reasons	4
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	9
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**

**Teacher:** Ms Helena Eckles  
**Teacher ref number:** 9354484  
**Teacher date of birth:** 25 July 1972  
**TRA reference:** 24684  
**Date of determination:** 17 April 2026  
**Former employer:** Hall Cliffe Primary School, Wakefield

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened by way of virtual hearing on 17 April 2026 to consider the case of Ms Helena Eckles.

The panel members were Mr Nigel Shock (lay panellist – in the chair), Ms Georgina Bean (teacher panellist) and Mr Chris Major (teacher panellist).

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

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Silas Lee of Mountford Chambers.

Ms Eckles was present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public save those portions of the hearing which were heard in private and was recorded.

## **Allegations**

The panel considered the allegation set out in the notice of proceedings dated 14 January 2026.

It was alleged that Ms Eckles was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:

1. On 7 March 2025, she was convicted at Leeds Magistrates Court for the offence of assault by beating contrary to the Criminal Justice Act 1988 s.39.

Ms Eckles admitted the fact of the conviction in the hearing, but denied that she was convicted for a relevant offence.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section 1: Anonymised pupil list – page 3

Section 2: Notice of referral/response and notice of hearing/response – pages 4 to 32

Section 3: TRA documents – pages 33 to 55

Section 4: Teacher documents – pages 56 to 65

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”).

### **Witnesses**

No witnesses were called to provide oral evidence.

## **Decision and reasons**

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

The panel found that around November 2023, Ms Eckles commenced employment as a teacher at Hall Cliffe Primary School ('the School').

On 21 May 2024, an allegation was made that Ms Eckles had slapped Pupil A across the face.

On 21 May 2024, a referral was made to the LADO, and the incident was reported to West Yorkshire police via the non-emergency line. The West Yorkshire police then commenced a criminal investigation.

On 20 June 2024, Ms Eckles attended a voluntary interview with the police during which she denied intentionally assaulting the pupil and provided her account of the incident.

On 7 November 2024, the matter was referred to the TRA.

On 7 March 2025, it is alleged that Ms Eckles was convicted at Leeds Magistrates Court for the offence of assault by beating contrary to the Criminal Justice Act 1988 s.39.

## Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

- 1. On 7 March 2025, you were convicted at Leeds Magistrates Court for the offence of assault by beating contrary to the Criminal Justice Act 1988 s.39.**

The panel noted that Ms Eckles admitted this allegation at the hearing but did not admit that her conviction was for a relevant offence.

The panel considered the response to the notice of referral form signed by Ms Eckles on 2 June 2026. Within the form, Ms Eckles denied allegation 1 and subsequently denied that her conduct amounted to conviction of a relevant offence.

The panel proceeded to make a determination based on the facts available to it and proceeded to adopt a cautious and considered approach including in relation to the matter of whether or not the conviction constituted a "relevant" offence.

The panel noted that the conviction referred to "*Helen*" rather than "*Helena*" Eckles but noted also that Ms Eckles admitted the conviction which the panel had before it was her conviction.

The panel noted that Ms Eckles had chosen not to give live evidence. The panel also noted that she relied on the documents within the bundle including, without limitation, her initial report of the incident, her notes and her impact statement as setting out her position. The panel carefully considered those documents.

The panel noted that since Ms Eckles had not given live evidence these documents were hearsay evidence but admitted and considered them carefully giving them reasonable weight as setting out Ms Eckles' position, especially on noting that it had been directed to those documents by Ms Eckles in her submissions.

The panel observed that in the initial report of the incident by Ms Eckles, dated 21 May 2024, Ms Eckles described that on Tuesday 21 May 2024, pupils had been playing games on laptops after completing their learning and had been instructed to put them away. She stated that all pupils complied except Pupil A, who refused and said that he was in the middle of a game. Ms Eckles recorded that she told Pupil A he could continue until he had "*died*" in the game and then he needed to shut down the laptop.

Ms Eckles described observing that Pupil A appeared red in the face and that he continued to refuse to put the laptop away. Ms Eckles stated that after repeated instructions, she began unplugging the mouse and power cable and attempted to close the laptop lid, with [REDACTED] standing several feet away in support. She stated that while she was attempting to hand the laptop to the [REDACTED], Pupil A flailed his arms, tried to push her away and grab the laptop, and that she "*overbalanced slightly backwards on her left foot and stepped forward with her right foot to steady herself.*"

Ms Eckles stated that as she did so, her right arm came forward involuntarily and that her open palm came into contact with Pupil A's face lightly as he moved on his chair. She stated that there was no force or horizontal movement from her arm or hand and that any contact was completely unintentional and accidental. Ms Eckles further recorded that Pupil A immediately shouted that she had slapped him and ran out of the room shouting in the corridor. Ms Eckles recorded that she continued teaching and that Pupil A did not return to the classroom for the remainder of the afternoon.

The panel noted and considered the "Relevant Information" document from the police with which it had been provided. The panel noted that this document was hearsay and placed reasonable weight on it. The panel noted that it was recorded in that document that the victim of the offence of which Ms Eckles had been convicted was [REDACTED] and attended the school at which Ms Eckles was a teacher. It noted that the conviction was concerned with Ms Eckles slapping that pupil and that this action was witnessed by [REDACTED] and that the victim had a visible injury; a red handprint type mark on his left cheek which the police form stated was documented within the safeguarding concerns document files of the School. The report also contained Ms Eckles' account of the facts which the panel found was consistent with Ms Eckles' account in the documents which she had provided to the panel.

The panel noted page 8 of the Teacher misconduct: the prohibition of teachers ('the Advice') which provided that where there has been a conviction at any time, of a criminal offence, the panel will accept the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of both the

conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction, unless exceptional circumstances apply. On careful consideration, including of Ms Eckles' account of the wider circumstances, the panel did not find that any exceptional circumstances applied in this case.

The panel had been provided with a copy of the certificate of conviction from Leeds Magistrates' Court dated 31 March 2025, which detailed that Ms Eckles had been convicted of assault by beating on 7 March 2025. The panel noted that the issue of whether or not Ms Eckles pleaded guilty was not clearly evidenced but that Ms Eckles' position was that she did not.

In respect of the offence, Ms Eckles was sentenced to a community order to be complied with by 30 March 2026; a rehabilitation activity requirement of up to 5 days; and an unpaid work requirement of 150 hours to be completed within twelve months.

The panel was satisfied that it had conclusive proof of the conviction and noted that the teacher admitted to the conviction.

The panel 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 the proved allegation amounted to conviction of a relevant offence.

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

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

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Ms Eckles, in relation to the facts it found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that by reference to Part 2, Ms Eckles was in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
  - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position;
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions; and
  - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect [...].

- 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 the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety and security of pupils.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Ms Eckles' behaviour in committing the offence for which she had been convicted 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 Ms Eckles' behaviour did not lead to a sentence of imprisonment and took that into account.

The panel also considered the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice. The panel found that this was a case concerning the offence type of 'violence', which the Advice states is likely to be considered a 'relevant offence'.

The panel also again considered all the documents in the bundle. The panel also again considered the conviction and the matters which it had found proven and its decision.

The panel took into account evidence of potential mitigating circumstances when considering Ms Eckles' conduct at the time the offence was committed. It noted Ms Eckles' written account including in that she described the incident as arising in the context of a challenging classroom situation involving a pupil [REDACTED], during which she stated that any contact was accidental and occurred as she lost her balance while attempting to manage the situation.

The panel noted Ms Eckles' position that she did not appeal against the conviction as, she stated, she could not afford to so do but that she maintained her innocence of any wrongdoing and repeatedly stated that there had been a miscarriage of justice.

The panel also again considered the written material provided by Ms Eckles regarding her working environment at the School. It noted that, during her employment at the School she claimed to have experienced staffing shortages, to having worked frequently with agency teaching assistants who were not trained in restraint techniques and stated that she was often left without sufficient support in the classroom. She also described frequent incidents of challenging behaviour by pupils and stated that support requests were not always responded to.

In making a judgement on relevance the panel considered all the facts of the case including the nature and gravity of the offence, its circumstances and the mitigating circumstances put forward.

The panel noted that it had found that Ms Eckles' actions as proven by the conviction were contrary to the standard of personal and professional conduct expected of teachers.

The panel found that that the subject matter of the conviction was clearly relevant to teaching and working with children and working in an education setting as it was concerned with violence, specifically a physical assault of a [REDACTED] pupil.

The panel found that the subject matter of the conviction would be likely to have an impact on safety or security of pupils or members of the public and would be likely to affect public confidence in the teaching profession.

The panel found then that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Ms Eckles' 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 found that this was a conviction for a relevant offence.

## **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. The panel noted that 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, including the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and the declaring and upholding of proper standards of conduct in the profession.

In light of the panel's findings against Ms Eckles, which involved her having been convicted of a relevant offence, specifically the assault of a [REDACTED] pupil by slapping them across the face, there was clearly a strong public interest consideration in respect of 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 Eckles was 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 Eckles 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 Eckles in the profession. Whilst there was some limited evidence that Ms Eckles had ability as an educator, and the panel noted her stated dedication to the profession and her lengthy career within the profession, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Ms Eckles 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 Ms Eckles.

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, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of the Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures;
- 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);
- violation of the rights of pupils; and
- [...] other deliberate behaviour that undermines pupils, the profession, the school or colleagues;

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.

Whilst the panel noted that Ms Eckles continued to deny the facts of the crime for which she had been convicted (and, in her own account of the incident, claimed that the contact was accidental and occurred while she was regaining her balance), the panel noted that she admitted that she had received a criminal conviction and the panel did not seek to look behind that conviction. The panel could see no substantive basis to call into question the deliberate nature of her actions as found proven.

The panel carefully considered Ms Eckles' submissions in mitigation including that she was being attacked by Pupil A at the time, that this was a frequent occurrence, that she did not have sufficient trained staff around her, that Pupil A had thrown laptops at her on previous occasions and that the School was an unsafe and unsupported environment. Ms Eckles also set out the consequences for her of this situation including the impact upon [REDACTED].

Whilst the panel noted that the child's behaviour was clearly disruptive there was no evidence to suggest that Ms Eckles was acting under extreme duress.

The panel, whilst again noting her long service and the fact that the TRA had not alerted it to any previous misconduct findings, did not find it evidenced that Ms Eckles had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in her personal and professional conduct or that she had contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel did not find that it had a basis to establish whether this incident was out of character.

In relation to other mitigating factors, the panel considered Ms Eckles' written submissions in which she described the incident as accidental and maintained that there was no intention to harm the pupil. The panel noted that Ms Eckles continued to deny deliberate wrongdoing and did not accept the factual basis of the conviction beyond acknowledging its outcome.

The panel noted that Ms Eckles' submissions regarding sanction had been very much focused on herself and that she showed little or no awareness of the consequences of her actions for the [REDACTED] pupil, the consequences for the School or her profession.

Further, the panel found no evidence of insight or remorse demonstrated on the part of Ms Eckles.

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 Eckles of prohibition. The panel was particularly conscious that the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils is always paramount and considered that members of the public would be understandably concerned if a teacher who had been convicted of assaulting a young pupil in these circumstances was allowed to continue teaching.

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 Eckles. The seriousness of the offence for which she was convicted, and its violent nature as well as its very clear relevance to her role as a teacher and the serious breaches of the teachers' standards which it had found, were all 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 of the order. The panel was mindful that the Advice states that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances, in any given case, that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 2 years.

The Advice indicates that there are certain types of case where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period. None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel's findings.

The Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate. The panel found that the case type of "violence" was engaged by the allegation which it had found proven.

In assessing whether a review period was appropriate, and if so its length, the panel took into consideration Ms Eckles' written account of the circumstances surrounding the incident and the limited character evidence relating to her teaching career.

As previously stated, the panel had found no evidence of insight or remorse demonstrated by Ms Eckles.

The panel was extremely troubled by the offence against a child of which Ms Eckles had been convicted and considered that it could have no assurance that such actions would not be repeated.

Further the panel gave careful consideration to the fact that the relevant conviction which it had found Ms Eckles had received was of such a serious nature within the context of her role. The panel again noted the behaviours which it had found demonstrated, as listed, and considered, on balance, that it would not be appropriate for Ms Eckles to return to the teaching profession. The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended without provisions 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 the proven facts amount to a relevant conviction.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Ms Eckles is in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
  - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position;
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions; and
  - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect [...].
- 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 proven conduct was a conviction for a relevant offence.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding “...as it was concerned with violence, specifically a physical assault of a [REDACTED] pupil.”

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 Ms Eckles, 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. The panel has observed, “*The panel found that the subject matter of the conviction would be likely to have an impact on safety or security of pupils or members of the public...*” A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel’s comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, “...*the panel considered Ms Eckles’ written submissions in which she described the incident as accidental and maintained that there was no intention to harm the pupil. The panel noted that Ms Eckles continued to deny deliberate wrongdoing and did not accept the factual basis of the conviction beyond acknowledging its outcome.*”

The panel has also commented “*Further, the panel found no evidence of insight or remorse demonstrated on the part of Ms Eckles.*”

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

I am particularly mindful of the finding of a criminal conviction of assault in relation to a pupil 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 Ms Eckles herself. The panel comment *“Ms Eckles also set out the consequences for her of this situation including the impact upon [REDACTED].”*

The panel also state that it *“...did not find it evidenced that Ms Eckles had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in her personal and professional conduct or that she had contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel did not find that it had a basis to establish whether this incident was out of character.”*

A prohibition order would prevent Ms Eckles 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, *“The panel noted that Ms Eckles’ submissions regarding sanction had been very much focused on herself and that she showed little or no awareness of the consequences of her actions for the [REDACTED] pupil, the consequences for the School or her profession.”*

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

In this case, the panel has said that,

*“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. The panel found that the case type of “violence” was engaged by the allegation which it had found proven.”*

I have also considered the panel’s comments,

*“In assessing whether a review period was appropriate, and if so its length, the panel took into consideration Ms Eckles’ written account of the circumstances surrounding the incident and the limited character evidence relating to her teaching career.*

*As previously stated, the panel had found no evidence of insight or remorse demonstrated by Ms Eckles.*

*The panel was extremely troubled by the offence against a child of which Ms Eckles had been convicted and considered that it could have no assurance that such actions would not be repeated.”*

I have considered whether not allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is proportionate to achieving the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In my view, factors in this case mean that 10-year review period is sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the seriousness of the conduct, including the finding of violence against a pupil, and the lack of evidence of insight and remorse. In determining that a review period is appropriate, I have also taken into account that this was a single incident and panel’s finding that there has been no other identified misconduct in Ms Eckles record.

I consider therefore that a 10-year review period is necessary to maintain public confidence and is proportionate and in the public interest.

**This means that Ms Helena Eckles 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 24 April 2036, 10 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 Eckles remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Ms Eckles 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 cursive script that reads "S. Blomfield".

**Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield**

**Date: 20 April 2026**

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