



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Ms Jennifer Farron: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

May 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	16
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	21

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

Teacher: Ms Jennifer Farron

Teacher ref number: 1680756

Teacher date of birth: 22 December 1991

TRA reference: 25303

Date of determination: 8 May 2026

Former employer: St John Bosco Arts College, Liverpool

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 8 May 2026 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Ms Jennifer Farron.

The panel members were Mr Terry Hyde (former teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Bernie Whittle (teacher panellist) and Ms Jan Stoddard (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mrs Luisa Gibbons of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP Solicitors.

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Ms Farron that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Ms Farron provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer Ms Leah Redden of Browne Jacobson LLP, Ms Farron or her representative Nuala Lavery-Noon of the NASUWT.

The meeting took place in private and was not recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 3 February 2026.

It was alleged that Ms Farron was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that:

1. She failed to maintain appropriate boundaries with one or more pupils in that she sent and or exchanged emails with them:
 - a. which were sent outside schooling hours;
 - b. which were excessive in number;
 - c. in which she suggested that Pupil A visit her partner's café;
 - d. in which she discussed her tattoo and/or encouraged a pupil to obtain a similar temporary tattoo;
 - e. in which Pupil A informed her that New Years' Eve "was the worst 24 hours of [their] life" or words to that effect;
 - f. in which Pupil A told her they "missed u" or words to that effect;
2. During the year 2023- 2024 academic year and in respect of the investigation into email communications between herself and one or more pupils, she caused and/or permitted and/or failed to prevent and/or requested that relevant emails to that investigation be deleted;
3. She failed to take appropriate action and/or ensure appropriate action was taken to safeguard one or more pupils in or around the academic year 2023 – 2024 in that she failed to report the emails at one above;
4. Her conduct as may be found proven at allegations 1 – 3 above was despite being aware that pupil/s were vulnerable;
5. Her conduct as may be found proven at allegation 2 above lacked integrity and/or was dishonest.

The panel amended the stem of allegation 1 and allegation 1f, as referred to below in the preliminary applications section.

Ms Farron admitted the allegations and admitted that she was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Summary of evidence

Documents

In advance of the hearing, the panel received a bundle of documents which included the following (with page references taken from the automated pdf numbering):

Section 1: Chronology and anonymised pupil list – pages 5 to 6

Section 2: Response to notice of referral and notice of meeting– pages 7 to 18

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 19 to 31

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 32 to 119

Section 5: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 120 to 263

Section 6: Teacher documents – pages 264 to 277

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the hearing. The panel also accepted an email from Ms Farron confirming she had no objection to the amendment to the stem of allegation 1.

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 Farron on 19 November 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 Farron 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.

Ms Farron was employed at St Johns Bosco Arts College (“the School”) as a teacher of science from 1 September 2017.

On or around 13 June 2024, concerns were brought to the attention of the School regarding Ms Farron’s communication with a pupil, Pupil A.

On 25 June 2024, Ms Farron was suspended from her position at the School.

Ms Farron ceased to be employed at the School on 5 February 2025. She was referred to the TRA on 10 March 2025.

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. You failed to maintain appropriate boundaries with one or more pupils in that you sent and or exchanged emails with them:

a. which were sent outside schooling hours;

b. which were excessive in number;

On 20 August 2025, Ms Farron responded to a notice of referral admitting allegation 1a and 1b.

On 19 September 2025, Ms Farron completed a further notice of referral form admitting allegations 1a and 1b.

In the statement of agreed facts Ms Farron accepted that she sent to and/or received emails from Pupil B outside of school hours. She accepted that the emails sent to Pupil B were excessive in number. Ms Farron also accepted that a number of emails had been deleted and were not available to the Panel.

Ms Farron also accepted that she sent emails to Pupil A and/or received emails from Pupil A outside of school hours. She accepted that the emails sent to Pupil A were excessive in number.

Ms Farron accepted that within the emails sent to and received from Pupil A, a number did not relate to schoolwork, including:

- emails on 1 March 2024 between 21:44 and 23:39 regarding Pupil A’s relationship with another individual(s); and

- emails between 13 February 2024 and 17 February 2024 regarding Pupil A's emotional state and Ms Farron's personal life

Ms Farron accepted that in sending emails to Pupil B and Pupil A which were outside of school hours, and which were excessive in number, she failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries.

Individual A, [REDACTED], provided a witness statement for these TRA proceedings. She stated that she was appointed as investigating officer to investigate concerns raised in relation to Ms Farron and Pupil A. She stated that whilst emails had been deleted, message trace logs indicated that as at 19 June 2024, in the previous 90 days, 80 emails had been sent from Pupil A to Ms Farron, and 79 emails had been sent from Ms Farron to Pupil A.

Individual A provided a log of the deleted emails with Pupil A. This log included records of emails sent by Ms Farron to Pupil A between 21 March 2024 and 17 June 2024 including emails sent at 20:36; 07:28; 22:44; 07:18; 21:35; 21:27 (on a Sunday); 21:34; 19:51; 22:02; 06:07; 21:53 and 21:51. Individual A also marked two emails which had been sent during the School holidays. A further log included records of emails sent by Pupil A to Ms Farron over a similar period. These included emails timed at 05:55; 23:24; 22:34; 23:39; 01:59; 20:47; and 21:04.

Individual A also provided screenshots of emails taken before they were deleted. This included emails exchanged with Pupil A outside of School hours and included an email sent by Ms Farron on a Sunday. The panel noted that one email sent by Pupil A on Tuesday 13 February 2024 stated "I hope youre [sic] having a nice half term." The panel noted that Ms Farron responded the following day which would also have been in the half term break.

Individual A also produced a log of deleted emails with Pupil B. This similarly contained information relating to a large number of emails exchanged between Ms Farron and Pupil B over the period between March and June 2024. It included records of emails sent by Ms Farron at 20:08; 20:38; 21:27; 22:01; 21:27 and emails sent by Pupil B to Ms Farron at 20:34; 21:01; 20:31; 21:46 and 23:13.

Individual A stated that the School's communications policy which applies to staff and pupils advises that the acceptable hours to send emails is between 7:30am and 6pm, and that emails should instead be saved as drafts and sent during working hours, or scheduled to automatically send during working hours. She explained that there was an exception if matters were urgent, and that the rule did not apply to the safeguarding inbox. The panel noted that the emails were not sent to or from the safeguarding inbox. Individual A stated that emails sent late at night and in school holidays were beyond what she would expect of communications between a staff member and pupil. The panel had sight of the School's Communications policy confirming the above information.

The panel found it proven that Ms Farron had sent and exchanged emails with pupils which were sent outside schooling hours and which were excessive in number.

Whilst the emails were sent using School email addresses, the panel considered that there had been a failure to maintain appropriate boundaries on the part of Ms Farron. Communicating outside of usual working hours and to an excessive degree had the effect of blurring a professional relationship with a more personal one.

The panel found allegation 1a and 1b proven.

e. in which Pupil A informed you that New Years' Eve "was the worst 24 hours of [their] life" or words to that effect;

f. in which Pupil A told you they "missed u" or words to that effect;

On 20 August 2025, Ms Farron responded to a notice of referral admitting allegations 1e and 1f.

On 19 September 2025, Ms Farron completed a further notice of referral form admitting allegations 1e and 1f.

Ms Farron accepted that Pupil A stated to her "worst 24 hours of my life" at 2:14am on 31 December 2024. She also admitted that, on 19 March 2024, Pupil A told Ms Farron that they missed her.

Ms Farron accepted that in sending and/or receiving the above emails, she failed to maintain appropriate boundaries with Pupil A.

The panel was provided with screenshots of emails taken before emails were deleted. This included:

- an email from Pupil A dated 19 March 2024 to Ms Farron stating "I enjoyed catching up today, missed u"; and
- an email from Pupil A dated 31 December 2023 at 02:14 to Ms Farron stating "worst 24 hours of my life".

The panel considered that it had been proven that Pupil A had sent the emails referred to in allegation 1e and 1f. The panel went on to consider whether Ms Farron had thereby failed to maintain appropriate boundaries. The panel considered that Ms Farron had fostered a culture whereby pupils felt they were able to send emails to her during the night, and expressing affection towards her. The panel therefore considered Ms Farron had failed to maintain appropriate boundaries in respect of allegations 1e and 1f.

The panel found allegations 1e and 1f proven.

2. During the year 2023- 2024 academic year and in respect of the investigation into email communications between yourself and one or more pupils, you caused and/or permitted and/or failed to prevent and/or requested that relevant emails to that investigation be deleted;

On 20 August 2025, Ms Farron responded to a notice of referral denying this allegation.

On 19 September 2025, Ms Farron completed a further notice of referral form admitting this allegation.

The statement of agreed facts signed by Ms Farron included a statement that “any statements made by Ms Farron which pre-dated this document which conflict with the agreed facts set out [within the statement of agreed facts] should be disregarded for the purpose of establishing the facts of the allegations.”

In the statement of agreed facts, Ms Farron accepted that during the academic year 2023 – 2024, and in relation to the School’s investigation, she asked Pupil B to delete the emails between herself and Pupil B. Ms Farron accepted that she had deleted a number of emails between herself and Pupil A and between herself and Pupil B.

Individual A stated that on 14 June 2024, [REDACTED] Individual B, was tasked with looking through the email communications. She stated that Individual B took screenshots of some emails of interest, and noted emails dating back to 22 June 2023. Individual A stated that, on 18 June 2024, they obtained a statement from Pupil A, and prior to doing so spoke with Pupil A’s [REDACTED] to make her aware of the need to speak with Pupil A. She stated that Pupil A found Ms Farron and alerted Ms Farron that the school had been in touch with [REDACTED]. Individual A stated that she and [REDACTED] met with Ms Farron to advise her of the situation. She stated that, on the same day, Individual B found her to say that she was trying to review the emails, but it looked like they had been deleted, and she was not able to locate emails between Pupil A and Ms Farron. Individual A stated that the [REDACTED] confirmed on 19 June 2024 that emails had been deleted by both Ms Farron and Pupil A. Individual A stated that when she asked Ms Farron about this, Ms Farron asserted that she deleted her emails routinely, but the [REDACTED] reported that not all of Ms Farron’s emails had been deleted; only select emails were deleted.

The panel noted that Individual A’s investigation report stated that, on 20 June 2024, Pupil B spoke with her [REDACTED] to say that Ms Farron had approached them, that week, and asked them to delete emails.

The panel was provided with a written statement of Pupil B in which she stated “I don’t think any of her emails were sent in a bad way, I think it was purely just her trying to look out for me. I don’t think it’s okay the way she’s asking me to delete them. She asked me this on Tuesday 18th of June period 2, but I don’t understand why she asked me to delete

them. The emails were purely just me having [REDACTED] and emailing her as she's a teacher who I feel I can speak to or her emailing either checking in or asking if we can grab her printing / things for her class when she was busy. There was nothing to hide in the emails, other than my [REDACTED] which I soon got over as they were minor things like coursework, friendship issues or just me being stressed in general. I didn't get a chance to ask her why she wanted me to delete the emails as when she asked, I was already [REDACTED], and since that I haven't really spoke to her other than in passing."

In Ms Farron's representations in September 2025 for these TRA proceedings, Ms Farron maintained that she regularly deleted emails "in bulk" and that she had "no ill intent when clearing [her] emails".

Given Ms Farron's subsequent admissions in the statement of agreed facts, supported by Individual A's account that emails were deleted, and Pupil B's written statement stating that Ms Farron had asked her to delete emails, the panel found this allegation proven. The timing of the deletion which coincided with Ms Farron becoming aware of the investigation and the selection of the emails deleted indicated that it was more likely than not that Ms Farron caused emails relevant to the investigation to be deleted.

The panel found this allegation proven.

3. You failed to take appropriate action and/or ensure appropriate action was taken to safeguard one or more pupils in or around the academic year 2023 – 2024 in that you failed to report the emails at one above;

On 20 August 2025, Ms Farron responded to a notice of referral admitting that she had failed to take appropriate action and/or ensure appropriate action was taken to safeguard one or more pupils in or around the academic year 2023 – 2024. On 19 September 2025, Ms Farron completed a further notice of referral form with the same response.

In the statement of agreed facts, Ms Farron accepted that she did not report the emails between herself and Pupil B. She also accepted that she did not report the emails between herself and Pupil A, including emails in which Pupil A stated that they had the "worst 24 hours of [their] life" and that they missed her. Ms Farron accepted that not reporting those emails amounted to a failure to take appropriate action and a failure to ensure that appropriate action was taken to safeguard Pupil B and Pupil A.

The panel considered that Ms Farron ought to have reported that emails were being exchanged with pupils outside of school hours and in an excessive number, given the safeguarding risks posed by this blurring of professional boundaries. The panel also considered that Ms Farron ought to have reported a pupil stating they had the "worst 24 hours of [their] life" given the potential safeguarding concern regarding Pupil A's welfare. Similarly, the panel considered that Ms Farron ought to have reported when a pupil

stated they “missed” her, given that it indicated a pupil potentially developing a personal attachment to her.

The panel was satisfied that Ms Farron had failed to report these matters. The panel noted that it came to light during the School’s investigation that there were excessive numbers of emails and that emails were being exchanged outside of school hours. Whilst there was evidence from the head of sixth form of communications between Pupil A and Ms Farron, and that there had been an intervention to reduce this reliance, it had not been known that this contact had continued to the degree found during the investigation.

Furthermore, the School’s investigation report confirmed that the email dated 31 December 2024 had not been forwarded to the School’s safeguarding email account, nor was it flagged to the designated safeguarding lead, any member of the safeguarding team, or a line manager upon the return to school. The School’s investigation report also stated that Ms Farron had not reported on CPOMS that Pupil A had sent an email saying “missed u”.

The panel therefore found this allegation proven.

4. Your conduct as may be found proven at allegations 1 – 3 above was despite being aware that pupil/s were vulnerable;

On 20 August 2025, Ms Farron responded to a notice of referral admitting this allegation.

On 19 September 2025, Ms Farron completed a further notice of referral form admitting this allegation.

In the statement of agreed facts, Ms Farron admitted this allegation.

Individual A stated in her witness statement that Ms Farron was aware of Pupil A’s [REDACTED]. She stated that Ms Farron had held the position of assistant head of year for a period of 12 months, and had access to CPOMS records where Pupil A’s [REDACTED] were detailed.

The panel noted that in the School’s investigation meeting with Ms Farron, she described her relationship with Pupil A which indicated that she was well aware of [REDACTED].

Individual A also stated that Ms Farron had access to [REDACTED] records and would have been aware of the contents. Individual A explained that Pupil B was a pupil [REDACTED]. She stated that Ms Farron had sent an email relating to Pupil B [REDACTED]. The panel saw evidence of this within the CPOMS records.

The panel considered that it had been proven that her conduct as found proven at allegations 1a, 1b, 1e, 1f, 2 and 3 was despite her being aware that the pupils were vulnerable.

The panel found allegation 4 proven.

5. Your conduct as may be found proven at allegation 2 above lacked integrity and/or was dishonest.

On 20 August 2025, Ms Farron responded to a notice of referral denying this allegation.

On 19 September 2025, Ms Farron completed a further notice of referral form admitting this allegation

In the statement of agreed facts, Ms Farron admitted that her conduct at allegation 2 was dishonest. She admitted that she asked Pupil B to delete the emails between them. She agreed that ordinary decent teachers would regard her behaviour as dishonest. As such Ms Farron admitted that her conduct met the test of dishonesty as set out in Ivey v Genting Casinos, albeit the panel noted that test had not been set out within the statement of agreed facts.

The panel considered that Ms Farron had known of the investigation when she deleted emails and when she asked Pupil B to delete their emails. The panel considered that it was more likely than not that Ms Farron took those steps to interfere with the conduct of the investigation. The panel considered that ordinary decent people would consider that interfering with the conduct of an investigation was dishonest.

The panel therefore found it proven that Ms Farron had acted dishonestly.

Ms Farron also acknowledged that she acted in a manner which fell far below the higher standards which society expects of a teacher resulting from their privileged and trusted role in society. She accepted that a professional person is expected to adhere to the ethical standards of their profession and “be even more careful” than a member of the general public. As such Ms Farron admitted that her conduct at allegation 2 amounted to a lack of integrity.

Given the expectations of teachers to ensure that pupils are safeguarded, the panel considered that it breached the ethical standards of the profession to interfere with an investigation around safeguarding matters. The panel therefore found it proven that Ms Farron’s conduct lacked integrity.

The panel found the following particulars of the allegations against you not proved, for these reasons:

1. You failed to maintain appropriate boundaries with one or more pupils in that you sent and or exchanged emails with them:

c. in which you suggested that Pupil A visit your partner’s café;

d. in which you discussed your tattoo and/or encouraged a pupil to obtain a similar temporary tattoo;

On 20 August 2025, Ms Farron responded to a notice of referral admitting allegations 1c and 1d.

On 19 September 2025, Ms Farron completed a further notice of referral form admitting allegations 1c and 1d.

In the statement of agreed facts, Ms Farron admitted that she suggested that Pupil A visit her partner's café if Pupil A felt [REDACTED]. Ms Farron accepted that she discussed her tattoos with Pupil A including that Ms Farron had a tattoo [REDACTED].

Ms Farron accepted that "in sending and/or receiving the above emails", she failed to maintain appropriate boundaries with Pupil A.

The panel was provided with a safeguarding record form in which it was reported that an anonymous person [REDACTED] had raised concerns regarding what they believed as an inappropriate relationship between Ms Farron and one of her students. This included a concern that "Jennifer has now got a [REDACTED] tattoo because this child [REDACTED]. It wasn't to symbolise being a teacher it was because of this child". Within this safeguarding record, the anonymous person also raised a concern that Ms Farron had told this child that if they felt vulnerable or unsafe, they could go to Ms Farron's [REDACTED] and this was somewhere that the child had gone.

In an interview on 3 July 2024 as part of the School's investigation, Ms Farron confirmed that she had had multiple conversations with multiple students over tattoos. [REDACTED] Ms Farron confirmed that she had a tattoo of [REDACTED] and that she had got this tattoo in March 2023. She stated that they had had a discussion when Pupil A was planning getting his tattoo, and that pupils were aware she had tattoos because they could see them. She stated that she did not believe that [REDACTED].

In the same interview, Ms Farron denied that she had ever had a conversation with Pupil A about him going to her [REDACTED]. She stated that she had seen the back of Pupil A's head in the restaurant and then left.

In Ms Farron's representations submitted for these TRA proceedings, she stated that she had, on multiple occasions, discussed tattoos with students, but had never encouraged any student to get any tattoo. She stated that she could acknowledge how this situation might be interpreted.

In the same representations, Ms Farron acknowledged that she had advised students to visit places that they had identified to her as somewhere they enjoyed to go and liked to spend their time. She accepted that, with hindsight, she should have guided them away from a location that she had a link to.

The panel considered that there was sufficient evidence that Ms Farron had suggested that Pupil A visit Ms Farron's partner's café. However, there was no evidence that this had been suggested in an email with Pupil A as alleged in the stem of allegation 1c. There was no indication that such matters were discussed by email in the report from the anonymous person, nor did any of the screenshots of emails available to the panel refer to this.

Allegation 1c was therefore found not proven.

Whilst it was clear to the panel that Ms Farron had discussed her tattoo with Pupil A, there was no evidence available that Ms Farron had encouraged Pupil A to obtain a similar temporary tattoo. Similarly, the panel did not consider that discussing a tattoo with a pupil was necessarily inappropriate in circumstances where the pupils were in the sixth form, and Ms Farron had a pastoral role in respect of their care. Additionally, there was no evidence that Ms Farron had sent and/ or exchanged emails with one or more pupils discussing her tattoo as alleged in the stem of allegation 1d. There was no indication that such matters were discussed by email in the report from the anonymous person, nor did any of the screenshots of emails available to the panel refer to this.

Allegation 1d. was therefore found not proven.

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

Having found allegation 1a, 1b, 1e, 1f, 2, 3, 4 and 5 proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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

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

The panel noted that Ms Farron had breached the requirement set out in the preamble to Teachers' Standards requiring that teachers act with honesty and integrity. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Ms Farron was in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position

- having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
- 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 was satisfied that the conduct of Ms Farron, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education ("KCSIE").

The panel considered that Ms Farron was in breach of the requirement to consider, at all times, what is in the best interests of the child, and to ensure her approach was child centred.

The panel was not satisfied that the conduct of Ms Farron in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Working Together to Safeguard Children.

The panel also considered whether Ms Farron's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

The Advice indicates that where behaviours associated with such an offence exist, a panel is likely to conclude that an individual's conduct would amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel found that the offence of fraud or serious dishonesty was relevant.

The panel considered that the conduct took place within the education setting. Even though emails were sent late at night, on weekends and during the school holidays, they were sent using School email accounts, and arose out of Ms Farron's position as a teacher.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Ms Farron 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 Farron was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Ms Farron'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 Farron'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 Farron was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that behaviours associated with the offence of fraud or serious dishonesty 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 considered that Ms Farron's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher.

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

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

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

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

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

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of having failed to maintain appropriate boundaries with children, having failed to safeguard one or more pupils, and causing the deletion of emails pertinent to a safeguarding investigation.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Farron 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 Farron 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 Farron in the profession. Whilst there is evidence that Ms Farron had ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Ms Farron 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 Farron.

The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours of a teacher have been proved. In the list of such behaviours, those that were relevant in this case were:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- failure to act on evidence that indicated a child's welfare may have been at risk e.g. failed to notify the designated safeguarding lead and/or make a referral to children's social care, the police or other relevant agencies when abuse, neglect and/or harmful cultural practices were identified;
- 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);
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions or purposeful destruction of evidence, especially where these behaviours have been repeated or had serious consequences, or involved the coercion of another person to act in a way contrary to their own interests;
- collusion or concealment including:

- ...
- ...concealing inappropriate actions;
- ...
- lying to prevent the identification of wrongdoing.

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

There was evidence that Ms Farron's actions were deliberate. She was deliberately emailing pupils out of school hours and she acted dishonestly in asking at least one pupil to delete emails relevant to the School's investigation.

There was no evidence to suggest that Ms Farron was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation. The panel took account of Ms Farron's representations during the Schools' disciplinary hearing that Ms Farron is [REDACTED], and works at unusual times at night, to allow her [REDACTED], and then access her workload [REDACTED].

There was no evidence that Ms Farron had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in her personal and professional conduct or that she had contributed significantly to the education sector. The referral to the TRA stated that the School had no record of any prior misconduct or disciplinary action.

Individual A stated in her witness statement that Ms Farron was competent in the classroom; she had good order in her classes and was friendly with children and staff. Ms Farron did not produce any references attesting to her character or to her ability as a teacher.

The panel took into account that Ms Farron had made full admissions in these TRA proceedings and agreed for the matter to be determined at a professional conduct panel meeting, saving the cost and resources of a hearing being convened.

The panel took account of representations made by Ms Farron sent to the presenting officer's firm on 5 September 2025, prior to Ms Farron signing the statement of agreed facts. In those representations, Ms Farron expressed remorse stating that she offered her deepest apologies to the student and their family for the distress and disruption her actions had caused. She also stated that she extended her apologies to her colleagues and the wider school community, and that she understood that her actions had undermined the trust placed in the profession and caused additional strain for those who remained dedicated to their students' success.

She referred to having taken the time to become more reflective and having developed a “greater understanding now of the situation”. She stated that, with the benefit of hindsight, there were things she would do differently. She stated that she should have sought further support from her colleagues to ensure that students herself had as much help as possible. She stated that, it “saddens [her] the most” that “anyone might think that I would do anything other than safeguard a child”. Ms Farron referred to the empathy she had for children who found teenage years a struggle and that her intention had been to guide and advise.

Ms Farron accepted that emailing pupils outside of school hours, and to an excessive extent, was a betrayal of the trust and the ethical standards expected of her, and that she had “violated the School’s IT acceptable use policies”. She also stated that she deeply regretted the impact this had on the student, their family and the school community. She referred to her approach to relationship building as being poorly judged, leading her to overstep appropriate boundaries, and stated that she was “profoundly sorry” for this.

The panel noted that there was some indication that Ms Farron had been alive to the issues of a student becoming reliant upon her, and taking steps to manage this. For example the panel saw a note from Individual C, [REDACTED], stating that Ms Farron had spoken with her regarding Pupil A’s reliance upon her and this becoming “a bit of a strain”. Individual C stated that Ms Farron followed a suggestion that she actively pull herself away from Pupil A so that “throughout the first year of sixth form, he became less reliant on her when he was having a bad day”. Individual D, [REDACTED], also referred to having discussed strategies to get Pupil A to trust Individual D more and to use her as the point of contact for pastoral support. Individual D stated that Ms Farron had followed her advice and used the sixth form office for conversations with Pupil A with either Individual D or “Individual E” present. She stated that she noticed that Pupil A had gained confidence in coming to her more often, and used herself and Individual E “a lot more frequently for pastoral support or advice on a quiet space”. There was therefore some indication that Ms Farron could recognise issues of professional boundaries and that she had previously taken steps to ameliorate the situation. Nevertheless, there remains a concern regarding her maintenance of appropriate boundaries with Pupil A and Pupil B in light of the panel’s findings.

[REDACTED] She referred to taking the strategies she has learnt and implementing them going forwards. No independent evidence was received [REDACTED] Ms Farron had referred to, or as to its efficacy.

The panel noted that within these representations, Ms Farron maintained that she had regularly deleted emails in bulk, and did not accept that she had acted dishonestly in deleting emails relevant to the School’s investigation or that she had asked a pupil to delete their emails. The panel noted that Ms Farron has since made admissions regarding these allegations in the statement of agreed facts. However, the panel did not

receive any further evidence as what had led Ms Farron to make those admissions or as to her reflections regarding the impact that her request to delete emails had on the child concerned. The panel noted that Pupil B's statement for the School's investigation stated that when Ms Farron asked her to delete the emails, Pupil B was "already [REDACTED]". There has not been any acknowledgement by Ms Farron of the impact her request had on Pupil B.

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 Farron 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 Farron. The serious dishonesty of interfering with the School's investigation and the impact on Pupil B of that dishonesty, as well as her failure to appropriately safeguard pupils 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 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.

One of these includes fraud or serious dishonesty.

The panel considered that Ms Farron had exhibited insight and remorse for her failure to maintain appropriate boundaries, and appeared to have appreciated that she had not taken appropriate steps to safeguard children. However, the panel did not have any

evidence available to it that Ms Farron has undertaken any further safeguarding training, or of the efficacy of the [REDACTED] Ms Farron has referred to. Furthermore, the panel did not have any evidence as to Ms Farron's reflection regarding her acts of dishonesty. In the circumstances, the panel did not consider that it had sufficient evidence to provide assurance regarding the risk of repetition.

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 provision for a review period after 3 years.

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 some of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. In this case, the panel has found allegations 1c and 1d not proven. I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

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

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
- 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 was satisfied that the conduct of Ms Farron, 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 Ms Farron fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of dishonesty on the part of a teacher and also a failure to appropriately safeguard pupils.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself, whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Ms Farron, 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, *“There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of having failed to maintain appropriate boundaries with children, having failed to safeguard one or more pupils, and causing the deletion of emails pertinent to a safeguarding investigation.”* 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, *“Ms Farron expressed remorse stating that she offered her deepest apologies to the student and their family for the distress and disruption her actions had caused. She also stated that she extended her apologies to her colleagues and the wider school community, and that she understood that her actions had undermined the trust placed in the profession and caused additional strain for those who remained dedicated to their students’ success.”*

The panel has also commented that *“There has not been any acknowledgement by Ms Farron of the impact her request had on Pupil B.”*

In my judgement, the lack of full insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour, and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, “...*that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Farron were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.*” I am particularly mindful of the finding of dishonesty in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

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

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

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Ms Farron herself. The panel comment

“The panel took account of Ms Farron’s representations during the Schools’ disciplinary hearing that Ms Farron is [REDACTED], and works at unusual times at night, to allow her [REDACTED], and then access her workload [REDACTED].

There was no evidence that Ms Farron had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in her personal and professional conduct or that she had contributed significantly to the education sector. The referral to the TRA stated that the School had no record of any prior misconduct or disciplinary action.

Individual A stated in her witness statement that Ms Farron was competent in the classroom; she had good order in her classes and was friendly with children and staff. Ms Farron did not produce any references attesting to her character or to her ability as a teacher.”

A prohibition order would prevent Ms Farron 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, “*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 Farron. The serious dishonesty of interfering with the School’s investigation and the impact on Pupil B of that*

dishonesty, as well as her failure to appropriately safeguard pupils were significant factors in forming that opinion.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Ms Farron has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, that is not backed up by full 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 three-year review period.

I have considered the panel’s comments “The panel considered that Ms Farron had exhibited insight and remorse for her failure to maintain appropriate boundaries, and appeared to have appreciated that she had not taken appropriate steps to safeguard children. However, the panel did not have any evidence available to it that Ms Farron has undertaken any further safeguarding training, or of the efficacy of the [REDACTED] Ms Farron has referred to. Furthermore, the panel did not have any evidence as to Ms Farron’s reflection regarding her acts of dishonesty. In the circumstances, the panel did not consider that it had sufficient evidence to provide assurance regarding the risk of repetition.”

The panel has also said that a three-year review period would be appropriate and proportionate.

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. In this case, factors mean that a three-year review period is sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the dishonesty found, and the lack of full insight and remorse.

I consider therefore that a three-year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

This means that Ms Jennifer Farron 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 19 May 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 Farron remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Ms Farron has a right of appeal to the High Court within 28 days from the date she is given notice of this order.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "S. Blomfield". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'S'.

Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield

Date: 11 May 2026

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