



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Ms Ngaio Trueman: 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	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	12
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	16

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

**Teacher:** Ms Ngaio Trueman

**Teacher ref number:** 9856884

**Teacher date of birth:** 7 October 1974

**TRA reference:** 24637

**Date of determination:** 20 May 2026

**Former employer:** St Mary's Church of England Primary School, Gloucestershire

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel ("the panel") of the Teaching Regulation Agency ("the TRA") convened on 20 May 2026 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Ms Ngaio Trueman.

The panel members were Ms Chloe Nash (lay panellist – in the chair), Mr David Loveless (teacher panellist) and Ms Claire Lane (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Nicholas West 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 Trueman that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Ms Trueman provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and conviction of a relevant offence. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer Mr Wen Yeap, of Browne Jacobson, Ms Trueman or any representative for Ms Trueman.

The meeting took place in private and was not recorded.

## **Allegations**

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Meeting dated 2 March 2026.

It was alleged that Ms Trueman was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst employed as a Teacher at St Mary's Primary School between 24 March 2015 and 31 August 2024:

1. She displayed unprofessional behaviour, on or around 11 July 2024, in that she arrived at school under the influence of alcohol and/or was under the influence of alcohol whilst on school premises and/or during school hours
2. Her conduct as may be found proven at 1 above put one or more pupils at risk of harm.

In addition, it was also alleged that Ms Trueman was guilty of having been convicted, at any time, of a relevant offence in that:

1. She was convicted at Cheltenham Magistrates Court on or around 30 July 2024 for driving a motor vehicle with excess alcohol on or around 11 July 2024.

Ms Trueman admitted the facts of allegations 1 and 2. In respect of those admitted allegations, she also admitted that her conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, as set out in the statement of agreed facts signed by Ms Trueman on 29 August 2025.

Ms Trueman further admitted that, in respect of having been convicted of a relevant offence, she admitted allegation 1, as set out in the statement of agreed facts signed by Ms Trueman on 29 August 2025.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section 1: Chronology – page 4

Section 2: Notice of Referral, Response and Notice of Meeting – pages 5 to 35

Section 3: Statement of Agreed Facts and Presenting Officer Representations – pages 36 to 42

Section 4: TRA documents – pages 43 to 84

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 85 to 90

The panel also received a further document titled ‘Virtual Notice of Meeting’ dated 2 March 2026.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the meeting, including the Notice of Meeting document.

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

### **Statement of agreed facts**

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Ms Trueman on 29 August 2025 and subsequently signed by the presenting officer on 29 September 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 Trueman 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 24 March 2015, Ms Trueman commenced employment at St Mary’s Church of England Primary School (‘the School’).

On 11 July 2024, Ms Trueman arrived late for work and parked her vehicle in a disabled parking space at the School. On the same day, the police were called, and Ms Trueman was subjected to a breathalyser test, which indicated that she was over the legal alcohol limit. Ms Trueman was subsequently escorted from the School by the police.

On 30 July 2024, Ms Trueman was formally convicted at Cheltenham Magistrates’ Court following a guilty plea for driving a motor vehicle while over the legal alcohol limit, contrary to section 5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988. She was made subject to a community order, which included an alcohol treatment requirement for six months and a rehabilitation activity requirement of up to ten days. She was also disqualified from

holding or obtaining a driving licence for 30 months, with a reduction available upon completion of an approved course and was fined £615.

On 28 October 2024, a referral was made to the TRA.

## Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

### **1. You displayed unprofessional behaviour, on or around 11 July 2024, in that you arrived at school under the influence of alcohol and/or were under the influence of alcohol whilst on school premises and/or during school hours**

The panel noted that Ms Trueman admitted allegation 1, as set out in the statement of agreed facts, signed by her on 29 August 2025. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the facts available to it.

Ms Trueman accepted that she arrived at School under the influence of alcohol, that she was under the influence of alcohol whilst on the School's premises and during school hours on 11 July 2024. Ms Trueman further accepted that she was breathalysed by the police on the School's premises and was significantly over the legal limit.

The panel noted the School's investigation report dated 18 July 2024. The report followed an incident in which Ms Trueman was confirmed, through a police breathalyser, to have been intoxicated on the School's premises and to have driven to work while over the legal alcohol limit. The report stated that the evidence gathered consisted of eyewitness accounts from members of staff. It was reported that there had been a number of occasions on which staff members had raised concerns about Ms Trueman's conduct while at the School. Although this evidence was hearsay, the panel considered that the written accounts from all six witnesses and the [REDACTED] of the School were broadly consistent and contemporaneous as they were appended to the School's investigation report dated 18 July 2024. The panel therefore determined that appropriate weight could be given to this hearsay evidence.

The report stated that, on 11 July 2024, the deputy headteacher observed that Ms Trueman appeared unsteady on her feet first thing in the morning. The [REDACTED] asked Ms Trueman if she was okay, but Ms Trueman did not respond. At that time, Ms Trueman was standing outside on the steps leading into the School, greeting children and parents. The [REDACTED] alerted the [REDACTED] who noticed a strong smell of alcohol on Ms Trueman's breath and observed that her eyes appeared "*glazed*" and that she was unsteady on her feet. [REDACTED] escorted Ms Trueman into an office and asked her whether she was drunk. Ms Trueman denied this and stated that she had not been drinking, although she acknowledged that she may have consumed wine the previous evening. [REDACTED] then asked Ms Trueman whether she had driven to

School, to which Ms Trueman replied that she had. When asked where her car was parked, Ms Trueman said it was in the staff car park. [REDACTED] informed Ms Trueman that the police would need to be contacted. The police attended and administered a breathalyser test, which showed that Ms Trueman was significantly over the legal limit. Ms Trueman was subsequently arrested.

Having considered the admitted facts and the supporting documentary evidence, the panel was satisfied on the balance of probabilities that allegation 1 was proven.

## **2. Your conduct as may be found proven at 1 above put one or more pupils at risk of harm.**

The panel noted that Ms Trueman admitted allegation 2, as set out in the statement of agreed facts dated 29 September 2025. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the facts available to it.

Ms Trueman accepted that her conduct at allegation 1 put one or more pupils at risk of harm. The panel also noted that Ms Trueman accepted that she had driven to the School under the influence of alcohol and was on site at a time when there were pupils, parents, and staff present.

The panel noted the School's investigation report dated 18 July 2024, which included evidence gathered from six members of staff. It was reported that on 11 July 2024, Ms Trueman was observed to be *"very unsteady on her feet"*, *"seemed very distracted and not focused"*, *"tripped over the threshold of the door when she came out of the classroom"*, *"had her head down and she was mumbling"* and *"her eyes were glazed"*. The School's [REDACTED] also noted, *"I followed her outside where she was greeting children. She was swaying and looked vacant. I called her name twice and she ignored me so I went to get [REDACTED]"*. Although this evidence was hearsay, the panel considered that the written accounts from all six witnesses and [REDACTED] of the School were broadly consistent with the behaviour expected of an individual that was significantly over the legal alcohol limit. The panel also noted that the written witness accounts were contemporaneous as they were appended to the School's investigation report dated 18 July 2024. The panel therefore determined that appropriate weight could be given to this hearsay evidence.

Having considered all of the evidence before it, the panel was satisfied that Ms Trueman's actions on 11 July 2024 put pupils at risk of potential harm. The panel considered that the risk of potential harm included Ms Trueman being under the influence of alcohol whilst on the School's premises and being responsible for pupils as a class teacher, as she would not have been able to respond appropriately to pupils' needs or an emergency situation. The panel also considered Ms Trueman's conduct by virtue of her having driven onto the School's premises whilst intoxicated put pupils at risk of potential harm. Ms Trueman was found to be almost four times over the legal prescribed alcohol

limit whilst in control of a motor vehicle and driving in close proximity to the School's pupils, parents and staff members at a busy drop off time on the morning of 11 July 2024.

Having considered the admitted facts and the supporting evidence, the panel was satisfied on the balance of probabilities that allegation 2 was proven.

**1. You were convicted at Cheltenham Magistrates Court on or around 30 July 2024 for driving a motor vehicle with excess alcohol on or around 11 July 2024.**

The panel considered statement of agreed facts signed by Ms Trueman on 29 August 2025, in which she admitted this allegation and further accepted that the facts of the allegation amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the facts available to it.

The panel noted page 8 of the Teacher misconduct: the prohibition of teachers ('the Advice'), which states 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. The panel did not find that any exceptional circumstances applied in this case.

The panel had been provided with an unsigned copy of the certificate of conviction from Cheltenham Magistrates' Court, which detailed that Ms Trueman had been convicted on 30 July 2024 of an offence of driving a motor vehicle after consuming so much alcohol that the proportion of it in her breath exceeded the prescribed limit, which occurred on 11 July 2024. The panel noted that Ms Trueman pleaded guilty to the offence and this was supported by the statement of agreed facts that she had signed.

The panel noted documentary evidence which confirmed that Ms Trueman was made subject to a community order, which included an alcohol treatment requirement for six months and a rehabilitation activity requirement of up to ten days. She was also disqualified from holding or obtaining a driving licence for 30 months, with a reduction available upon completion of an approved course and was fined £615. In particular, the panel noted a PNC record printout dated 27 November 2024 which mentioned this sentencing.

On examination of the documents before the panel, and the admissions in the signed statement of agreed facts, the panel was satisfied that allegation 1 was proven.

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

Having found all of the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to:

- In respect of allegation 1 and 2, unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.
- In respect of allegation 1, conviction of a relevant offence.

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

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

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Ms Trueman 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
  - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs.
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

### Unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute

The panel made the following determination in respect of allegation 1 and 2 only.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Ms Trueman, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education (“KCSIE”).

The panel considered that Ms Trueman was in breach of the following provisions of KCSIE, September 2023:

- Part One, paragraph 2: *“Safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children is everyone’s responsibility. Everyone who comes into contact with children and their families has a role to play. In order to fulfil this responsibility effectively, all practitioners should make sure their approach is child centred. This means that they should consider, at all times, what is in the best interests of the child”*;
- Part One, paragraph 4: *“Safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children is defined for the purposes of this guidance as...preventing the impairment of children’s mental and physical health or development...and taking action to enable all children to have the best outcomes”*; and
- Part One, paragraph 7: *“All staff have a responsibility to provide a safe environment in which children can learn”*.

The panel also considered whether Ms Trueman’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 serious driving offences, particularly those involving alcohol was relevant. The panel considered that the level by which Ms Trueman had exceeded the prescribed alcohol limit, having been found to be almost four times over the legal driving limit for alcohol when arriving at School, meant that her conduct met the threshold of a serious driving offence. The panel further found that Ms Trueman was under the influence of alcohol whilst on the School’s premises and during school hours when she was responsible for pupils’ wellbeing. The panel was particularly concerned by the documentary evidence that Ms Trueman was unsteady on her feet and swaying which could have placed pupils at unnecessary and avoidable risk.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Ms Trueman 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 Trueman was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct with respect to allegations 1 and 2.

In relation to whether Ms Trueman’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 Trueman'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 Trueman was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found that the offence of serious driving offences, particularly those involving alcohol was relevant.

The panel considered that Ms Trueman's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher as the public would not expect a teacher to arrive on school premises whilst driving under the influence of alcohol or to teach pupils whilst under the influence of alcohol.

For these reasons, the panel found that Ms Trueman's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute with respect to allegations 1 and 2.

#### Conviction of a relevant offence

Having found allegation 1 proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of that proved allegation amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

The panel noted that in the statement of agreed facts, Ms Trueman admitted that the facts of allegation 1 amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the facts available to it.

The panel noted that Ms Trueman's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting. The panel considered that the offence involved driving whilst significantly over the legal alcohol limit, including driving to the School whilst under the influence of alcohol. The panel considered that such conduct demonstrated a serious failure to exercise reasonable or appropriate judgement.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had a serious impact on the safety of pupils, staff members and members of the public such as parents who may have been present on the School's premises and the surrounding areas on her drive to the School.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Ms Trueman's behaviour in committing the offence could affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community.

The panel noted that Ms Trueman's behaviour did not lead to a sentence of imprisonment, which was indicative that the offence was not at the most serious end of the possible spectrum.

The panel also considered the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

This was a case concerning an offence involving serious driving offences, particularly those involving alcohol, which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence. The panel considered that Ms Trueman had committed a serious driving offence, having been almost four times over the legal alcohol limit and driving on the School's premises whilst under the influence of alcohol placing pupils at the risk of harm. The panel's view was that this was not a minor driving offence as a result of these aggravating factors.

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

Accordingly, the panel concluded that Ms Trueman had been convicted of a relevant offence in respect of allegation 1.

## **Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State**

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

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

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely: the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils; the protection of other members of the public; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct; and that prohibition strikes the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest, if they are in conflict.

In light of the panel's findings against Ms Trueman, which involved arriving at School under the influence of alcohol, placing pupils at risk of harm, and being convicted of an

alcohol related driving offence, there was 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 Trueman was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

Additionally, the panel considered that there was a strong public interest in the protection of members of the public, particularly in light of a conviction of an alcohol related driving offence.

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 Trueman 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 Trueman in the profession.

Whilst there was limited documentary evidence that Ms Trueman had some ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Ms Trueman in the profession, since her behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and she breached her position of trust.

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 Trueman.

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;

- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- failure in their duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk or failing to promote the safety and welfare of the children (as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE); and
- violation of the rights of pupils.

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 Ms Trueman's actions were deliberate, even though she was under the influence of alcohol at the material time of committing the offence.

There was no evidence to suggest that Ms Trueman was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation.

There was no evidence available to the panel to suggest that Ms Trueman demonstrated exceptionally high standards in her personal and professional conduct or that she had contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel saw no evidence that showed Ms Trueman had been previously subject to any disciplinary proceedings or warnings. The panel further noted witness evidence that Ms Trueman had not behaved "*in an inappropriate manner with children and she always has the best interest of the children at heart*". However, the panel did not accept that the incident was out of character. The panel noted repeated witness evidence confirming that there were a number of different occasions when Ms Trueman's colleagues had concerns about her conduct in School noting her behaviour as "*highly emotional*", "*erratic*", "*zoned out*" and "*chaotic*". As noted above, the panel considered this hearsay evidence could be given appropriate weight notwithstanding the fact that it had not been tested by the panel at a hearing.

The panel considered whether there was any evidence of insight or remorse. The panel found limited evidence of insight or remorse beyond Ms Trueman's acceptance of the facts in the absence of any written representations. The panel noted an email from Ms Trueman dated 6 January 2025 in which she stated, "*I am now under the care of my doctor and have been receiving treatment [REDACTED]. I am aware of everything I did and although some are not accurate accusations I will not be arguing or contesting anything. I am now in a much better place [REDACTED] and with the support of my whole family*".

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 Trueman 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 Trueman. Being convicted of an alcohol related driving offence and Ms Trueman's admittance that she had been driving under the influence of alcohol whilst on the School's premises and interacting with pupils and parents 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.

None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel's findings.

The panel took into account the fact that Ms Trueman had admitted to the conduct found proven, pleaded guilty to the offence that led to her conviction and cooperated with the TRA in the course of these proceedings. The panel also noted the mitigating circumstances, in that there was no evidence of any concerns regarding Ms Trueman's conduct at School before February 2024. Ms Trueman had also shown insight by seeking medical advice and treatment [REDACTED] and she had confirmed she was in a "*much better place*" and had support from her whole family which the panel considered lowered the risk of repetition. The panel was still concerned about a lack of evidence regarding whether Ms Trueman was remorseful for her actions and considered that a review period of 2 years would allow her to reflect on her behaviour and the impact that it had on others. The panel also considered a review period of 2 years would allow Ms Trueman to seek additional support as necessary to lower the risk of repetition should she apply for the prohibition order to be set aside.

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 of 2 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 all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and/or a relevant conviction.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Ms Ngaio Trueman should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of 2 years.

In particular, the panel has found that Ms Trueman 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
  - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs.
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- 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 Trueman involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE).

The panel has found that the conduct of Ms Trueman fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding that Ms Trueman had put pupils at risk by being under the influence of alcohol on school premises, and a finding of a relevant conviction for driving with excess alcohol.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct, conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute and a relevant conviction, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Ms Trueman, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children and safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, "In light of the panel's findings against Ms Trueman, which involved arriving at School under the influence of alcohol, placing pupils at risk of harm, and being convicted of an alcohol related driving offence, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils." 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. The panel has said that it "found limited evidence of insight or remorse beyond Ms Trueman's acceptance of the facts in the absence of any written representations." In my judgement, the lack of full insight and remorse 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 has observed that "public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Trueman was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession." I am particularly mindful of the finding of a teacher being under the influence of alcohol on school premises and being convicted for a serious driving offence involving

alcohol 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, conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute and a relevant conviction, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Ms Trueman herself. The panel has commented, "There was no evidence available to the panel to suggest that Ms Trueman demonstrated exceptionally high standards in her personal and professional conduct or that she had contributed significantly to the education sector."

A prohibition order would prevent Ms Trueman 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 seriousness of the misconduct. The panel has said, "The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Ms Trueman. Being convicted of an alcohol related driving offence and Ms Trueman's admittance that she had been driving under the influence of alcohol whilst on the School's premises and interacting with pupils and parents were significant factors in forming that opinion." The panel has found that Ms Trueman's actions were deliberate and that she was not acting under extreme duress.

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that there was limited evidence of Ms Trueman's insight into, and remorse for, her actions.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Ms Trueman has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, that is not backed up by full insight and remorse, 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 2-year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments:

"The panel took into account the fact that Ms Trueman had admitted to the conduct found proven, pleaded guilty to the offence that led to her conviction and cooperated with the TRA in the course of these proceedings. The panel also noted the mitigating circumstances, in that there was no evidence of any concerns regarding Ms Trueman's conduct at School before February 2024. Ms Trueman had also shown insight by seeking medical advice and treatment [REDACTED] and she had confirmed she was in a "*much better place*" and had support from her whole family which the panel considered lowered the risk of repetition. The panel was still concerned about a lack of evidence regarding whether Ms Trueman was remorseful for her actions and considered that a review period of 2 years would allow her to reflect on her behaviour and the impact that it had on others. The panel also considered a review period of 2 years would allow Ms Trueman to seek additional support as necessary to lower the risk of repetition should she apply for the prohibition order to be set aside."

I have considered whether a 2-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 I agree with the panel that allowing a 2-year review period is sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the serious nature of the misconduct found as well as the lack of evidence of full insight and remorse and the risk this creates of repetition.

I consider therefore that a 2-year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

**This means that Ms Ngaio Trueman 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 8 June 2028, 2 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 Trueman remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

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

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Oatley', with a large, sweeping flourish at the end.

**Decision maker: David Oatley**

**Date: 28 May 2026**

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