



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Emma Anderson: Professional conduct panel 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
Witnesses	6
Decision and reasons	6
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	23
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	27

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

**Teacher:** Mrs Emma Anderson

**Teacher ref number:** 0357923

**Teacher date of birth:** 20 October 1979

**TRA reference:** 24945

**Date of determination:** 22 May 2026

**Former employer:** Whinstone Primary School, Stockton-on-Tees, part of the Spark Academy Trust (“the Trust”)

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 29-30 April 2026 and 22 May 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mrs Anderson.

The panel members were Dr Martin Coles (former teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Wendy Baxter (teacher panellist) and Mr Paul Hawkins (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mrs Charlotte Belcher of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Laurence Harris, Counsel at Mountford Chambers, instructed by Allana Edwards of Brabners solicitors.

Mrs Anderson was not present and she was not represented during the hearing.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

## Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of hearing dated 4 February 2026.

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

Whilst employed as a teacher at Whinstone Primary School ('the School'), she:

1. Between 8 October 2024 and 11 November 2024 exchanged emails with Pupil A ('the Pupil A Emails') which were inappropriate as:
  - a. She sent emails to Pupil A's personal email account.
  - b. She sent emails to Pupil A:
    - i. outside of school working hours;
    - ii. during school holidays.
  - c. the content of the Pupil A Emails included:
    - i. details of her personal life;
    - ii. photographs of her;
    - iii. that she expressed favouritism toward Pupil A;
    - iv. that she sought to meet Pupil A outside of school at [REDACTED];
    - v. her opinions about other pupils.
2. On a date prior to 11 November 2024 she took three photographs of Pupil B and Pupil D at the School in class using her personal mobile phone when she did not have appropriate permission to do so.
3. Failed to take appropriate action or ensure another took appropriate action to safeguard Pupil A when, within the Pupil A emails, Pupil A disclosed to her:
  - a. Having been bullied by other pupils;
  - b. [REDACTED]
  - c. [REDACTED]

4. Between 11 August 2024 and 11 November 2024 exchanged emails with Pupil B ('the Pupil B emails') which were inappropriate as:
  - a. She knew that Pupil B had left the School at the end of academic year 2023/2024;
  - b. She had provided Pupil B with her email address;
  - c. She sent emails to Pupil B's personal email account.
5. On or around 11 November 2024, she made arrangements to meet Pupil B and/or other former pupils outside of the school.
6. On 1 July 2024 she failed to take appropriate action or ensure another took appropriate action to safeguard Pupil C after being informed that Pupil C had been hit by [REDACTED].
7. Her actions as described at paragraphs 1 and/or 2 and/or 4 and/or 5 above blurred professional boundaries between her and pupils.
8. By her actions at paragraphs 3 and/or 6 above she failed to act in accordance with her duties as Deputy Designated Safeguarding Lead at the School.

Whilst the panel received submissions on behalf of Mrs Anderson from her legal representative prior to the hearing, they did not make any admissions in relation to the allegations, whether in relation to the facts or in relation to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. In the absence of a response from Mrs Anderson, the allegations were not admitted.

## Summary of evidence

### Documents

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

Section 1: Anonymised pupil list – page 3

Section 2: Notice of hearing – pages 4 to 35

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statement – pages 36 to 330

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 331 to 428

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 429 to 450

Due to their size, the panel also received separately: Exhibit 2 to Witness A's witness statement, which contained emails from and to Mrs Anderson, and 12 videos.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle as well as the documents received separately, in advance of the hearing. The panel also viewed the videos in advance of the hearing.

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

## **Witnesses**

The panel heard oral evidence from the following witnesses called by the presenting officer:

Witness A – [REDACTED].

Mrs Anderson did not give oral evidence and she did not call any witnesses.

## **Decision and reasons**

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

Mrs Anderson has been employed at Whinstone Primary School ("the School") since January 2005. She was initially employed as a teacher and she commenced her role as assistant headteacher in April 2024 with responsibility for curriculum and health and wellbeing for staff and students. Mrs Anderson was also the deputy designated safeguarding lead ("DDSL") at the School. Mrs Anderson was suspended by the School on 12 November 2024. She resigned prior to a disciplinary hearing on 17 December 2024.

## **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. Between 8 October 2024 and 11 November 2024 exchanged emails with Pupil A ('the Pupil A Emails') which were inappropriate as:**
  - a. You sent emails to Pupil A's personal email account.**

The panel was provided with 1669 emails from Mrs Anderson's account dated between 8 October 2024 and 11 November 2024, which were from or to Pupil A.

The panel noted that in Mrs Anderson's signed witness statement of 22 October 2025, originally made to [REDACTED], she admitted:

*"when Pupil A asked to email me a video of [REDACTED], I thought nothing of it. This sharing of achievements has always been encouraged as a school and children/parents were given staff emails whenever they asked... After the initial email of the video regarding [their] [REDACTED], Pupil A then started to email me on a more regular basis. At first it was 'can I talk to you tomorrow at school' or 'thank you for your help'. I didn't see any reason why these emails were going to escalate so would often just reply yes to put [their] mind at rest. However, the emails began to escalate and the volume increased again at first, [sic] I thought a reply was all that was needed and that would put an end to them. It didn't and eventually the emails began to take the form of an extension of what we'd been talking about in the sessions – how to take mind off missing someone, how to deal with children calling [them] names."*

The panel considered this evidence was also relevant to each of the sub-allegations within allegation 1.

The panel noted that the witness statement of Witness A, [REDACTED], confirmed that some of the emails were duplicated when the IT department extracted the emails from Mrs Anderson's work account and therefore the exact number of original emails is between 900 and 1600 emails.

The panel noted that the witness statement of Witness A confirmed:

*"Individual A, reviewed Mrs Anderson's work email account, and located hundreds of emails exchanged between Mrs Anderson and Pupil A on her work email and [their] personal email and included pictures and videos attached to some of the emails (located at appendix 4-7 of the Investigation Report)."*

The panel had received a copy of an email from [REDACTED] dated 24 November 2024 confirming the outcome of her police investigation into this matter. The email contained a summary of Mrs Anderson's interaction with the police, confirming *"this was before October half term the emails started, and was sent from Pupil A's private email address to ANDERSONS work email."*

The panel noted the email address of Pupil A was redacted within the emails it was provided, from which they inferred it was a personal email account. Taken in addition to the evidence of Witness A and the email from [REDACTED], the panel was satisfied that, on the balance of probabilities Mrs Anderson exchanged emails with Pupil A between 8 October 2024 and 11 November 2024 and that these were sent to Pupil A's personal

email account, which was inappropriate. In particular, the School's Staff Code of Conduct states *"the school expects that staff will maintain their professional boundaries and relationships with pupils at all times... only contact pupils via the school's established mechanisms: personal phone numbers, email addresses or social media platforms will not be used to contact pupils."*

Allegation 1.a. was therefore found proved.

**1. Between 8 October 2024 and 11 November 2024 exchanged emails with Pupil A ('the Pupil A Emails') which were inappropriate as:**

**b. You sent emails to Pupil A:**

**i. outside of school working hours.**

A number of the emails provided to the panel were sent to Pupil A outside of school working hours, including the following examples:

- An email from Mrs Anderson to Pupil A on Saturday 19 October 2024 at 08.04 hours stating *"Do you have [REDACTED] today? Then it's [REDACTED] this afternoon. Plus you have a [REDACTED] tomorrow too so that should help pass time and distract you."*
- An email from Mrs Anderson to Pupil A on Saturday 26 October 2024 at 18:40 hours stating *"Are you watching a show tonight? Did you go to [REDACTED]?"*
- An email from Mrs Anderson to Pupil A on Sunday 27 October 2024 at 08:35 hours stating *"Are you having a good time though? Enjoy later and [REDACTED]."*
- An email from Mrs Anderson to Pupil A on 30 October 2024 at 21:18 hours stating *"Yes, enjoy your [REDACTED] tomorrow!"*

The panel noted that these were examples of emails sent on weekends and evenings and there were more examples within the evidence before the panel. The panel was satisfied that, on the balance of probabilities Mrs Anderson exchanged emails with Pupil A between 8 October 2024 and 11 November 2024 and that some of these were sent outside of school working hours, which was inappropriate, because it breached the School's Child Protection and Safeguarding Policy. Allegation 1.b.i. was therefore found proved.

**1. Between 8 October 2024 and 11 November 2024 exchanged emails with Pupil A ('the Pupil A Emails') which were inappropriate as:**

**b. You sent emails to Pupil A:**

**ii. during school holidays.**

The panel was aware that it is usual for schools to have a half term holiday at the end of October or beginning of November. The panel was provided with emails dated Thursday 31 October 2024 from Pupil A to Mrs Anderson stating *“have you changed your mind over the half term about me being your fav [sic]”* and then later *“I will see you later enjoy your hair appointment hope to speak to your [sic] soon and I hope [REDACTED] goes away before school.”* Further, in an email on Friday 1 November 2024 from Mrs Anderson to Pupil A, it is stated *“apart from [REDACTED] did you have a good holiday.”* The panel was satisfied that these emails indicated that the School was on holiday that week, namely from Monday 28 October 2024.

The panel noted that there were numerous emails sent by Mrs Anderson to Pupil A over the course of that week, including:

- Six emails from Mrs Anderson to Pupil A on 30 October 2024 at 09.18, 13.24, 13.42, 21.18, 22.38 and 22.44 hours.
- Five emails from Mrs Anderson to Pupil A on 31 October 2024 at 09.15, 09.29, 09.37, 09.43, and 09.49 hours.
- Around 45 emails from Mrs Anderson to Pupil A on 1 November 2024, which were throughout the day, sometimes minutes apart.

The panel was satisfied that, on the balance of probabilities Mrs Anderson exchanged emails with Pupil A between 8 October 2024 and 11 November 2024 and that within this period there were emails which were more likely than not sent by her during school holidays, which was inappropriate, because it breached the School’s Child Protection and Safeguarding Policy and School Online Safety Policy. Allegation 1.b.ii. was therefore found proved.

**1. Between 8 October 2024 and 11 November 2024 exchanged emails with Pupil A (‘the Pupil A Emails’) which were inappropriate as:**

**c. the content of the Pupil A Emails included:**

**i. details of your personal life.**

The panel noted there were numerous emails provided to them which contained reference to Mrs Anderson’s personal life, including her plans in her personal time and the food she was eating. By way of example:

- An email from Mrs Anderson to Pupil A on 20 October 2024 at 13.36 hours, responding to a question from Pupil A regarding whether [REDACTED] played [REDACTED], stating *“yeah they did and [REDACTED]”*

- An email from Mrs Anderson to Pupil A on 20 October 2024 at 15.46 hours stating *"I'm watching [REDACTED] now then going out for tea. Thank you. What are you doing?"*
- An email from Mrs Anderson to Pupil A on 25 October 2024 at 20.03 hours stating *"you're fine but think I'm going to watch a film now so may not see any emails."*
- An email from Mrs Anderson to Pupil A on 26 October 2024 at 08.44 hours confirming that she lives *"[REDACTED]."*
- An email from Mrs Anderson to Pupil A on 26 October 2024 at 19.33 hours stating *"just had pasta and had pretty boring day."*
- An email from Mrs Anderson to Pupil A on 26 October 2024 at 19.55 hours stating *"ok but it'll just be shopping or getting my hair cut! nothing exciting like you're doing."*

The panel was satisfied that Mrs Anderson exchanged emails with Pupil A between 8 October 2024 and 11 November 2024 and that these contained details of Mrs Anderson's personal life, which was inappropriate, because it blurred professional boundaries between Mrs Anderson and Pupil A. Allegation 1.c.i. was therefore found proved.

**1. Between 8 October 2024 and 11 November 2024 exchanged emails with Pupil A ('the Pupil A Emails') which were inappropriate as:**

**c. the content of the Pupil A Emails included:**

**ii. photographs of you.**

The panel had received a copy of an email from [REDACTED] dated 24 November 2024 confirming the outcome of her police investigation into this matter. The email contained a summary of Mrs Anderson's interaction with the police:

*"it was put to ANDERSON that she was emailing Pupil A as if she was their age, by sending them snap chat photos of herself with filters on – ANDERSON stated this was because Pupil A became upset that ANDERSON had took [sic] a photo with other children and [they] had become upset, she had then sent some photos of herself with examples they could use when she sees them at school. Again it was put to ANDERSON that this was totally inappropriate to which she accepted."*

Further there was suggestion within the emails that photographs of Mrs Anderson had been sent, for example:

- An email on 1 November 2024 from Pupil A to Mrs Anderson at 16.32 hours stating *"are you in the [REDACTED] is this you"*, which is noted to contain an attachment.

- An email on 8 November 2024 from Mrs Anderson to Pupil A at 18.57 hours, in response to a question from Pupil A asking why Mrs Anderson did not take photos with them, stating *“snap chat ones. I’ll send you them.”*

The panel was satisfied that, on the balance of probabilities, Mrs Anderson exchanged emails with Pupil A between 8 October 2024 and 11 November 2024 and that these contained photographs of her, which was inappropriate, because it blurred professional boundaries between Mrs Anderson and Pupil A, and this was admitted to the police during their investigation. Allegation 1.c.ii. was therefore found proved.

**1. Between 8 October 2024 and 11 November 2024 exchanged emails with Pupil A (‘the Pupil A Emails’) which were inappropriate as:**

**c. the content of the Pupil A Emails included:**

**iii. that you expressed favouritism toward Pupil A.**

The panel noted that Mrs Anderson confirmed in her signed witness statement dated 22 October 2025 that:

*“since covid I have seen a huge increase in children suffering with anxiety, not wanting to come to school, looking for extra reassurance. At first these issues were only noticed within my classroom and I would reassure every class that they were my favourites or if any individual asked me numerous times I would often say they were as I felt it was just the extra reassurance they needed.”*

The panel was cognisant that the quantity and intimacy of the emails showed an unusually high level of interest in Pupil A. This gave the general impression to the panel of Mrs Anderson expressing favouritism toward Pupil A. In addition, the content of the emails from Mrs Anderson to Pupil A suggested that Mrs Anderson showed favouritism toward them, for example:

- An email on 25 October 2024 at 16.54 hours stating *“yes I’ll miss you this week.”*
- An email on 23 October 2024 where she confirms that Pupil A is her favourite in response to their question *“who is your favourite?”*.
- An email on 8 November 2024 at 19.04 hours stating *“I DO NOT hate you. You’ve never done anything to make me hate you only the opposite.”*
- An email on 8 November 2024 at 19.07 hours stating *“don’t think I’ve ever been with Individual B on their own. I’ve told you I’m not working with Individual C anymore. You are the only one I speak to on their own. I email you, see you at [REDACTED] and I don’t do that with anyone else. I won’t make those jokes*

*anymore but you have to believe me, I am not changing my mind you have nothing to worry about.”*

The panel was satisfied that, on the balance of probabilities, Mrs Anderson exchanged emails with Pupil A between 8 October 2024 and 11 November 2024 and that these expressed favouritism towards Pupil A, which particularly given their extent and timing was inappropriate, because it blurred professional boundaries between Mrs Anderson and Pupil A. Allegation 1.c.iii. was therefore found proved.

**1. Between 8 October 2024 and 11 November 2024 exchanged emails with Pupil A (‘the Pupil A Emails’) which were inappropriate as:**

**c. the content of the Pupil A Emails included:**

**iv. that you sought to meet Pupil A outside of school at [REDACTED].**

The panel noted that there were numerous emails before it referring to Mrs Anderson meeting Pupil A at a [REDACTED], including:

- An email from Mrs Anderson to Pupil A on 23 October 2024 at 17:37 hours stating *“yes you can if you can get round”* in response to Pupil A’s question *“can I come see you at [REDACTED].”*
- An email from Mrs Anderson to Pupil A on 23 October 2024 at 17.56 hours stating *“not sure what time I’ll be there but if I see you I’ll come [REDACTED] to talk to you.”*
- An email from Mrs Anderson to Pupil A on 1 November 2024 at 10.41 hours stating *“yes you can”* in response to Pupil A’s question *“ok I’ll ask if im [sic] going now and if I am can I come to you.”* The email chain is discussing a [REDACTED].

The panel was satisfied that, on the balance of probabilities, Mrs Anderson exchanged emails with Pupil A between 8 October 2024 and 11 November 2024 and that these referred to the intention to meet Pupil A outside of school at [REDACTED], which was inappropriate, because it blurred the professional boundaries between Mrs Anderson and Pupil A. Allegation 1.c.iv. was therefore found proved.

**2. On a date prior to 11 November 2024 you took three photographs of Pupil B and Pupil D at the School in class using your personal mobile phone when you did not have appropriate permission to do so.**

The panel was provided with three photographs, two of which appeared to show filtered images of Mrs Anderson and pupils, and a third showed two pupils. The panel heard evidence from Witness A that the headteacher of the School had identified the pupils in the photographs as Pupils B and D. The panel noted that their faces had then been

redacted as part of the TRA proceedings. The children were wearing school uniform in the photographs. The email from [REDACTED] did not refer to the photographs and therefore did not assist the panel further. Having considered all of the evidence before it, on the balance of probabilities, the panel was satisfied that these were photographs of Pupils B and D.

The panel considered the School's Staff Code of Conduct, the School's Online Safety Policy and the School's Child Protection and Safeguarding Policy, which states:

- Staff Code of Conduct: *"Examples of inappropriate behaviour that would constitute a low-level concern that should be reported to the DSL include, but are not limited to... Taking photographs of children on their personal mobile phones or devices."*
- Online Safety Policy: *"Staff will not use personal mobile devices to take photographs or videos of pupils or staff."*

The panel noted that the evidence before it was that the photographs had been taken with filters on them. The description provided of the photographs within the investigation report was *"images which were recovered from Mrs Andersons email exchange between her and the [REDACTED] student. This includes 18 of [sic] images, 3 of which contained pictures of two other previous Whinstone students."* The panel was cognisant that there was limited evidence of the date of the photographs or that they were taken on her personal mobile phone. However, the panel had regard to all of the evidence before it, including Ms Anderson's email of 8 November 2024 to Pupil A at 18.57 hours, in response to a question from Pupil A asking why Mrs Anderson did not take photos with them, stating *"snap chat ones. I'll send you them."*

The panel considered that on the balance of probabilities it was more likely than not that they had been taken on her personal mobile phone at the time stated. Allegation 2 was therefore found proved.

**3. Failed to take appropriate action or ensure another took appropriate action to safeguard Pupil A when, within the Pupil A emails, Pupil A disclosed to you:**

- a. Having been bullied by other pupils;**
- b. [REDACTED]**
- c. [REDACTED]**

The panel first considered whether Pupil A had disclosed to Mrs Anderson that they had been bullied by other pupils, about [REDACTED]. The panel had before it a large number of emails between Mrs Anderson and Pupil A in relation to these three topics. By way of example:

- Emails between Mrs Anderson and Pupil A on 5 November 2024 regarding bullying:
  - Pupil A: *[REDACTED]*
  - Mrs Anderson: *"I said [REDACTED] was nice before I knew they'd said something to you."*
  - Pupil A: *"[REDACTED]."*
- An email from Pupil A to Mrs Anderson on 8 November 2024 at 17.23 hours stating *"[REDACTED]."*
- An email from Pupil A to Mrs Anderson on 8 November 2024 at 18.03 hours stating *"[REDACTED]."*
- An email from Mrs Anderson to Pupil A on 9 November 2024 at 19.17 hours stating *"also I've told you before if you keep saying you want to [REDACTED] I will have to speak to [REDACTED] about it."*
- Emails between Mrs Anderson and Pupil A on 10 November 2024 regarding bullying:
  - Pupil A: *"[REDACTED]."*
  - Mrs Anderson: *"I have spoken to [REDACTED]. There is no one apart from the girls that I haven't spoken to. If you aren't happy about me and don't think I'm stopping it then maybe speak to another teacher about it."*
- An email from Pupil A to Mrs Anderson on 11 November 2024 at 20.07 and 20.08 hours stating *"[REDACTED]."*
- An email from Pupil A to Mrs Anderson on 11 November 2024 at 20.30 hours *"[REDACTED]."* The panel noted in response Mrs Anderson sought to reassure Pupil A that a lot of people cared about them.
- The panel had also seen a video sent to Mrs Anderson by a clearly distressed Pupil A disclosing [REDACTED].

The panel then considered the appropriate action Mrs Anderson should have taken under the circumstances set out above. The panel noted that the School's Child Protection and Safeguarding Policy stated:

*"if a member of staff has any concern about a pupil's welfare, or a pupil has reported a safeguarding concern in relation to themselves or a peer, they will act on them"*

*immediately by speaking to the DSL or deputy DSLs... If early help is appropriate, the case will be kept under constant review. If the pupil's situation does not improve, a referral will be considered. All concerns, discussions and decisions made, as well as the reasons for making those decisions, will be recorded in writing by the DSL and kept securely on CPOMS."*

The panel noted that within the evidence before it, it was confirmed following investigation by the School that there were no specific entries on CPOMS relating to concerns raised in the emails by Pupil A. Mrs Anderson was also required to follow statutory guidance Keeping Children Safe in Education ("KCSIE") and Working Together to Safeguard Children. The panel noted that Mrs Anderson was the DDSL and it had seen evidence of her recent training in safeguarding on 4 September 2024 and 11 October 2024. She should have been aware of the procedures when disclosures were made by a pupil.

The panel also noted that it had seen an email from Mrs Anderson to Pupil A on 8 November 2024 at 17.28 hours stating *"I don't plan on talking about you and I'd never tell anyone what we've talked about unless I thought you weren't safe. Even then I wouldn't tell them. No one has ever taken you at all so stop worrying."* The panel considered this was inappropriate and did not send the correct message to Pupil A, as it indicated that even where there was a suggestion that Pupil A was not safe, she would not disclose the content of the emails. There was also a further email from Mrs Anderson to Pupil A on 11 November 2024 at 20.23 hours stating *"do not do that, you have given me no choice now but to speak with [REDACTED]. I will keep checking on you tomorrow like I always do."*

There are further exchanges on that day where Pupil A asks Mrs Anderson not to tell [REDACTED] and she replies *"you have to stop saying things like that on an email to me. I can't see you and have no idea [REDACTED]."* In further emails in the chain the panel had seen she agreed not to tell [REDACTED] stating *"I won't but remember you can email me even if it's nothing bad. I will email you back. I didn't mean to make it worse but I need to make sure you are safe."* There were numerous further emails that night and she encouraged Pupil A to speak to [REDACTED] if they needed to speak to somebody that night.

In Mrs Anderson's signed witness statement dated 22 October 2025 she confirmed:

- *"I took safeguarding seriously in my role. I logged in on a daily basis to check for updates/actions that needed to be completed."*
- *"As a teacher I always reported anything of concern to DSL or on CPOMS."*
- *"Pupil A also discussed being bullied by other children. [REDACTED]. During the sessions we'd discuss any worries and how to deal with them whether that was lessons, teachers, friends, missing relatives or bullying. As a school we'd*

*previously completed extra work on bullying and we'd often discuss the definition as several times on purpose."*

- *"On one occasion Pupil A [REDACTED]. I insisted they discuss this with [REDACTED] -something which I expressed to them on several occasions. Pupil A informed me [they] had then talked to [REDACTED]. We talked about it in school following and I made the decision it was a one off and had been resolved through discussions with myself and [REDACTED]."*
- *"Whenever Pupil A expressed, they was being bullied I spoke to the children involved, informed class teachers both via email and in person to keep them updated. It became apparent there was an issue with children brushing things off saying it was 'banter' I logged this on CPOMS when another child brought it to my attention and asked [REDACTED] teachers to discuss in PSHE lessons."*
- *"I appreciate that my limited '[REDACTED]' and at that point is when I should have referred Pupil A to [REDACTED] and informed [REDACTED]. This was a mistake."*

The email from [REDACTED] confirmed:

*"ANDERSON explained that she was trying to help and support Pupil A due to [REDACTED] - it was again put to ANDERSON that if that was the case, why did she not refer [them] to services/CAMHS/safeguarding/ [REDACTED]/ or document this on CPOMS? ANDERSON stated she thought she had it in hand and accepted that she should have but did not."*

Mrs Anderson's statement during the School's investigation confirmed:

*"I kept Pupil A's teacher informed of any issues [they were] telling me about i.e. felt [they were] being bullied, missing some relatives that had passed. I did this both verbally and via email. [Their] teacher did not feel that the bullying issues were true or causing them upset and stated that they are always fine in class and that she had not witnessed any problems. I also spoke to some children regarding the alleged bullying. From this I was able to establish that it was a case of 'banter' that went too far. When another child also spoke to me regarding this I asked [REDACTED] staff to do some PSHE sessions on what is classed as banter vs bullying. This was logged on CPOMS via another child's parental complaint."*

In light of all of the evidence before it, the panel considered that Pupil A had disclosed to Mrs Anderson that they had been bullied by other pupils, about [REDACTED] and, on the balance of probabilities, Mrs Anderson had failed to take appropriate action. Allegation 3.a., 3.b. and 3.c. were therefore found proved.

- 4. Between 11 August 2024 and 11 November 2024 exchanged emails with Pupil B ('the Pupil B emails') which were inappropriate as:**
  - a. You knew that Pupil B had left the School at the end of academic year 2023/2024;**
  - b. You had provided Pupil B with your email address;**
  - c. You sent emails to Pupil B's personal email account.**

The panel had seen a bundle of emails between Mrs Anderson and Pupil B beginning on 8 November 2024.

The panel noted that the email from [REDACTED] stated:

*"ANDERSON was asked why she had arranged a meeting after school on Friday 15th November 2024? and arranged for another pupil from [REDACTED] to attend [sic] that child was named as Pupil B and Pupil A, ANDERSON explained that Pupil B often attends [REDACTED], this is because [REDACTED]. ANDERSON stated that it's not just her the students visit they visit other teachers to [sic]. On Friday Pupil B was attending the school to meet with [REDACTED], Pupil B had emailed ANDERSON as she was previously involved with her as a student and she had her email, she had bumped in to her at [REDACTED] and asked her if she was enjoying school to which she stated that she was not. She had responded to Pupil B with these emails."*

The panel noted that the School's Staff Code of Conduct states *"staff are strongly discouraged from forming personal relationships with former pupils, including on social media, as well as with the parents of any pupils on social media."*

Based on the evidence before it, on the balance of probabilities, the panel found that Mrs Anderson exchanged personal emails with Pupil B in November 2024, knowing that Pupil B had left the School, which was inappropriate.

The panel noted that Pupil B had initiated the email contact on 8 November 2024 and therefore, on the balance of probabilities, Mrs Anderson's had given Pupil B her email address, which was inappropriate.

The panel noted the email address of Pupil B was redacted within the emails it was provided, from which they inferred it was a personal email account because they were no longer a pupil at the School. The panel accepted the evidence before it that the email contact began following a meeting in [REDACTED]. On the basis of the evidence before it, on the balance of probabilities, the panel found that the emails had been sent to Pupil B's personal email account, which was inappropriate.

Therefore allegations 4.a., 4.b. and 4.c. were found proved.

**7. Your actions as described at paragraphs 1 and/or 2 and/or 4 and/or 5 above blurred professional boundaries between you and pupils.**

The panel was mindful that it had not found the facts of allegation 5 proved and therefore considered only the facts found proved in allegations 1, 2 and/or 4 in respect of this allegation. The panel noted that the formulation of this allegation was that it only needed to find that the facts of allegation 1 and/or allegation 2 and/or allegation 4 to have blurred professional boundaries between Mrs Anderson and pupils for this allegation to be found proved.

The panel found that the emails between Mrs Anderson and Pupil A, as set out in more detail in the reasoning for allegation 1, and between Mrs Anderson and Pupil B, as set out in the reasoning for allegation 4, blurred professional boundaries between them, as did taking photographs on a personal mobile phone, as set out in allegation 2. In particular:

- The emails contained personal details.
- The emails contained discussion regarding Pupil B's relationships.
- The emails took place outside of school time and in school holidays.
- It was expressly prohibited by the School in the Code of Conduct under the section Maintaining Professional Relationships with Pupils: *"the school expects that staff will maintain their professional boundaries and relationships with pupils at all times... ensure that they do not establish social contact with pupils for the purpose of securing a friendship or to pursue or strengthen a relationship... only contact pupils via the school's established mechanisms: personal phone numbers, email addresses or social media platforms will not be used to contact pupils."*
- The volume of emails exchanged.
- The expressions of favouritism.
- The taking and sharing of photographs.
- Seeking to meet Pupil A outside of school at [REDACTED].

On the basis of the evidence before it, on the balance of probabilities, the panel found that the emails with Pupil A and B, and the photographs, as found proved in allegations 1, 2 and 4, blurred professional boundaries between Mrs Anderson and pupils. Therefore allegation 7 was found proved.

**8. By your actions at paragraphs 3 and/or 6 above you failed to act in accordance with your duties as Deputy Designated Safeguarding Lead at the School.**

The panel was mindful that it had not found the facts of allegation 6 proved and therefore considered only the facts found proved in allegation 3 in respect of this allegation 8.

The panel has set out detailed reasoning above in respect of allegation 3 and the action which should have been taken. The panel was satisfied that as DDSL at the School, Mrs Anderson should have been aware of her responsibilities. In addition, the panel had seen evidence of her recent safeguarding training on 4 September 2024 and 11 October 2024. The panel noted that the emails and videos sent by Pupil A to Mrs Anderson were concerning and serious, and repeated on several occasions. Action should have been taken in accordance with both the School's policies and statutory guidance, KCSIE and Working Together to Safeguard Children, of which she would have been aware. In particular, Mrs Anderson's failure to act in relation to Pupil A's [REDACTED], was seriously concerning.

The panel noted that in Mrs Anderson's statement during the School's investigation she stated:

*"I accept my standards did not reflect my previous experience or actions and that in this instance they fell below standards I measure myself against... Though my intention was to only ever provide emotional support, I realise that I failed to do that as I did not follow the correct procedures."*

The panel therefore found that, on the balance of probabilities, the failure to take action in respect of disclosures made by Pupil A was a failure to act in accordance with her duties as the DDSL. Therefore allegation 8 was found proved.

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

- 1. Between 8 October 2024 and 11 November 2024 exchanged emails with Pupil A ('the Pupil A Emails') which were inappropriate as:**
  - c. the content of the Pupil A Emails included:**
    - v. your opinions about other pupils.**

Within the large volume of emails received by the panel between Mrs Anderson and Pupil A, the panel noted there were a few emails where Mrs Anderson expressed an opinion about a situation with another pupil. The panel did not consider these comments in the emails to be inappropriate in the context. Therefore, the panel did not consider, on the balance of probabilities, that allegation 1.c.v. was proved.

- 5. On or around 11 November 2024, you made arrangements to meet Pupil B and/or other former pupils outside of the school.**

The panel noted that the emails before it between Mrs Anderson and Pupil B from 8 November 2024 to 11 November 2024 suggested that there were arrangements to meet Pupil B, for example:

- Pupil B: “[Are they] still coming on Friday?”
- Mrs Anderson: “I think [they’re] coming yes, are you?”
- Pupil B: “I’ll tell you about them on Friday as well.”

The panel also noted the email from [REDACTED] stated “on Friday Pupil B was attending the school to meet with [REDACTED].”

The panel considered it did not have any evidence that the arrangements to meet Pupil B and/or other former pupils around this time was for a meeting outside of the school. Therefore, on the balance of probabilities, the panel did not find allegation 5 proved.

**6. On 1 July 2024 you failed to take appropriate action or ensure another took appropriate action to safeguard Pupil C after being informed that Pupil C had been hit [REDACTED].**

The panel first considered whether Mrs Anderson was informed that Pupil C had been hit by a parent. The panel noted it had received an entry from the CPOMS system on 1 July 2024 at 09.10 hours from Mrs Anderson which confirmed “a child had approached me (Emma Anderson DDSL) in the yard to say she was concerned as Pupil C had informed her that [REDACTED] had hit her [REDACTED].” The panel found that, on the balance of probabilities, Mrs Anderson was informed Pupil C had been hit by [REDACTED].

The panel then considered the appropriate action which should have been taken in these circumstances. The panel noted that the CPOMS entry indicated that she had spoken with Pupil C, who had disclosed to her that [REDACTED] had hit her. She asked where this happened and Pupil C pointed to their shoulder. The staff action was noted to speak to [REDACTED]. There was a follow up entry on CPOMS on 1 July 2024 at 09.40 hours which confirmed she had spoken with [REDACTED], who had confirmed [REDACTED] had hit Pupil C a few times on the arm, and confirmed this was because Pupil C had [REDACTED]. The action was noted on CPOMS as “staff to monitor”. The panel noted that the interview with Individual D, suggested:

*“Individual E sent an email and advised to phone it through to the CHUB and let them know. I presumed EA had done that... I think Emma did call through to ask. Individual E sent an email, advising us to speak to the CHUB. We don’t just put in a safer [sic]. We usually phone the CHUB and talk them through things and take their advice. Often the HUB say it wouldn’t be a safer [sic].”*

The panel noted that Mrs Anderson had taken action upon receiving the disclosure about Pupil C. The panel did not consider it had sufficient evidence to conclude that this action was inappropriate in the circumstances. Therefore, the panel found allegation 6 not proved.

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

Having found a number of the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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 Mrs Anderson, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mrs Anderson 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 Mrs Anderson, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education (“KCSIE”) 2024.

The panel considered that Mrs Anderson was in breach of the following provisions:

- Para 49: *“When concerned about the welfare of a child, staff should always act in the best interests of the child.”*
- Para 50: *“If staff have any concerns about a child’s welfare, they should act on them immediately.”*
- Para 51: *“If staff have a concern, they should follow their own organisation’s child protection policy and speak to the designated safeguarding lead (or a deputy).”*

- Para 52: *“Options will then include: • managing any support for the child internally via the school or college’s own pastoral support processes • undertaking an early help assessment or • making a referral to statutory services for example as the child could be in need, is in need or is suffering, or likely to suffer harm.”*

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mrs Anderson, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Working Together to Safeguard Children.

The panel considered that Mrs Anderson was in breach of the requirements under the statutory guidance to share information to safeguard children.

The panel also considered whether Mrs Anderson’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 none of these offences were relevant.

The panel considered the following points were also relevant in determining whether Mrs Anderson’s conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct:

- There was a very substantial number of emails exchanged between Mrs Anderson and Pupil A in particular and the content of these emails was inappropriate, in that they shared personal details, photographs and expressed favouritism.
- The panel was particularly concerned that Pupil A’s disclosures regarding [REDACTED] were serious, and were made on a number of occasions, but action was not taken in accordance with School policies and statutory guidance. This was particularly concerning in light of Mrs Anderson’s role as DDSL.
- The evidence before the panel indicated that Mrs Anderson showed disregard for School policies and statutory guidance. There were clear frameworks in place and Mrs Anderson was aware of these.

The panel noted that the emails with Pupil A and B and seeking to meet Pupil A at a [REDACTED] affected the way Mrs Anderson fulfilled her teaching role, as it blurred the professional boundaries between Mrs Anderson and pupils by strengthening her relationship with those pupils. The panel considered it would have been difficult for those pupils to understand where they stood in respect of their relationship with Mrs Anderson.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mrs Anderson amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession, in respect of all of the allegations found proved.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mrs Anderson was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Mrs Anderson's actions amounted to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, the panel took into account the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. It considered the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel also took account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils' lives and the fact that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way that they behave.

In considering the issue of disrepute, the panel also considered whether Mrs Anderson's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice.

As set out above in the panel's findings as to whether Mrs Anderson was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that none of these offences were relevant.

The findings of misconduct are serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on Mrs Anderson's status as a teacher.

The panel considered that Mrs Anderson's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher in respect of all the allegations found proved. If a member of the public, or a parent, became aware of Mrs Anderson's actions, they find this concerning, particularly in light of the volume and content of emails with pupils, and of her failure to take action on serious disclosures made by Pupil A to her. The panel considered the public would expect a teacher to act to safeguard a child.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mrs Anderson'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 and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

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

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

In the light of the panel's findings against Mrs Anderson which involved blurring professional boundaries including a failure to act to safeguard a pupil following serious disclosures of [REDACTED] and sending a large volume of emails to pupils containing personal details outside of school time, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils. This was a particular consideration given the serious findings of inappropriate relationships with children and failure to act on serious safeguarding concerns.

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

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

In addition to the public interest considerations set out above, the panel went on to consider whether there was a public interest in retaining Mrs Anderson in the profession. Whilst there is evidence that Mrs Anderson had ability as an educator, as she had held a position of responsibility at the School, and there was a general public interest to retain teachers in the profession, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mrs Anderson in the profession. Her behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and in particular, she failed to safeguard Pupil A when they made serious and repeated disclosures regarding [REDACTED] to her.

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 a high level of integrity and ethical standards at all times.

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

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; and
- 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).

In particular the panel noted that Mrs Anderson was a DDSL and should have been aware of her responsibilities to promote the safety and welfare of children. 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.

Mrs Anderson's actions were deliberate, in that she had actively chosen to continue to email Pupils A and B, to take photographs of pupils and chose not to act appropriately on serious safeguarding concerns disclosed to her by Pupil A, even though she was aware of those responsibilities as a DDSL.

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

Mrs Anderson did have a previously good history. However, the panel noted it did not have any evidence of her having contributed significantly to the education sector or having demonstrated exceptionally high standards in her professional conduct.

The panel did not have any evidence that Mrs Anderson was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings/warnings.

The panel was not provided with any evidence of good character or any character statements.

The panel went on to consider the level of insight and remorse shown by Mrs Anderson. The panel noted that it had received a copy of Mrs Anderson's statement from the School's investigation and her statement initially provided to [REDACTED], dated 22 October 2025. The panel acknowledged that there were some comments within the statement in the School's investigation which indicated that she was sorry such as:

*"in straight language it is very difficult to read this allegation. It is clear, in hindsight, and on reflection that this should not have escalated as it did. Once again, I am sorry to the child, the parents and school" and "[I] feel very remorseful".* However, the majority of the reflections set out in her statement of 22 October 2025 focussed predominantly on the personal consequences for herself and her family. For example

*“this has also had a significant financial impact on myself and my family. I have spent time reflecting on my actions daily, questioning every aspect of the interactions and where I should have made better choices. Being arrested and [REDACTED] is something I will never forget... I feel like being under the intense pressure and workload is what lead to me acting so out of character and making the wrong decisions.”*

The panel considered there was a lack of insight into the level of harm which could have been caused to Pupil A and Pupil B by her conduct, for example she stated in her statement of 22 October 2025 *“I understand that [REDACTED] concerns needed to immediately be reported up. I should have done so. However, I do stress that no harm was caused.”*

The panel noted that Mrs Anderson had admitted what had happened during the police investigation and the School’s investigation, where she submitted a written response to questions. She also made written submissions in the TRA process.

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

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mrs Anderson. The need to promote the safety and wellbeing of children was a significant factor in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate for it to decide to recommend a review period of the order. The panel was mindful that the Advice states that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances, in any given case, that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than two years.

Paragraph 50 of 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.

Paragraph 51 of 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 noted that these lists are not intended to be exhaustive and panels should consider each case on its individual merits taking into account all the circumstances involved.

The panel had regard to the extent to which there were mitigating circumstances, such as the level of insight and remorse into her actions. As set out above, the panel considered that Mrs Anderson showed poor insight into her actions, and the harm caused, and the panel was concerned at the risk of repetition in this case. The panel's findings were very serious, in particular the failure to safeguard Pupil A, given the nature of their disclosures. The panel did not have any evidence to suggest Mrs Anderson had taken steps to address the failings in her practice shown by her conduct.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a longer 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 five-year review period. The panel recommended a substantial review period in light of the nature and seriousness of the findings against Mrs Anderson and the risk of repetition in this case.

## **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/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. In this case, the panel has found some of the allegations not proven and I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mrs Emma Anderson should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of 5 years.

In particular, the panel has found that Mrs Anderson 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 Mrs Anderson involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE) and involved breaches of Working Together to Safeguard Children.

The panel has found that the conduct of Mrs Anderson fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include exchanging inappropriate emails with, and failing to take action to 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 Mrs Anderson, 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 the light of the panel’s findings against Mrs Anderson which involved blurring professional boundaries including a failure to act to safeguard a pupil following serious disclosures of [REDACTED] and sending a large volume of emails to pupils containing personal details outside of school time, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils. This was a particular consideration given the serious findings of inappropriate relationships with children and failure to act on serious safeguarding concerns.”

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 noted comments made by Mrs Anderson that indicate she was sorry for her actions but has found that "Mrs Anderson showed poor insight into her actions, and the harm caused, and the panel was concerned at the risk of repetition". 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 has observed:

"The panel considered that Mrs Anderson's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher in respect of all the allegations found proved. If a member of the public, or a parent, became aware of Mrs Anderson's actions, they find this concerning, particularly in light of the volume and content of emails with pupils, and of her failure to take action on serious disclosures made by Pupil A to her. The panel considered the public would expect a teacher to act to safeguard a child."

I am particularly mindful of the serious safeguarding failures 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 Mrs Anderson herself. The panel has commented:

"Mrs Anderson did have a previously good history. However, the panel noted it did not have any evidence of her having contributed significantly to the education sector or having demonstrated exceptionally high standards in her professional conduct."

A prohibition order would prevent Mrs Anderson 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 also placed considerable weight on the panel's finding that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mrs Anderson because of the need to promote the safety and wellbeing of children. The panel found that:

"Mrs Anderson's actions were deliberate, in that she had actively chosen to continue to email Pupils A and B, to take photographs of pupils and chose not to act appropriately on serious safeguarding concerns disclosed to her by Pupil A, even though she was aware of those responsibilities as a DDSL."

I have also placed considerable weight on the panel's comments concerning the lack of insight shown by Mrs Anderson into the harm that could have been caused to pupils by her conduct.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Mrs Anderson 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, 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 5-year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments on why a 5-year review period would be appropriate in this case including:

"The panel had regard to the extent to which there were mitigating circumstances, such as the level of insight and remorse into her actions. As set out above, the panel considered that Mrs Anderson showed poor insight into her actions, and the harm caused, and the panel was concerned at the risk of repetition in this case. The panel's findings were very serious, in particular the failure to safeguard Pupil A, given the nature of their disclosures. The panel did not have any evidence to suggest Mrs Anderson had taken steps to address the failings in her practice shown by her conduct."

I have considered whether a 5-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 allowing a shorter review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the serious nature of the misconduct found proven, the lack of full insight and the risk of repetition.

I consider therefore that a 5-year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

**This means that Mrs Emma Anderson 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 9 June 2031, 5 years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If she does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Mrs Anderson remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mrs Emma Anderson 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', written in a cursive style.

**Decision maker: David Oatley**

**Date: 27 May 2026**

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