



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Ms Carolyn Corner: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

August 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	11
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	15

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

Teacher: Ms Carolyn Corner

Teacher ref number: 0156404

Teacher date of birth: 27 March 1976

TRA reference: 25085

Date of determination: 4 August 2026

Former employer: Ferryhill School, County Durham

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 4 August 2026 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Ms Carolyn Corner.

The panel members were Mrs Christine McLintock (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Shabana Robertson (lay panellist) and Mr Adam Michie-Carr (teacher panellist).

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

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Ms Corner that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Ms Corner provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, Mr Callum Heywood of Browne Jacobson LLP, or Ms Corner.

The meeting took place in private and was not recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 14 May 2026.

It was alleged that Ms Corner was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst working as a teacher in Ferryhill School (“the School”)

1. In or around 2021, she failed to inform the School that [REDACTED], Individual X, had been convicted of historic sexual offences against a child and sentenced to five years’ imprisonment.
2. In or around April 2024, she failed to inform the School that Individual X had been released on licence.
3. In or around June 2024, she failed to inform the School that she was planning to move in with Individual X.
4. Her conduct at allegations 1 to 3 above was dishonest and/or lacking in integrity.

Ms Corner admitted both the alleged facts and that she was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Notice of referral response and statement of agreed facts – pages 4 to 16

Section 2: Presenting officer representations – pages 17 to 19

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 20 to 373

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 374 to 419

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 420 to 427

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

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

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Ms Corner on 20 November 2025.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

In advance of the meeting the TRA agreed to a request from Ms Corner for the allegations to be considered without a hearing. The panel had the ability to direct that the case be considered at a hearing if required in the interests of justice or in the public interest. The panel did not determine that such a direction was necessary or appropriate in this case.

Ms Corner was employed as a teacher of English at the School.

Allegations came to light when the School became aware of safeguarding concerns regarding [REDACTED] ("Individual X").

Ms Corner resigned from her position at the School on 31 August 2024. A disciplinary hearing was held on 22 November 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:

Whilst working as a teacher in Ferryhill School ("the School")

- 1. In or around 2021, you failed to inform the School that [REDACTED], Individual X, had been convicted of historic sexual offences against a child and sentenced to five years' imprisonment.**
- 2. In or around April 2024, you failed to inform the School that Individual X had been released on licence.**

On 7 July 2025, Ms Corner completed a notice of referral response form to confirm that she admitted these allegations.

In the statement of agreed facts, Ms Corner admitted these allegations.

Person A [REDACTED] was appointed as investigating officer. He stated that he had an initial conversation with Ms Corner. He stated that Ms Corner was informed that it had been reported that she had tried to [REDACTED] move in with Individual X. Ms Corner confirmed that it was true and also confirmed that Individual X had been convicted of the offence of historic sexual abuse.

The School's investigation report stated that safeguarding concerns regarding [REDACTED] were discussed with her on 21 June 2024. Person A's investigation report stated that Ms Corner had confirmed that historic allegations of sexual abuse had been made against [REDACTED], and that Ms Corner had not been living with Individual X at the time. The panel noted that the School's Investigation report had CPOMS entries appended to it. This included reference to a meeting with Ms Corner on 21 June 2024, albeit, it was not clear who had imparted the information summarised.

The School's investigation report referred to a further meeting having been held with Ms Corner in which Ms Corner was instructed to work from home whilst an investigation was undertaken. A further CPOMS entry dated 25 June 2024 appended to the investigation report stated "She knew when she moved in with the Individual X that she was going to have to have the conversation with [Person A]" and "She was too embarrassed to speak to [Person A] about it". Person A's referral to the TRA stated that at this meeting, Ms Corner had confirmed that the facts about [REDACTED] offences were correct, that he was on the Sex Offenders Register for the next 15 years as a minimum, that he had been convicted and served 2.5 years of a 5 year term.

The CPOMS entries recorded a further discussion on 26 June 2024 with Ms Corner in which it is recorded that Ms Corner agreed that she had been naïve in not telling Person A.

On 27 June 2024, a meeting between Person A, the police and the LADO was held. The CPOMS entries recorded that Individual X had been released on 15 April 2024. It was recorded that Individual X had been sentenced to 5 years imprisonment, regarding sexual offences committed whilst [REDACTED]. It was recorded that Individual X had been quickly moved to a low risk prison and that although, as with all sex offenders, he left prison as a high risk sex offender, he was soon downgraded to medium risk. It was also noted that as Individual X had a sentence over 30 months, he would be on the sex offenders register for the rest of his life, although after 15 years, he could apply to be removed from it. It was noted that the LADO's view was that it had been Ms Corner's responsibility to keep the school informed over the last four years, and particularly when the risk changed, when Individual X was released from prison. It was also noted that Ms Corner had not informed the School about them moving in together.

Person A's referral to the TRA referred to this meeting having taken place on 24 June 2024, albeit the panel did not consider that this discrepancy of dates was material. The referral stated that, at the meeting, it was confirmed that Ms Corner [REDACTED] a convicted sex offender, who had been convicted in October 2021 and sentenced to 5 years in prison in respect of previous historic offences [REDACTED]. It was also stated that Individual X had served 2.5 years of his sentence and was released from prison on April 2024 and was currently on license until 2027.

The referral stated that Ms Corner had not made the school aware that [REDACTED] (who she had known for approximately 6 years before he was sentenced) had been released from prison, or that he remained on the Registered Sex Offender list.

The panel was provided with a criminal record certificate in respect of Individual X. This stated that on 15 October 2021, he was convicted of two offences of indecent assault on [REDACTED]. It also confirmed that Individual X was imprisoned for 5 years, with an extended license period of 1 year and that there was a Sex Offenders' notice until further order.

The panel noted that the School's code of conduct (reviewed in September 2023) stated that "whether in or outside work, employees must not conduct themselves in any way that creates doubt as to their suitability for their post or brings the Trust into disrepute. This includes conduct which would bring into question their suitability to work with children". The Code of Conduct went on to state "The behaviour of [REDACTED] may raise similar concerns and may require careful consideration by the Trust as to whether there may be a potential risk to children and young people in the workforce." It is also stated that "For the avoidance of doubt an employee must immediately inform their Manager, if during their employment with the Trust they are... involved in any other matter which it would be reasonable to think would impact upon their role and or professional standing".

The panel did not have the Code of Conduct applicable prior to September 2023. However, the panel noted that Ms Corner did not disclose Individual X's situation after the Code of Conduct had been reviewed, as might have been expected if it had introduced a new expectation in this regard.

Based on the above records and Ms Corner's admissions, the panel found this allegation proven.

3. In or around June 2024, you failed to inform the School that she was planning to move in with Individual X.

On 7 July 2025, Ms Corner completed a notice of referral response form to confirm that she admitted this allegation.

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

The School's investigation report referred to a meeting having been held with Ms Corner on 25 June 2024 in which Ms Corner was instructed to work from home whilst an investigation was undertaken. A further CPOMS entry dated 25 June 2024 appended to the investigation report stated "She knew when she moved in with the Individual X that she was going to have to have the conversation with [Person A]" and "She was too embarrassed to speak to [Person A] about it".

The referral by Person A to the TRA referred to the meeting with Ms Corner held on 25 June 2024. It stated that "Ms Corner also confirmed that they had planned to move-in together in July 2024.

In the CPOMS entries of the LADO meeting held on 27 June 2024, it was noted that Individual X had been released on 15 April 2024 [REDACTED].

The CPOMS entries confirm that an investigation meeting was held on 22 July 2024, attended by Ms Corner. It was noted that Ms Corner and Individual X had moved in together on 12 July 2024.

Person A's referral to the TRA stated that Ms Corner had also not informed the school that "[REDACTED] that Individual X [sic] and herself had plans to move in together. Moreover at the point of the investigation, [REDACTED]".

Based on the above records and Ms Corner's admissions, the panel found this allegation proven.

4. Her conduct at allegations 1 to 3 above was dishonest and/or lacking in integrity.

On 7 July 2025, Ms Corner completed a notice of referral response form to confirm that she admitted this allegation.

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

Person A stated that Ms Corner was experienced with safeguarding cases. He stated that based on her safeguarding experience, she would have known the process to follow and how she should report concerns. He stated that, had it been any other case in school, he believed that she would have reported it, and that she had reported numerous safeguarding cases in the past. Person A stated that there had been an open-door policy and the School and that Ms Corner could have approached him, at any time, to advise him of the situation.

The School's investigation report referred to a meeting having been held with Ms Corner on 25 June 2024 in which Ms Corner confirmed that the facts about [REDACTED] offences were correct, that had been convicted, had served 2.5 years of a five year term and was on the Sex Offenders Register for the next 15 years as a minimum. She also

stated that he was classed as “high risk” when he was released from prison but was then deemed as being “medium risk”. A further CPOMS entry dated 25 June 2024 appended to the investigation report stated “She knew when she moved in with the Individual X that she was going to have to have the conversation with [Person A]” and “She was too embarrassed to speak to [Person A] about it”.

The CPOMS entries recorded a further discussion on 26 June 2024 with Ms Corner in which it is recorded that Ms Corner agreed that she had been naïve in not telling Person A.

The CPOMS entries confirm that an investigation meeting was held on 22 July 2024. It is noted that at the meeting Ms Corner recognised the conflict of interest, in that Individual X’s charges brought her role at the School into question. It is noted that Person A conceded that there had been a total lack of advice to Ms Corner from the police and prison service. It was also noted that in earlier meetings, there was a sense that Ms Corner had “buried her head in the sand”, rather than there being any active deception. It was noted that Person A fully accepted that Ms Corner had no intention to mislead.

Person A, confirmed that Ms Corner’s approach during the School’s investigation was open and honest. He stated that she appeared “mortified”, that she knew the conversation was going to happen at some point, and that she had hoped it would go away.

At the disciplinary hearing, the notes of the hearing record that Person A provided a statement saying “I do believe it was deceiving she didn’t tell us”.

The panel carefully considered the balance of the evidence as to Ms Corner’s state of mind. The panel decided that Ms Corner had buried her head in the sand and not told anyone as a result of embarrassment and naivety rather than having any intention to deceive the School. The panel did not consider that an ordinary honest person would consider that to be dishonest. The panel found it not proven that her conduct at allegations 1 – 3 above was dishonest.

The panel noted the School’s Code of Conduct was reviewed in September 2023 and that it was clear that there was an obligation to report if [REDACTED] behaviour called into question an employee’s suitability for the post, or which might bring the reputation of the School into disrepute. As referred to above, even though the panel did not have sight of the Code of Conduct prior to September 2023, had this been a new requirement, the panel would have expected Ms Corner to have disclosed the issues at that point. The panel noted Ms Corner’s safeguarding experience and that she knew, or ought to have known that she was required to inform the School of the situation when Individual X was convicted, when he was released and when she planned to move in with [REDACTED]. In not doing so, over an extended period of time, she deprived the School of the opportunity to undertake risk assessments and to put in place measures to mitigate any

risk to pupils. The panel therefore considered that Ms Corner's actions lacked integrity. The panel found it proven that Ms Corner's actions at allegations 1 to 3 above lacked integrity.

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

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

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

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

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

- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

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

The panel considered that Ms Corner was in breach of the provision requiring her to be aware of systems within her school which support safeguarding, which included the School's Code of Conduct.

The panel also considered whether Ms Corner'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 was relevant.

Nevertheless, the panel considered that Ms Corner's lack of integrity in failing to report serious safeguarding issues over a period of time was serious, given that it was linked to

her suitability to teach. It called into question her professional judgment and deprived the School of the opportunity to carry out risk assessments at the relevant time.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Ms Corner 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 Corner was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Ms Corner'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 Corner'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 Corner was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that none of these offences were relevant.

The panel noted that the advice is not intended to be exhaustive and there may be other behaviours that panels consider to be "conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute". The panel considered that the public would expect Ms Corner, as an experienced teacher, to have exercised her professional judgement to ensure that the School could carry out the relevant risk assessments and mitigations to ensure that pupils were safeguarded.

The panel considered that Ms Corner's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher.

For these reasons, the panel found that Ms Corner'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 a 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.

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of having failed to inform the School of relevant safeguarding matters arising from her personal life over a period of time.

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

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Ms Corner 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 Corner in the profession. Whilst there is evidence that Ms Corner had ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Ms Corner the profession, since her behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the behaviour, noting that the Advice states that the expectation of both the public and pupils, is that members of the teaching profession maintain an exemplary level of integrity and ethical standards at all times.

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

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;

- ...failing to promote the safety and welfare of the children (as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE); and
- ... a lack of integrity....

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 Corner's actions were deliberate in the sense that she had not informed the School over a prolonged period of time of Individual X's situation but that she did not have any intention to deceive.

Person A referred to Ms Corner being the "type of person who always tries to see the best in others". He described her decision making in this matter as being "uncharacteristically naïve and not the sensible approach that we would normally see". He described being worried about her and why this change had occurred. However, there was no evidence before the panel to suggest that Ms Corner was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation.

Ms Corner did have a previously good history and was well regarded as a teacher. However, there was limited evidence before the panel that she had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in her professional conduct or that she had contributed significantly to the education sector. There was no evidence before the panel that she had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in her personal conduct.

Person A stated in his witness statement that Ms Corner was, in his view, an outstanding teacher and one of the best at the School. He stated that she was popular amongst staff members, pupils and parents. He stated that he would describe her as someone who would always go the extra mile for someone and was always willing to help. He stated that, in addition to Ms Corner's role as a teacher, she was also responsible for transition of the new year 7 pupils into the School. Person A also stated that she had been very good at her job in respect of reporting safeguarding cases in the School. The panel accepted that her behaviour in not reporting safeguarding issues arising from her own personal life was out of character with her attitude and approach otherwise towards safeguarding.

Person A, confirmed that Ms Corner's approach during the School's investigation was open and honest. He stated that she appeared "mortified", that she knew the conversation was going to happen at some point, and that she had hoped it would go away. He stated that she was clearly remorseful and he believed that she felt trapped by the situation and how to approach it. The CPOMS entries included details of the investigation meeting held with Ms Corner in which it was noted that Person A fully

accepted Ms Corner's genuine concern for the reputation of the School which had been repeated several times through various meetings. It was also noted that Ms Corner recognised the conflict of interest in the Individual X's charges brought her role in school into question.

The panel took account of Ms Corner's resignation from the School in which she acknowledged that her "current [REDACTED] do not currently align with the commitments of being a teacher" and "I have always upheld the wellbeing and safety of the students and the reputation of the school and I recognise that my current circumstances are not compatible to upholding this but I have decided to put [REDACTED]".

Although the perception of the School had been that Ms Corner was remorseful and concerned with the reputation of the School, the panel noted that in Ms Corner's representations for this panel, she had not expressed remorse, nor had she demonstrated that she understood that her failure to inform the School had created a safeguarding risk for the pupils. Instead her representations were concerned more with protecting [REDACTED] conviction being publicised. In the absence of evidence from Ms Corner as to her reflection on her actions, the panel could only conclude that her level of insight was limited (based upon her recognition that her circumstances were not compatible with being a teacher) and there was insufficient evidence of her remorse.

[REDACTED]. However, the panel recognised that it had to apply its own independent judgement as to whether Ms Corner should be prohibited from teaching.

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 Corner 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 Corner. Safeguarding responsibilities ought to have been paramount for Ms Corner and her actions indicated that this was not her prime consideration. There was insufficient evidence as to her current attitude towards safeguarding or of her understanding of the transfer of risk for the panel to conclude that publication was sufficient in this case. 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 noted that Ms Corner had omitted to inform the School of [REDACTED] circumstances over a significant period of time. She had a professional obligation to have difficult conversations, and safeguarding ought to have been paramount in her mind. [REDACTED] had been convicted of a serious sexual offence and the potential transfer of risk ought to have been evident to her. The panel recognised that there was no evidence that any child was directly harmed by Ms Corner's omission. However, the panel was concerned that it had insufficient evidence before it that her attitude towards safeguarding and her understanding of transfer of risk had sufficiently developed in order for the risk of repetition to be sufficiently mitigated.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a review period after three 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, except for the allegation of dishonesty, and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. I have put the matter of dishonesty entirely from my mind.

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

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

- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Ms Corner 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 Corner fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a lack of integrity in failing to report serious safeguarding issues over a period of time.

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

“There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of having failed to inform the School of relevant safeguarding matters arising from her personal life over a period of time.”

A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which the panel has set out as follows:

“Although the perception of the School had been that Ms Corner was remorseful and concerned with the reputation of the School, the panel noted that in Ms Corner’s representations for this panel, she had not expressed remorse, nor had she demonstrated that she understood that her failure to inform the School had created a safeguarding risk for the pupils. Instead her representations were concerned more with protecting [REDACTED] conviction being publicised. In the absence of evidence from Ms Corner as to her reflection on her actions, the panel could only conclude that her level of insight was limited (based upon her recognition that her circumstances were not compatible with being a teacher) and there was insufficient evidence of her remorse.”

In my judgement, the lack of full insight and evidence of 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:

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

I am particularly mindful of the finding of a lack of integrity in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

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

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

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Ms Corner herself. The panel has commented:

“Ms Corner did have a previously good history and was well regarded as a teacher. However, there was limited evidence before the panel that she had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in her professional conduct or that she had contributed significantly to the education sector. There was no evidence

before the panel that she had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in her personal conduct.

Person A stated in his witness statement that Ms Corner was, in his view, an outstanding teacher and one of the best at the School. He stated that she was popular amongst staff members, pupils and parents. He stated that he would describe her as someone who would always go the extra mile for someone and was always willing to help. He stated that, in addition to Ms Corner's role as a teacher, she was also responsible for transition of the new year 7 pupils into the School. Person A also stated that she had been very good at her job in respect of reporting safeguarding cases in the School. The panel accepted that her behaviour in not reporting safeguarding issues arising from her own personal life was out of character with her attitude and approach otherwise towards safeguarding."

A prohibition order would prevent Ms Corner 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 and the limited insight shown by Ms Corner. The panel has said:

"Safeguarding responsibilities ought to have been paramount for Ms Corner and her actions indicated that this was not her prime consideration. There was insufficient evidence as to her current attitude towards safeguarding or of her understanding of the transfer of risk for the panel to conclude that publication was sufficient in this case."

I have taken account of the panel's finding that Ms Corner's actions were deliberate:

"The panel considered that Ms Corner's actions were deliberate in the sense that she had not informed the School over a prolonged period of time of Individual X's situation but that she did not have any intention to deceive."

I have also noted that the panel saw no evidence to suggest that Ms Corner was acting under extreme duress.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Ms Corner 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 evidence of 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 three-year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments:

"The panel noted that Ms Corner had omitted to inform the School of [REDACTED] circumstances over a significant period of time. She had a professional obligation to have difficult conversations, and safeguarding ought to have been paramount in her mind. [REDACTED] had been convicted of a serious sexual offence and the potential transfer of risk ought to have been evident to her. The panel recognised that there was no evidence that any child directly harmed by Ms Corner's omission. However, the panel was concerned that it had insufficient evidence before it that her attitude towards safeguarding and her understanding of transfer of risk had sufficiently developed in order for the risk of repetition to be sufficiently mitigated."

I have considered whether a three-year review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a two-year 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 and the lack of full insight and evidence of remorse.

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

This means that Ms Carolyn Corner 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 4 August 2029, three years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If she does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Ms Corner remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Ms Carolyn Corner 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 loop at the end.

Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 5 August 2026

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