Teaching Regulation Agency

Ms Evangelina Tsadiosou: Professional conduct panel hearing outcome

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

October 2026

Contents

Introduction 3

Allegations 4

Summary of evidence 5

Documents 5

Witnesses 5

Decision and reasons 6

Findings of fact 6

Panel’s recommendation to the Secretary of State 15

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State 18

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

Teacher:	Ms Evangelina Tsadiosou
Teacher ref number:	0155411
Teacher date of birth:	23 January 1976
TRA reference:	18758
Date of determination:	21 October 2026
Former employer:	John Hampden Grammar School, High Wycombe

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ("the panel") of the Teaching Regulation Agency ("the TRA") convened on 19 October 2026 to 21 October 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Ms Evangelina Tsadiosou.

The panel members were Mr Alan Wells (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Emma Barnett (lay panellist) and Mrs Samantha Haslam (teacher panellist).

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

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Alexander Barnfield of Capsticks Solicitors LLP.

Ms Tsadiosou was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 5 August 2026.

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

1. On or around 18 August 2019, she stated in an application form sent to John Hampden School ('the School') that:

    a. She was employed at Ashmole Academy from September 2002 until July 2003 when she knew or ought to have known that her employment ceased in April 2003;

    b. Her salary scale whilst she was employed at Ashmole Academy was M4, when she knew or ought to have known that her salary scale was as an unqualified teacher point 10;

    c. She was employed at Alfriston School from September 2014 until December 2014 when she knew or ought to have known that her employment was from October 2014 to December 2014;

    d. Her salary scale whilst she was employed at Icknield School was M6 when she knew or ought to have known that her salary scale was M5.

2. In or around September-December 2019, she

    a. Allowed one or more pupils from the School to follow her Instagram account when she knew or ought to have known that this was not appropriate;

    b. Liked a photo of Pupil A on Pupil A's Instagram account when she knew or ought to have known that this was not appropriate.

3. By her conduct in one or more of the following paragraphs, she was dishonest:

    a. Paragraph 1(a);

    b. Paragraph 1(b);

    c. Paragraph 1(c);

    d. Paragraph 1(d)

Ms Tsadiosou provided no admissions and the panel proceeded on the basis that she disputed all allegations.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology and anonymised pupil list – pages 4 to 7

Section 2: Notice of proceedings – pages 8 to 31

Section 3: TRA witness statements – pages 32 to 55

Section 4: TRA documents – pages 56 to 317

The panel also received a hearsay application bundle and a service bundle.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundles 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 April 2018, (the "Procedures").

Witnesses

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

Witness A [REDACTED]

Witness B [REDACTED]

Witness C [REDACTED]

Witness D [REDACTED]

The panel also considered the written evidence of:

Witness E [REDACTED]

Witness F [REDACTED]

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

Ms Tsadiosou commenced employment at the School on 2 September 2019.

On 3 September 2019, the School received Ms Tsadiosou's application form, which included details of salary rates that she claimed to have received in her previous roles as well as her length of service in those roles.

The School engaged with three of Ms Tsadiosou's former employers to seek to verify the information in the application form.

On 23 September 2019, the School held a probation review meeting in Ms Tsadiosou's absence. The School terminated Ms Tsadiosou's employment.

On 27 September 2019, the School sent a letter to Ms Tsadiosou asking her to stop engaging with pupils on social media.

The matter was referred to the TRA on 2 October 2019.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

The panel considered throughout its deliberations the weight to place on the hearsay evidence of Witness E and Witness F whose evidence it had decided to admit.

The panel recognised that Witness E's evidence was significant to the allegations, albeit not the sole and decisive evidence on any allegation. The panel noted that an unfortunate amount of time had passed since the events which it was considering. The panel could not conceive of any reason why either witness would conceal or misrepresent any evidence or would have any motive to do so and noted that Witness E's reasons for not attending especially were strong ones.

Having carefully considered the issue and tested both witnesses' evidence during the course of the hearing against the contemporary documentary evidence, with which it found it to be consistent, the panel determined to place significant weight on both witnesses' evidence. The panel did not though place as much weight on their evidence as it placed on the evidence of the witnesses who attended the hearing and provided live evidence, whose evidence the panel had had the opportunity to directly test.

1. On or around 18 August 2019, you stated in an application form sent to John Hampden School ("the School") that:

a. You were employed at Ashmole Academy from September 2002 until July 2003 when you knew or ought to have known that your employment ceased in April 2003;

b. Your salary scale whilst you were employed at Ashmole Academy was M4, when you knew or ought to have known that your salary scale was as an unqualified teacher point 10;

The panel carefully considered a copy of Ms Tsadiosou's application form to the School dated 18 August 2019, with a typed signature apparently from Ms Tsadiosou.

The panel noted that on the face of that form Ms Tsadiosou appeared to have stated that she worked for Ashmole Academy ("Ashmole") between September 2002 and July 2003 and was on the salary scale "*M4*".

The panel considered the written evidence of Witness E, who submitted that when she had noted that, in her application form, Ms Tsadiosou had stated that she received the M4 salary scale this had raised suspicions for her, as a newly qualified teacher is usually on the M1 or M2 pay rate.

Witness E explained that she contacted Ashmole and spoke to [REDACTED], which is when she made manuscript notes on a copy of Ms Tsadiosou's application form.

The panel then carefully considered the further copy of Ms Tsadiosou's application form which had been annotated by Witness E. The panel noted that Witness E, in her telephone calls with Ashmole and Alfriston Academy ("Alfriston") had referred to this document as Ms Tsadiosou's "*CV*".

This document contained notes from Witness E stating "*Ashmole say M1*" below the pay rate Ms Tsadiosou stated was M4 and "*LIED? Left April '03*" under the leaving date that Ms Tsadiosou had stated was July 2003. The panel understood these to have been notes Witness E made during her investigations at the time.

The panel considered the written evidence of Witness F who explained that he did not know Ms Tsadiosou as she was employed between September 2002 and April 2003, prior to his employment at the School. Witness F stated that Ashmole's previous headteacher confirmed that Ms Tsadiosou's salary was based on an unqualified teacher point 10 in 2003. Witness F stated that an M4 salary as at September 2022 was £37,763 and that an unqualified 10 pay rate is no longer used, but that the top scale point of an unqualified teacher is unqualified 6 which is £33,758.

The panel also considered a copy of a letter from [REDACTED] of Ashmole, in which [REDACTED] confirmed that Ms Tsadiosou "*was employed as a teacher at Ashmole Academy from 1st September 2002 to 29th April 2003*" and that Ms Tsadiosou's *"salary was based on an unqualified teacher point 10 in 2003*".

The panel carefully considered the evidence and found it clearly proven from the witness evidence and documentary record that, on or around 18 August 2019, when applying to work at the School, Ms Tsadiosou stated in an application form she sent to the School (a) that she was employed at Ashmole from September 2002 until July 2003 when she knew or ought to have known that her employment ceased in April 2003, and (b) that her salary scale whilst she was employed at Ashmole was M4, when she knew or ought to have known that her salary scale was as an unqualified teacher point 10.

The panel found allegations 1(a) and 1(b) proven.

c. You were employed at Alfriston School from September 2014 until December 2014 when you knew or ought to have known that your employment was from October 2014 to December 2014;

The panel again considered a copy of Ms Tsadiosou's application form to the School dated 18 August 2019 with a typed signature apparently from Ms Tsadiosou.

The panel noted that on the face of that form Ms Tsadiosou appeared to have stated that she worked for Alfriston between September 2014 and December 2014.

The panel considered the written and oral evidence of Witness B who provided that Ms Tsadiosou was employed at Alfriston between 1 October 2014 and 31 December 2014 as a teacher.

The panel considered the written evidence of Witness E who submitted that she contacted Alfriston at the time and spoke with their [REDACTED], who confirmed Ms Tsadiosou's employment dates as 1 October 2014 to 31 December 2014. Witness E submitted that she made notes of her call with Alfriston's [REDACTED] on a copy of Ms Tsadiosou's application form.

The panel further noted that Witness E had provided email correspondence confirming her contact with [REDACTED], from Ashmole. The panel carefully considered this correspondence.

The panel also noted that the annotated copy of Ms Tsadiosou's application contained notes from Witness E stating, *"1st Oct 2014 END 31/12/2014 no contact details*" below the period of employment that Ms Tsadiosou stated she worked for Alfriston.

Witness B also provided a copy of Alfriston's SIMS record which contained details of Ms Tsadiosou's employment. The panel noted that the SIMS record showed that Ms Tsadiosou was employed from 1 October 2014 to 31 December 2014.

The panel carefully considered the evidence and found it clearly proven from the witness evidence and documentary record that, on or around 18 August 2019, when applying to work at the School, Ms Tsadiosou stated in an application form she sent to the School that she worked at Alfriston between September 2014 and December 2014 when she knew or ought to have known that her employment was from October 2014 to December 2014.

The panel found allegation 1(c) proven.

d. Your salary scale whilst you were employed at Icknield School was M6 when you knew or ought to have known that your salary scale was M5;

The panel again considered a copy of Ms Tsadiosou's application form to the School dated 18 August 2019 with a typed signature apparently from Ms Tsadiosou.

The panel noted that on the face of that form Ms Tsadiosou appeared to have stated that she was on the M6 salary scale.

The panel considered the written evidence of Witness E who confirmed that the School's [REDACTED], contacted [REDACTED] of Icknield High School ("Icknield"), who informed [REDACTED] that Ms Tsadiosou was on pay scale M5.

The panel noted that on the copy of Ms Tsadiosou's application which Witness E had annotated during her investigations she had written "*looks like M5*" below Ms Tsadiosou's stated pay rate whilst at Icknield.

The panel considered a copy of a letter from Icknield to the School which stated that "*at her time of employment, Evangelina's pay band was M5*".

The panel considered the written and oral evidence of Witness C who submitted that Ms Tsadiosou's salary was £29,829 MPS 5 whilst she was at Icknield and that her salary did not change during the term of her employment.

The panel also had a copy of Ms Tsadiosou's employment contract at Icknield which stated that Ms Tsadiosou received "*05*" as a "*Scale Point*" on the "*Teacher Main Pay Scale*" under the "*Pay Details*" section.

The panel carefully considered the evidence and found it clearly proven from the witness evidence and documentary record that, on or around 18 August 2019, when applying to

work at the School, Ms Tsadiosou stated in an application form she sent to the School that her salary scale whilst she was employed at Icknield was M6 when she knew or ought to have known that her salary scale was M5.

The panel found allegation 1(d) proven.

2. In or around September-December 2019, you

a. Allowed one or more pupils from the School to follow your Instagram account when you knew or ought to have known that this was not appropriate;

The panel considered the written evidence of Witness E who submitted that concerns were raised about Ms Tsadiosou's online presence by [REDACTED], a teacher at the School, and other members of staff, who said that Ms Tsadiosou had open and active social media accounts that she had not mentioned during her application or interview.

Witness E stated that following an informal meeting with Ms Tsadiosou, where the social media issues were raised, Witness E thought that Ms Tsadiosou would "*lock*" her accounts immediately. Witness E provided that Ms Tsadiosou had been given the School's ICT policy which was very clear that all teachers must have social media accounts set to private.

Witness E stated that on 27 September 2019 the School informed Ms Tsadiosou via a letter that they were aware of a number of pupils at the School following her on Instagram and that she had liked Pupil A's Instagram picture. Witness E stated that the School asked Ms Tsadiosou to block all communications with the pupils immediately. Witness E stated that Ms Tsadiosou did not provide a response to this request.

The panel carefully considered screenshots and emails which it had sight of, which it understood had been gathered by two teachers at the School, that appeared to show several pupils of year 9 in September 2019 following Ms Tsadiosou's Instagram account.

The panel had sight of the School's Staff Use of ICT Policy Statement which expressly stated "*staff must not have any current student of this school added to their personal page"* and *"staff who use social networking sites must check their privacy and security settings carefully"* and "*All contact with children and young people should only use school e-mail addresses or school telephones*".

The panel considered the written and oral evidence of Witness A, who submitted that he did not ask Ms Tsadiosou about her social media presence, nor did she mention her social media presence during the interview or while employed at the School.

The panel was satisfied from the documentary evidence before it that Ms Tsadiosou had allowed one or more pupils from the School to follow her on Instagram. The panel was satisfied that this was not appropriate and that Ms Tsadiosou, as an experienced and qualified teacher would have, and ought to have known that this was not appropriate. Whilst noting it was hearsay, the panel also placed weight on Witness E's evidence that she had provided Ms Tsadiosou with the School's ICT policy from which Ms Tsadiosou would also have been clear that continuing to allow pupils to follow her Instagram account was inappropriate.

The panel found allegation 2(a) proven.

b. Liked a photo of Pupil A on Pupil A's Instagram account when you knew or ought to have known that this was not appropriate;

The panel carefully considered a redacted photograph stated to be of Pupil A attached to an e-mail of 30 September 2019 stating to be from Pupil A's [REDACTED] in which she stated *“here's the screenshot of her liking his photo”.* She further stated within that e-mail *“Is Miss Tsa still in the house? The more I thought about this the more concerned I am*”. The screenshot clearly showed that “*Evangelina.tsa*” liked Pupil A’s photo.

The panel considered the written evidence of Witness E, who submitted that she had been sent a screenshot of Pupil A’s Instagram account by Pupil A’s [REDACTED]. Witness E stated that it was clear from the screenshot that Ms Tsadiosou liked a picture of Pupil A, who was in year 9 at the time, in his football kit. The panel noted that the screenshot depicted a notification on Instagram that Ms Tsadiosou’s Instagram account had liked a picture of Pupil A on Pupil A’s Instagram account.

The panel again noted that the School had written to Ms Tsadiosou on 27 September 2019 citing her liking of a pupil's Instagram picture and asking her to block all communication with pupils immediately.

The panel was satisfied from the documentary evidence before it that it was proven to the standard of the balance of probabilities that Ms Tsadiosou had liked a photo of Pupil A on Pupil A's Instagram account in September 2019. The panel was satisfied that this was not appropriate and that Ms Tsadiosou, as an experienced and qualified teacher would have known, and ought to have known, that this was not appropriate.

The panel found allegation 2(b) proven.

3. By your conduct in one or more of the following paragraphs, you were dishonest:

a. Paragraph 1(a);

b. Paragraph 1(b);

c. Paragraph 1(c);

d. Paragraph 1(d);

The panel noted that it had found proven each of allegations 1(a), 1(b), 1(c) and 1(d) and proceeded to consider whether Ms Tsadiosou had acted dishonestly in respect of her conduct under those proven allegations.

In doing so, the panel carefully considered the legal advice it had been provided including the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd t/a Crockfords*.

The panel first considered Ms Tsadiosou's actual state of knowledge or belief as to the facts.

The panel noted that it had found that the application form to the School had contained a series of inaccurate statements. Each of those inaccurate statements, the panel noted, was in Ms Tsadiosou's favour. Specifically, it either exaggerated her period of service at a previous employer or stated that she was in receipt of remuneration which was at a higher level than that which she had actually been entitled to.

Whilst the panel acknowledged that mistakes can be made in relation to completion of formal documents, although clearly all due care should be taken, the panel did not find it plausible that each of the four instances which it had found proven could have been a mistake. The panel found that, on the balance of probabilities, Ms Tsadiosou had knowingly falsely represented her period of service and her remuneration at previous employers for the seeming purposes of (a) increasing her prospects of attaining employment at the School, and (b) increasing her prospects of then attaining a higher remuneration at the School.

The panel was satisfied that Ms Tsadiosou would have been well aware that providing false statements in these terms was wholly inappropriate and dishonest.

The panel then proceeded to consider whether Ms Tsadiosou's conduct would be regarded as dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people.

The panel was satisfied that ordinary decent people would consider it dishonest for a teacher to make knowingly false statements about their employment history when applying for teaching posts. The panel noted that the absolute accuracy of statements made by teachers in relation to their employment history was particularly important within the profession as such information is relied upon by schools in making safeguarding and recruitment decisions. The integrity of such a process is therefore vital.

Accordingly, the panel concluded that Ms Tsadiosou's conduct, as found proved in relation to allegations 1(a), 1(b), 1(c) and 1(d), was dishonest.

The panel therefore found allegation 3 proven.

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

Having found all 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 Ms Tsadiosou, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Ms Tsadiosou 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
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

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

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

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

The panel carefully considered again the conduct which it found proven. Firstly, the panel had found proven that Ms Tsadiosou had, in an employment application for a teaching position, made false statements in relation to her employment history and had done so dishonestly. The panel noted that it had found four instances of that dishonest behaviour, albeit within the same form. The panel had also found that Ms Tsadiosou had allowed pupils to engage with her private Instagram account, and had liked a pupil's photograph on his Instagram account when, in each case, she knew or ought to have known that such behaviour was inappropriate.

The panel took the dishonest conduct in particular extremely seriously noting that teachers are expected to be role models in the way that they behave and that dishonesty within the recruitment process had the potential to fundamentally undermine safeguarding and, in any event, displayed a manner of behaviour clearly wholly inappropriate for a teacher.

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

In relation to whether Ms Tsadiosou'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.

In considering the issue of disrepute, the panel also considered whether Ms Tsadiosou'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 Tsadiosou was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found that the offence type of fraud and serious dishonesty was relevant.

Again, the panel considered the allegations which it had found proven. The panel was satisfied that a member of the public, fully advised as to the facts of the matter and the circumstances, would consider it extremely concerning that a teacher had sought to secure a role at a school by being dishonest and providing false information. The panel considered that a member of the public would rightly be concerned that dishonest engagement in teachers' recruitment processes could lead to the risk of staff being hired

who were wholly inappropriate to teach their children. Indeed, the panel considered that the mere fact of the dishonesty alone would be considered by the public to call into question whether Ms Tsadiosou should be employed as a teacher.

On the question of engaging with pupils via social media the panel considered that a member of the public would consider it was obvious that such things should not happen, and the panel noted that it had before it evidence that Pupil A's [REDACTED] had been highly concerned by Ms Tsadiosou's actions.

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

For these reasons, the panel found that Ms Tsadiosou'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 the declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In the light of the panel's findings against Ms Tsadiosou, which involved dishonestly providing false information on a teaching application form and inappropriate use of social media concerning pupils, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Tsadiosou 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 Tsadiosou 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 Tsadiosou in the profession.

Whilst noting that she had been qualified for some time, the panel had little or no evidence of Ms Tsadiosou's abilities as an educator and the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Ms Tsadiosou in the profession, since her behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and she sought to exploit her position of trust.

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

The panel noted that a teacher's behaviour that seeks to exploit their position of trust should be viewed very seriously in terms of its potential influence on pupils and be seen as a possible threat to the public interest.

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 Tsadiosou.

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

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions or purposeful destruction of evidence, especially where these behaviours have been repeated or had serious consequences, or involved the coercion of another person to act in a way contrary to their own interests;

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors.

Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

There was no evidence that Ms Tsadiosou's actions were not deliberate.

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

Ms Tsadiosou did not demonstrate exceptionally high standards in her personal and professional conduct and there was no evidence of her having contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel did not have any basis to conclude that the allegations which it had found proven were out of character.

The panel noted that no mitigation had been provided by Ms Tsadiosou and it was unable to assess the extent, if any, of Ms Tsadiosou's insight, or gauge whether she had any remorse for her conduct. The panel noted, in fact, that Ms Tsadiosou had made no attempt at all to engage with this process or provide any evidence of mitigation or insight. The panel further considered that her failure to engage in the process was potentially indicative of a disregard for her professional obligations, which the proven facts had already suggested.

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 Tsadiosou 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 Tsadiosou. Her dishonesty in using false information on her application form to endeavour to secure a job and enhance her remuneration 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 2 years.

The Advice indicates that there are certain types of case where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period.

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

The Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate.

One of these case types is that of *"fraud or serious dishonesty"*. The panel found this category to be engaged as Ms Tsadiosou's conduct at allegation 1 was found to be dishonest.

The panel noted that it had no evidence whatsoever of any level of insight or remorse from Ms Tsadiosou. The failure to even go so far as to attend the Hearing or provide any evidence to explain her behaviours and her attempts, if any, at insight suggested to the panel that Ms Tsadiosou had no intention of seeking to address her past behaviours and the potential harm she could have caused to the School and the wider profession, let alone developing a future methodology to prevent recurrence of the same.

The panel considered it had no alternative but to take the view that Ms Tsadiosou would have a high risk of repeating this behaviour and had evinced no intention of doing otherwise. Whilst noting that the panel had not identified anything within the Advice that required a prohibition order without a review period the panel noted that it had found fraud and serious dishonesty and had formed the view that these were very serious allegations and, in the wider circumstances of this particular case, the proven allegations and absence of any insight, remorse or mitigation, presented a picture of an individual who was simply not fit to practise as a teacher.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended without provisions for a review period.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

I have given very careful consideration to this case and to the recommendation of the panel in respect of both sanction and review period.

In considering this case, I have also given very careful attention to the Advice that the Secretary of State has published concerning the prohibition of teachers.

In this case, the panel has found all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Ms Tsadiosou 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
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of dishonesty by providing false information on an application form that could have helped the teacher secure employment and enhance her remuneration.

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 Tsadiosou, 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 Ms Tsadiosou, which involved dishonestly providing false information on a teaching application form and inappropriate use of social media concerning pupils, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils."

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

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

> "The panel noted that no mitigation had been provided by Ms Tsadiosou and it was unable to assess the extent, if any, of Ms Tsadiosou's insight, or gauge whether she had any remorse for her conduct. The panel noted, in fact, that Ms Tsadiosou had made no attempt at all to engage with this process or provide any evidence of mitigation or insight. The panel further considered that her failure to engage in the process was potentially indicative of a disregard for her professional obligations, which the proven facts had already suggested."

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

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel has observed:

> "Again, the panel considered the allegations which it had found proven. The panel was satisfied that a member of the public, fully advised as to the facts of the matter and the circumstances, would consider it extremely concerning that a teacher had sought to secure a role at a school by being dishonest and providing false information. The panel considered that a member of the public would rightly be concerned that dishonest engagement in teachers' recruitment processes could lead to the risk of staff being hired who were wholly inappropriate to teach their children. Indeed, the panel considered that the mere fact of the dishonesty alone would be considered by the public to call into question whether Ms Tsadiosou should be employed as a teacher.
>
> On the question of engaging with pupils via social media the panel considered that a member of the public would consider it was obvious that such things should not happen, and the panel noted that it had before it evidence that Pupil A's [REDACTED] had been highly concerned by Ms Tsadiosou's actions."

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

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

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

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

> “Ms Tsadiosou did not demonstrate exceptionally high standards in her personal and professional conduct and there was no evidence of her having contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel did not have any basis to conclude that the allegations which it had found proven were out of character.”

A prohibition order would prevent Ms Tsadiosou 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 behaviours, especially the findings of dishonesty and inappropriate use of social media. I have also placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments on the absence of mitigating factors. The panel has found no evidence that Ms Tsadiosou’s actions were not deliberate or that she was acting under extreme duress.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Ms Tsadiosou has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, that is not backed up by evidence of insight and remorse, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

For these reasons, I have concluded that a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest in order to achieve the intended aims of a prohibition order.

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended that no provision should be made for a review period.

The panel has noted that this case did not involve any of the characteristics which would weigh in favour of not offering a review period. It has also noted that the category of "fraud or serious dishonesty" was relevant, which would weigh in favour of a longer review period.

I have considered the panel's comments:

> "The panel noted that it had no evidence whatsoever of any level of insight or remorse from Ms Tsadiosou. The failure to even go so far as to attend the Hearing or provide any evidence to explain her behaviours and her attempts, if any, at insight suggested to the panel that Ms Tsadiosou had no intention of seeking to address her past behaviours and the potential harm she could have caused to the School and the wider profession, let alone developing a future methodology to prevent recurrence of the same.
>
> The panel considered it had no alternative but to take the view that Ms Tsadiosou would have a high risk of repeating this behaviour and had evinced no intention of doing otherwise. Whilst noting that the panel had not identified anything within the Advice that required a prohibition order without a review period the panel noted that it had found fraud and serious dishonesty and had formed the view that these were very serious allegations and, in the wider circumstances of this particular case, the proven allegations and absence of any insight, remorse or mitigation, presented a picture of an individual who was simply not fit to practise as a teacher."

Having carefully considered the Advice, the panel's recommendation and the specific circumstances of this case, I have concluded that not allowing a review period would be disproportionate. Although the misconduct in this case is serious, particularly as it includes dishonesty and inappropriate use of social media, it does not involve any of the behaviours that the Advice indicates may weigh in favour of no review period being offered. In addition, whilst I have concurred with the panel's assessment on the absence of mitigating factors, I have taken the view that Ms Tsadiosou should have the opportunity, after a significant period of time, to demonstrate to a panel that she has addressed the behaviours, has developed sufficient insight and remorse and will adhere to the Teachers' Standards in future.

In my judgement, a five-year review period reflects the seriousness of the findings in this case and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. A shorter review would not be sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining

public confidence in the profession because of the dishonesty found, the lack of evidence of insight and remorse, and the risk of repetition.

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

This means that Ms Evangelina Tsadiosou 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 23 October 2031, five 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 Tsadiosou remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

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



Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 23 October 2026

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