



National College for
Teaching & Leadership

Ms Francoise Jenkins: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

March 2017

Contents

A. Introduction	3
B. Allegations	4
C. Preliminary applications	5
D. Summary of evidence	5
Documents	9
Witnesses	10
E. Decision and reasons	10
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	23
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	26

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

Teacher: Ms Françoise Jenkins
Teacher ref number: 0433898
Teacher date of birth: 19 April 1972
NCTL case reference: 15018
Date of determination: 31 March 2017
Former employer: Danum Academy, Doncaster

A. Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the National College for Teaching and Leadership (“the National College”) convened on 30 March 2017 – 31 March 2017 at 53 to 55 Butts Road, Earlsdon Park, Coventry CV1 3BH to consider the case of Ms Françoise Jenkins.

The panel members were Dr Robert Cawley (teacher panellist), Mr Diljinder Sekhon (lay panellist) and Ms Jean Carter (lay panellist – in the chair).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Victoria Callicott of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP.

The presenting officer for the National College was Mr Ian Perkins of Browne Jacobson LLP.

Ms Françoise Jenkins was not present nor represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

B. Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Proceedings dated 8 December 2016.

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

1. Beginning in or around April 2007 when she was employed as a teacher at Danum Academy she engaged in an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A, in that she:
 - a. befriended her;
 - b. shared personal information with her;
 - c. obtained her mobile phone number from the school's database;
 - d. sent text messages to her;
 - e. met her in a classroom store cupboard where she:
 - i. kissed her;
 - ii. attempted to initiate sexual activity with her.
 - f. met with her one-to-one outside school including:
 - i. when she met her for coffee;
 - ii. when she took her dress shopping and engaged in sexual activity with her in a changing room.
 - g. visited her whilst she was staying in a homeless provision on one or more occasions where she:
 - i. kissed her;
 - ii. cuddled her;
 - iii. suggested that she go upstairs with her;
 - iv. engaged in sexual activity with her on a subsequent visit.
 - h. met with her after the school prom where she:
 - i. drank alcohol with her;
 - ii. invited and/or took her to her home;

- iii. invited Pupil A to share a bed with her and Individual C;
 - iv. engaged in sexual activity with her;
 - v. engaged in sexual activity with Pupil A together with Individual C.
- i. invited Pupil A to her home where she engaged in sexual activity with her on one or more occasions including:
 - i. between herself and Pupil A;
 - ii. involving herself, Pupil A and Individual C;
 - iii. involving herself, Pupil A, Individual C and Individual A;
 - iv. involving herself, Pupil A, Individual C and Individual B.
- 2. She attempted to conceal her relationship with Pupil A including by:
 - a. paying Individual C approximately £13,000 wholly or partly so that he would not report the relationship;
 - b. asking Pupil A to delete messages detailing the relationship;
 - c. asking Pupil A to lie to Danum Academy about the relationship.
 - 3. In doing the conduct described at allegation 2. she was acting dishonestly in that she was seeking to avoid the consequences of her actions.

In the response to the Notice of Proceedings signed by Ms Jenkins on 5 January 2017 and in the Statement of Agreed Facts signed by Ms Jenkins on 13 March 2017, Ms Jenkins admitted a number of the allegations above and that they amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that would bring the profession into disrepute. However, Ms Jenkins also denied a number of the allegations and accordingly, this case proceeded as a disputed case.

C. Preliminary applications

Proceeding in the absence of Ms Jenkins

The panel considered whether this hearing should continue in the absence of Ms Jenkins.

The panel is satisfied that National College has complied with the service requirements of paragraph 19.a. to c. of the Teachers' Disciplinary (England) Regulations 2012, (the "Regulations"). The panel is also satisfied that the Notice of Proceedings complies with paragraphs 4.11 and 4.12 of the Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the

Teaching Profession (the “Procedures”). The panel has determined to exercise its discretion under paragraph 4.29 of the Procedures to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Ms Jenkins.

The panel understands that its discretion to commence a hearing in the absence of the teacher has to be exercised with the utmost care and caution, and that its discretion is a severely constrained one.

In making its decision, the panel has noted that Ms Jenkins may waive her right to participate in the hearing. The panel has taken account of the various factors drawn to its attention from the case of *R v Jones* [2003] 1 AC1. The panel is satisfied that Ms Jenkins is aware of the proceedings as she completed a response to the Notice of Proceedings which was signed by Ms Jenkins on 5 January 2017 (p. 12). There is also correspondence between Ms Jenkins’ representative and the presenting officer which has been provided to the panel regarding the submission of late documents in readiness for today’s hearing. The panel therefore considers that Ms Jenkins’ has waived her right to be present at the hearing in the knowledge of when and where the hearing is taking place.

The panel has had regard to the requirement that it is only in rare and exceptional circumstances that a decision should be taken in favour of the hearing taking place. Ms Jenkins has always indicated that she did not intend to attend the hearing and there has been no application or request for an adjournment from Ms Jenkins.

The panel has had regard to the extent of the disadvantage to Ms Jenkins in not being able to give her account of events, having regard to the nature of the evidence against her. The panel has however reviewed the written witness evidence from Ms Jenkins (p. 190 to p. 213). The panel also has the benefit of a Statement of Agreed Facts (p. 16 to p. 20) which details Ms Jenkins’ position on the allegations against her. Further, although Ms Jenkins’ representative is not attending today’s hearing, he has issued written submissions for the panel to consider. The panel is therefore able to ascertain the lines of defence.

The panel also has Ms Jenkins’ witness statement adducing evidence of mitigation and is able to take this into account at the relevant stage and able to consider such points as are favourable to Ms Jenkins as are reasonably available on the evidence. The panel has not identified any significant gaps in the documentary evidence provided to it and should such gaps arise during the course of the hearing, the panel may take such gaps into consideration in considering whether the hearing should be adjourned for such documents to become available and in considering whether the presenting officer has discharged the burden of proof. The panel is also able to exercise vigilance in making its decision, taking into account the degree of risk of the panel reaching the wrong decision as a result of not having heard Ms Jenkins’ account.

The panel also finds it important that there is an indication that the stress of these proceedings is having a detrimental impact on the mental and physical wellbeing of both Ms Jenkins and Pupil A who is the subject of these proceedings. There is therefore good reason for the panel to proceed in Ms Jenkins' absence today so that the allegations can be efficiently and expeditiously disposed by the panel, which is also in the public interest to ensure. Further, there is a cost to public purse if this hearing is adjourned and re-convened at a further time, which may not be justified if there is no indication that such an adjournment would lead to Ms Jenkins or her representative attending the adjourned hearing.

The panel has had regard to the seriousness of this case, and the potential consequences for Ms Jenkins and has accepted that fairness to Ms Jenkins is of prime importance. However, it considers that in light of Ms Jenkins' waiver of her right to appear; by taking such measures referred to in order to address that unfairness insofar as is possible; and taking account of the inconvenience an adjournment would cause, on balance, these are serious allegations and the public interest in this hearing proceeding within a reasonable time is in favour of this hearing continuing today.

Submission of late documents

The panel has considered an application by the presenting officer to admit the document at page 15 of the bundle which consists of a letter dated 8 March 2017 from Pupil A's care co-ordinator indicating the reasons why Pupil A would not attend the hearing. Although this document appears in the bundle, the presenting officer confirmed it was not provided to Ms Jenkins outside of the four-week period required under paragraph 4.20 of the Procedures.

The panel also considered whether to accept the following late documents submitted by Ms Jenkins' representative on 29 March 2017:

1. written submissions from Ms Jenkins' representative dated 29 March 2017 and covering email;
2. covering email and a letter from Ms Jenkins' counsellor dated 18 January 2006;
3. a letter from Ms Jenkins' counsellor dated 24 August 2005;
4. a letter from Ms Jenkins' doctor dated 9 November 2015; and
5. a letter from Ms Jenkins' doctor's surgery dated 13 January 2017.

The panel considered whether to exercise its discretion under paragraph 4.18 to admit these documents. The panel noted that it may admit any evidence, where it is fair to do so, which may reasonably be considered to be relevant to the case. The panel decided to admit the documents.

The panel notes that the National College's document was in the bundle which had been sent to Ms Jenkins and her representative and that she therefore had the opportunity to raise representations in respect of the document. No such representations have been received or objections raised. Further, the written submission of Ms Jenkins' representative is not evidence but written submissions for the panel to consider instead of oral submissions being given. The panel notes that, although this was only received by the presenting officer yesterday, the presenting officer will have the opportunity to respond to those submissions during the course of the hearing.

Finally, the medical evidence provided by Ms Jenkins' doctor and surgery was important to consider in fairness to Ms Jenkins to the question of whether the panel should proceed in the absence of Ms Jenkins. The panel notes there is no objection to the submission of the medical evidence by the presenting officer and that the presenting officer has had the opportunity to comment on those documents in his submission on this preliminary application.

The panel has decided to add the documents to the bundle in the following order:

1. written submissions from Ms Jenkins' representative dated 29 March 2017 and covering email at pages 214 to 225;
2. covering email enclosing the medical information dated 29 March 2017 at pages 226 to 227;
3. a letter from Ms Jenkins' counsellor dated 18 January 2006 at page 228;
4. a letter from Ms Jenkins' counsellor dated 24 August 2005 at page 229;
5. a letter from Ms Jenkins' doctor dated 9 November 2015 at pages 230 to 231; and
6. a letter from Ms Jenkins' doctor's surgery dated 13 January 2017 at pages 232 to 233.

Excluding the public from the hearing

The panel notes that Ms Jenkins has indicated previously that she wished the hearing to take place in private. As Ms Jenkins or her representative were not in attendance, the panel considered whether to exclude the public in her absence. In respect of the consideration on whether the public should be excluded, the panel has determined not to exercise its discretion under paragraph 11.3.a. and 11.3.b. of the Regulations and the first and second bullet point of paragraph 4.57 of the Procedures that the public should be excluded from the hearing.

The panel has taken into account the general rule that hearings should be held in public and that this is generally desirable to maintain public confidence in the administration of these proceedings and also to maintain confidence in the teaching profession.

The panel has however noted that there are concerns about confidential matters relating to both Ms Jenkins and Pupil A's health being placed in the public domain. The panel has also identified that there is personal and sensitive information in the evidence relating to Ms Jenkins' past. The panel has balanced the reasons why Ms Jenkins has requested that the public be excluded against the competing reasons for which a public hearing is required.

The panel notes that any departure from the general rule has to be no greater than the extent reasonably necessary and that interference for a limited period of the hearing is preferable to a permanent exclusion of the public. The panel has therefore, considered whether there are any steps short of excluding the public that would serve the purpose of protecting the confidentiality of matters relating to Ms Jenkins' and Pupil A's health and the personal and sensitive details of Ms Jenkins' past.

The panel considers that should it become necessary during the course of the hearing to discuss the details of Ms Jenkins and Pupil A's medical conditions, then the public will be excluded from that part of the hearing, and any detailed information on the same in the published decision will be redacted. The panel considers that it is in the interests of fairness to both Ms Jenkins and Pupil A that such information is considered in private and there is no good reason why the public will need to be aware of the details of such conditions in order to understand the reasoning behind any decision given.

Further, the panel considers that should the details of Ms Jenkins' past be discussed at the hearing such discussions should also be considered in private and any reference in the decision to such information should be redacted. The panel finds there is no good reason why such information, which is not directly relevant to the allegations at hand, should become public knowledge or be available in the public domain. The release of such information could have adverse consequences for Ms Jenkins and there is no prejudice to the public interest by withholding this information in the decision.

D. 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 2 to 3

Section 2: Notice of Proceedings and Response – pages 5 to 12

Section 3: National College witness statements – pages 14 to 20

Section 4: National College documents – pages 22 to 188

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 190 to 213

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

1. written submissions from Ms Jenkins' representative dated 29 March 2017 and covering email at pages 214 to 225;
2. covering email enclosing the medical information dated 29 March 2017 at pages 226 to 227;
3. a letter from Ms Jenkins' counsellor dated 18 January 2006 at page 228;
4. a letter from Ms Jenkins' counsellor dated 24 August 2005 at page 229;
5. a letter from Ms Jenkins' doctor dated 9 November 2015 at pages 230 to 231; and
6. a letter from Ms Jenkins' doctor's surgery dated 13 January 2017 at pages 232 to 233.

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

Witnesses

No oral evidence was heard at the hearing.

E. Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

The panel confirms that it has read all the documents provided in the bundle in advance of the hearing.

Ms Jenkins had been working as a supply teacher on a temporary contract at the Danum Academy (the "School") since 19 February 2007. During April 2007, she allegedly befriended and entered into a relationship with year 13 student, Pupil A. There were regular occasions when Pupil A and Ms Jenkins met both inside and outside of the School setting. Ms Jenkins denied that she engaged in sexual activity with Pupil A whilst she was a pupil at the School. Pupil A alleges that they did engage in such activity. On the night of the School prom, Ms Jenkins met Pupil A for a drink and they returned together to Ms Jenkins' house and shared a bed. There is a dispute about whether sexual activity took place between them, and between them and Individual C, on this occasion.

On 30 June 2007, Pupil A disclosed details of the relationship to staff at the homeless provision where she was living at the time. After Pupil A left the homeless provision on 8 July 2007, staff passed on this information to the School and the School's Safeguarding

Children Board. No further steps were taken at this time as Pupil A was not prepared to make a statement to the police or take matters further.

Pupil A and Ms Jenkins continued to have a sexual relationship for just under two years. During that time, it is alleged that Pupil A and Ms Jenkins engaged regularly in sexual activity and sexual activity together with others. Pupil A and Ms Jenkins appear to have ended their relationship in or around December 2008.

Pupil A went to University and Pupil A disclosed the relationship with Ms Jenkins and was advised to report it. Pupil A describes how she had not felt mentally able to report the relationship previously.

Ms Jenkins ceased working at the School in July 2015 but continued working in a teaching capacity elsewhere. In or around October 2015, Pupil A contacted Ms Jenkins via text message to discuss their relationship and the sexual activity they had engaged in. On 21 October 2015, Pupil A disclosed the details of the relationship with Ms Jenkins to the School. Ms Jenkins was then suspended from teaching in or around November 2015 whilst the matter was investigated.

Pupil A attended an interview with the School on 2 December 2015 to provide her account of her relationship with Ms Jenkins. Ms Jenkins was then asked to attend an interview with the School on 6 January 2016. Once the School had spoken to Ms Jenkins, a series of Local Authority Designated Officer (“LADO”) meetings were held. A referral of the relationship between Pupil A and Ms Jenkins was then made to the National College on or around 10 February 2016.

Findings of fact

Our findings of fact are as follows:

The panel has found the following particulars of the allegations against you proven, for these reasons:

- 1. Beginning in or around April 2007 when you were employed as a teacher at Danum Academy you engaged in an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A, in that you:**
 - a. befriended her;**

The panel notes that Ms Jenkins admitted this allegation in her response to the Notice of Proceedings, signed on 5 January 2017 (p. 10). Additionally, the panel notes that Ms Jenkins admitted this allegation in the Statement of Agreed Facts, signed by her on 13 March 2017 (p. 18).

Turning its independent mind to the admission, although Ms Jenkins states in her witness statement dated 20 March 2017 (p. 200) that she did not become a friend with Pupil A

until months later, the panel notes that Ms Jenkins' admission is corroborated by the statement given by Pupil A to the School on 2 December 2015 (p. 36) and in the answers Ms Jenkins gave to the School during an interview on 6 January 2016 (p. 32).

The panel is satisfied that there is sufficient evidence to support Ms Jenkins' admissions, and the panel therefore finds the facts of this allegation proven.

b. shared personal information with her;

The panel notes that Ms Jenkins admitted this allegation in her response to the Notice of Proceedings, signed on 5 January 2017 (p. 10). Additionally, the panel notes that Ms Jenkins admitted this allegation in the Statement of Agreed Facts, signed by her on 13 March 2017 (p. 18).

Turning its independent mind to the admission, Ms Jenkins states in her letter to the National College on 24 March 2016 that she did not share any personal information at the time of teaching Pupil A and only exchanged personal information once Pupil A had left School following the exam period (p. 190). The panel however also notes that Ms Jenkins' admission of the facts of this allegation is corroborated by Pupil A's statement to the School on 2 December 2015 (p. 36) who states that they exchanged text messages about the problems Ms Jenkins was having with Individual C and in the answers Ms Jenkins gave to the School during an interview on 6 January 2016 (p. 32).

The panel is satisfied that there is sufficient evidence to support Ms Jenkins' admissions, and the panel therefore finds the facts of this allegation proven.

c. obtained her mobile phone number from the school's database;

The panel notes that Ms Jenkins admitted this allegation in her response to the Notice of Proceedings signed on 5 January 2017 (p. 10). Additionally, the panel notes that Ms Jenkins had admitted this allegation in the Statement of Agreed Facts, signed by her on 13 March 2017 (p. 18).

Turning its independent mind to the admission, the panel notes that Ms Jenkins expressly states in her letter to the National College on 24 March 2016 that she did not obtain Pupil A's mobile phone number from the School's database (p. 190). The panel notes however that Ms Jenkins confirms in her witness statement dated 20 March 2017 that she did obtain Pupil A's telephone number from the School Information Management System (p. 198) but maintains that the mobile number was only taken for the purpose of study intervention. The panel also notes that Ms Jenkins' admission of this allegation is corroborated by the statement given by Pupil A to the School on 2 December 2015 (p. 36).

Whilst there are various inconsistencies in Ms Jenkins' account, the panel is satisfied that on the balance of probabilities, the facts of this allegation are proven.

d. sent text messages to her;

The panel notes that Ms Jenkins admits this allegation in her response to the Notice of Proceedings signed on 5 January 2017 (p. 10). Additionally, the panel notes that Ms Jenkins admitted this allegation in the Statement of Agreed Facts, signed by her on 13 March 2017 (p. 18).

Turning its independent mind to the admission, the panel notes Ms Jenkins denies sending Pupil A texts other than about deadlines or revision sessions in her letter to the National College (p. 190) and in her witness statement dated 20 March 2017 (p. 198). However, the panel also notes that Ms Jenkins' admission of the facts of this allegation are corroborated by the statement given by Pupil A to the School on 2 December 2015 (p. 36) who states that she used to text Ms Jenkins on her personal mobile a lot and that Pupil A's partner at the time had commented to Pupil A that the messages were inappropriate.

Whilst there are various inconsistencies in Ms Jenkins' account, the panel is satisfied that on the balance of probabilities, the facts of this allegation are proven.

f. met with her one-to-one outside school including:

i. when you met her for coffee;

The panel notes that Ms Jenkins admits this allegation in her response to the Notice of Proceedings signed on 5 January 2017 (p. 10). Additionally, the panel notes that Ms Jenkins admitted this allegation in the Statement of Agreed Facts, signed by her on 13 March 2017 (p. 18).

Turning its independent mind to the admission, the panel notes that Ms Jenkins' admissions are corroborated in the answers she gave to the School on 6 January 2016 (p. 32), in the answers she was reported to have given at the LADO strategy meeting on 27 January 2016 (p. 46) and in Ms Jenkins' letter to the National College on 24 March 2017 (p. 190).

The panel is satisfied that there is sufficient evidence to support Ms Jenkins' admissions, and the panel therefore finds the facts of this allegation proven.

g. visited her whilst she was staying in a homeless provision on one or more occasions where you:

i. kissed her;

ii. cuddled her;

The panel notes that Ms Jenkins denied these allegations in her response to the Notice of Proceedings signed on 5 January 2017 (p. 10) and in the Statement of Agreed Facts, signed by her on 13 March 2017 (p. 18) in which Ms Jenkins admits that she visited Pupil

A at a homeless provision where Pupil A was living at the time, but denies that any inappropriate or sexual physical contact took place. Ms Jenkins also denies the facts of these allegations in her letter to the National College on 24 March 2017 (p.190) and in her witness statement dated 20 March 2017 (p. 200).

However, the panel finds it persuasive that the LADO strategy meeting on 27 January 2016 (p. 46) reports that Ms Jenkins admitted to visiting Pupil A whilst Pupil A was living at a homeless provision and still a pupil at the School and that “they kissed, cuddled and were friends” (p. 46). Further, this account is corroborated by Pupil A’s statement given to the School in that Pupil A admits that Ms Jenkins visited her one evening whilst Pupil A was still a pupil at the School and that they kissed on the sofa (p. 36).

Although there is conflicting evidence on this point, in light of how the panel finds the relationship developed as a whole in or around April 2017 and that Ms Jenkins admits she did visit the homeless provision, the panel finds the facts of these allegations proven on the balance of probabilities.

iv. engaged in sexual activity with her on a subsequent visit.

The panel notes that Ms Jenkins denied this allegation in her response to the Notice of Proceedings signed on 5 January 2017 (p. 10) and in the Statement of Agreed Facts, signed by her on 13 March 2017 (p. 18) in which Ms Jenkins admits that she visited Pupil A at a homeless provision where Pupil A was living at the time, but denies that any inappropriate or sexual physical contact took place. Ms Jenkins also denies the facts of this allegation in her letter to the National College on 24 March 2017 (p. 190) and in her witness statement dated 20 March 2017 (p. 200).

However, the panel notes that the statement given by Pupil A to the School on 2 December 2015, Pupil A claims Ms Jenkins visited the homeless provision, used her School’s ID badge to sign in and that was the first time that they engaged in sexual activity together (p. 37). The panel notes that in the exchange of text messages with Pupil A in or around October 2015, Pupil A states to Ms Jenkins that they engaged in sexual activity together when she lived at the homeless provision and that Ms Jenkins responded “The stuff that shouldn’t have happened” (p. 95). The panel finds this exchange highly persuasive as these were text messages which Ms Jenkins did not consider would be seen by anyone else. Further, Ms Jenkins neither denies nor questions the statement made by Pupil A about engaging in sexual activity at the homeless provision. Accordingly, on the balance of probabilities, the panel find the facts of this allegation proven.

h. met with her after the school prom where you:

- i. drank alcohol with her;**
- ii. invited and/or took her to your home;**

The panel notes that these allegations were admitted by Ms Jenkins in her response to the Notice of Proceedings signed on 5 January 2017 (p. 10). Additionally, the panel notes that Ms Jenkins had admitted these allegations in the Statement of Agreed Facts, signed by her on 13 March 2017 (p. 18).

Turning its independent mind to the admissions, the panel notes that Ms Jenkins' admission of the facts of these allegations are corroborated in the responses Ms Jenkins gave to the School during an interview on 6 January 2016 (p. 32), in the statement given by Pupil A to the School on 2 December 2015 (p. 37) and in Ms Jenkins' witness statement dated 20 March 2017 (p. 202).

The panel is satisfied that there is sufficient evidence to support Ms Jenkins' admissions, and the panel therefore finds the facts of this allegation proven.

iii. invited her to share a bed with you and Individual C;

The panel notes that Ms Jenkins denied this allegation in her response to the Notice of Proceedings signed on 5 January 2017 (p. 10) and in the Statement of Agreed Facts, signed by her on 13 March 2017 (p. 19).

However, the panel notes that in the responses given to the School during an interview on 6 January 2016, Ms Jenkins confirms that she "asked [Pupil A] to come upstairs with me" (p. 33). Further, Ms Jenkins admits in her witness statement dated 20 March 2017 that she was "not sure who asked who about going upstairs together it was ten years ago and we had been drinking" (p. 202).

Taking into account the circumstances as a whole that the panel finds proven in respect of the night of the School prom, the panel finds on the balance of probabilities this allegation proven.

iv. engaged in sexual activity with her;

The panel notes that this allegation was admitted by Ms Jenkins in her response to the Notice of Proceedings signed on 5 January 2017 (p. 10). Additionally, the panel notes that Ms Jenkins had admitted this allegation in the Statement of Agreed Facts, signed by her on 13 March 2017 (p. 19).

Turning its independent mind to the admission, the panel notes that Ms Jenkins' admission of the facts of this allegation are corroborated in the responses Ms Jenkins gave to the School during an interview on 6 January 2016 in that she states that she and Pupil A had "a bit of a grope" on the night of the School prom (p. 33) and also in Pupil A's statement to the School on 2 December 2015 (p. 37). The panel does note however that although Ms Jenkins acknowledges in her letter to the National College on 24 March 2017 (p. 191) and in her witness statement dated 20 March 2017 (p. 202) that she had shared a bed with Pupil A on the night of the prom, and that they had "cuddled" and "kissed", she does not expressly state that sexual activity took place.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel is satisfied that there is sufficient evidence to support Ms Jenkins' admissions, and the panel therefore finds the facts of this allegation proven.

v. engaged in sexual activity with Pupil A together with Individual C.

The panel notes that Ms Jenkins denied this allegation in her response to the Notice of Proceedings signed on 5 January 2017 (p. 10) and in the Statement of Agreed Facts, signed by her on 13 March 2017 (p. 19). Ms Jenkins also denies that Pupil A engaged in sexual activity with her and Individual C in her responses given in the School's interview on 6 January 2016 (p. 33).

However, the panel notes that in Pupil A's statement to the School on 2 December 2015, Pupil A states that on the night of the prom, Pupil A engaged in sexual activity with both Ms Jenkins and Individual C (p.37). Further, the panel notes that in the exchange of text messages with Pupil A in or around October 2015, Pupil A states on a number of occasions to Ms Jenkins that they engaged in sexual activity together with Individual C on the night of the prom (p. 91, p.93, p.99 and p. 129). The panel finds this exchange highly persuasive as these were text messages which Ms Jenkins did not consider would be seen by anyone else. Further, Ms Jenkins neither denies nor questions the statements made by Pupil A during the exchange. Accordingly, on the balance of probabilities, the panel find the facts of this allegation proven.

i. invited Pupil A to your home where you engaged in sexual activity with her on one or more occasions including:

i. between yourself and Pupil A;

ii. involving yourself, Pupil A and Individual C;

The panel notes that these allegations were admitted by Ms Jenkins in her response to the Notice of Proceedings signed on 5 January 2017 (p. 10). Additionally, the panel notes that Ms Jenkins had admitted these allegations in the Statement of Agreed Facts, signed by her on 13 March 2017 (p. 19).

Turning its independent mind to the admissions made, the panel notes that the admissions of the facts of these allegations are corroborated by Pupil A in the statement given to the School on 2 December 2015 when she describes generally how she and Ms Jenkins and Individual C would engage in sexual activity (p. 38). Pupil A describes that "As it progressed [Individual C] became more involved but did not have full sex with [Pupil A] as she was worried about becoming pregnant" (p. 38). The facts of these allegations are also admitted in Ms Jenkins' letter to the National College dated 24 March 2017 as she states that "During 2008, [Pupil A] and me did engage in sexual activity both alone and with Individual C" (p. 191). This is further admitted in Ms Jenkins' witness statement dated 20 March 2017 (p. 203).

The panel is satisfied that there is sufficient evidence to support Ms Jenkins' admissions, and the panel therefore finds the facts of this allegation proven.

iii. involving yourself, Pupil A, Individual C and Individual A;

The panel notes that this allegation was admitted by Ms Jenkins in her response to the Notice of Proceedings signed on 5 January 2017 (p. 10). Additionally, the panel notes that Ms Jenkins had admitted this allegation in the Statement of Agreed Facts, signed by her on 13 March 2017 (p. 19).

Turning its independent mind to the admissions made, the panel notes that the admissions of the facts of this allegation are corroborated by Pupil A in the statement given to the School on 2 December 2015 when she describes that she had been invited to Ms Jenkins' house with her friend, Individual A, and had engaged in sexual activity with Ms Jenkins, Individual A and Individual C. Pupil A describes how she had sex with Individual A but cried and had asked for it to stop as she did not want to have sex with a man (p. 38). This is further corroborated in Ms Jenkins' witness statement dated 20 March 2017 (p. 204).

The panel is satisfied that there is sufficient evidence to support Ms Jenkins' admissions, and the panel therefore finds the facts of this allegation proven.

2. You attempted to conceal your relationship with Pupil A including by:

a. paying Individual C approximately £13,000 wholly or partly so that he would not report the relationship;

The panel notes that this allegation was admitted by Ms Jenkins in her response to the Notice of Proceedings signed on 5 January 2017 (p. 10). Additionally, the panel notes that Ms Jenkins had admitted this allegation in the Statement of Agreed Facts, signed by her on 13 March 2017 (p. 19).

Further, the panel notes that Ms Jenkins describes in her interview with the School on 6 January 2016 that Individual C "always threatened to tell the school. I paid him off in the end as he wouldn't leave the house and asked for money to stop him telling" (p. 34). The panel notes this is also corroborated by Pupil A in her statement to the School on 2 December 2015 (p. 40).

Although the panel notes that in Ms Jenkins' letter to the National College on 24 March 2017 (p. 191) and in her witness statement dated 20 March 2017 (p. 205), Ms Jenkins describes the payment as solely connected with buying Individual C out of her house, the panel finds on the balance of probabilities the facts of this allegation proven.

b. asking Pupil A to delete messages detailing your relationship;

The panel notes that this allegation was admitted by Ms Jenkins in her response to the Notice of Proceedings signed on 5 January 2017 (p. 10). Additionally, the panel notes that Ms Jenkins had admitted this allegation in the Statement of Agreed Facts, signed by her on 13 March 2017 (p. 19).

Further, the panel notes that Ms Jenkins admission of this allegation is corroborated by the statement given by Pupil A to the School on 2 December 2015 as she describes how “[Ms Jenkins] text back admitting everything and telling [Pupil A] to delete all the messages” (p. 39). Further the panel notes in the exchange of text messages between Pupil A and Ms Jenkins in October 2015, Ms Jenkins continually asks Pupil A to delete the messages (p. 94, p. 167 and p. 167). However, the panel notes that it seems the primary purpose of Ms Jenkins’ request for Pupil A to delete the messages was to conceal the text messages from the partner of Pupil A, Individual C and Ms Jenkins rather than appearing to be an attempt to conceal the relationship from the authorities.

The panel is satisfied that there is sufficient evidence to support Ms Jenkins’ admissions, and the panel therefore finds the facts of this allegation proven.

3. In doing the conduct described at allegation 2. you were acting dishonestly in that you were seeking to avoid the consequences of your actions.

The panel only considered allegation three in respect of the conduct alleged and found proven in allegation 2.a. and 2.b. The panel received and accepted advice from the legal adviser that if it was satisfied on a balance of probabilities that Ms Jenkins conduct paid Individual C to prevent him from disclosing details of her relationship with Pupil A and asking Pupil A to delete text messages in an attempt avoid the consequences of her actions, then there was a further requirement to consider two questions when deciding whether Ms Jenkins’ actions were dishonest.

The panel was advised that the first limb of the traditional test to which panels are referred is “*whether the panel is satisfied on the balance of probabilities that Ms Jenkins actions would be regarded as dishonest according to the standard of a reasonable and honest person.*”

The panel was informed of a High Court case of May 2015 concerning the appeal against a decision of a Professional Conduct Panel which stated that the tribunal should first determine whether on the balance of probabilities, a defendant acted dishonestly by the standards of ordinary and honest members of that profession”. If so, the panel was advised that it must then go on to determine whether or not it is more likely than not that Ms Jenkins realised that what she was doing was by those standards dishonest. The panel accepted that only if the answer to both these questions is yes can the allegation of dishonesty be established in this case. The panel were also informed that the Court of Appeal in an appeal against a criminal conviction in December 2015 held that the required standard under the objective limb was the ordinary standards of reasonable and honest people. However, the panel understands that it has yet to be seen whether that

decision will be applied in the context of professional discipline proceedings, given the shift away from that test by the High Court.

The panel considers Ms Jenkins' conduct in respect of allegation 2(a) to be dishonest in that she was seeking to avoid the consequences of her actions.

It is clear to the panel that Ms Jenkins paid Individual C in order to avoid him telling the School as she confirmed this in her responses to her interview with the School on 6 January 2016 (p. 34). The panel finds that this would be dishonest by the standards of reasonable and honest people and by the standards of the teaching profession. Ms Jenkins must have considered this behaviour dishonest as the panel finds that if she was concerned about being blackmailed, she would have reported the blackmail to the authorities herself.

However, as the panel has found that the primary purpose of Ms Jenkins conduct in respect of allegation 2.b. in asking Pupil A to delete the messages was mainly to hide the text messages from Individual C and the partner of Pupil A rather than to avoid the consequences of her actions in a professional capacity, the panel does not find this behaviour dishonest by the standards required of the law.

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

1. Beginning in or around April 2007 when you were employed as a teacher at Danum Academy you engaged in an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A, in that you:

e. met her in a classroom store cupboard where you:

i. kissed her;

ii. attempted to initiate sexual activity with her.

The panel notes that Ms Jenkins denies the facts of these allegations in her response to the Notice of Proceedings signed by Ms Jenkins on 5 January 2017 (p. 10) and in the Statement of Agreed Facts signed by Ms Jenkins on 13 March 2017 (p. 16 to p 20).

Although the panel notes that in her responses to the School on 2 December 2015, Pupil A describes that she would go into School during her final exams and into the classroom store cupboard with Ms Jenkins and kiss and that Ms Jenkins tried to initiate further sexual activity (p. 38), the panel finds this is not corroborated anywhere else in the evidence before it.

Accordingly, the panel does not consider the National College has presented enough evidence for it to find on the balance of probabilities the facts of these allegations proven.

f. met with her one-to-one outside school including:

ii. when you took her dress shopping and engaged in sexual activity with her in a changing room.

The panel notes that Ms Jenkins denies the facts of this allegation in her response to the Notice of Proceedings signed by Ms Jenkins on 5 January 2017 (p. 10) and in the Statement of Agreed Facts signed by Ms Jenkins on 13 March 2017 (p. 16 to p. 20).

Although the panel notes that in her responses to the School on 2 December 2015, Pupil A describes that she went dress shopping with Ms Jenkins and engaged in sexual activity with her in a changing room (p. 37), the panel finds this is not corroborated anywhere else in the evidence before it.

Accordingly, the panel does not consider the National College has presented enough evidence for it to find on the balance of probabilities the facts of this allegation proven.

g. visited her whilst she was staying in a homeless provision on one or more occasions where you:

iii. suggested that she go upstairs with you;

The panel notes that Ms Jenkins denies the facts of this allegation in her response to the Notice of Proceedings signed by Ms Jenkins on 5 January 2017 (p. 10) and in the Statement of Agreed Facts signed by Ms Jenkins on 13 March 2017 (p. 16 to p. 20).

The panel notes that in her responses to the School interview on 2 December 2015, Pupil A describes that Ms Jenkins had “suggested they went upstairs” when she visited Pupil A at the homeless provision, the panel finds this is not expressly corroborated anywhere else in the evidence before it (p. 37).

Accordingly, the panel does not consider the National College has presented enough evidence for it to find on the balance of probabilities the facts of this allegation proven.

i. invited Pupil A to your home where you engaged in sexual activity with her on one or more occasions including:

iv. involving yourself, Pupil A, Individual C and Individual B.

The panel notes that Ms Jenkins denies the facts of this allegation in her response to the Notice of Proceedings signed by Ms Jenkins on 5 January 2017 (p. 10) and in the Statement of Agreed Facts signed by Ms Jenkins on 13 March 2017 (p. 16 to p. 20).

The panel notes that in her responses to the School interview on 2 December 2015, Pupil A describes Ms Jenkins had text Pupil A whilst she was with Individual B and invited them around to her home and that “all 4 had sex” (p. 38). However, the panel finds this is not expressly corroborated anywhere else in the evidence before it.

Accordingly, the panel does not consider that the National College has presented enough evidence for it to find on the balance of probabilities the facts of this allegation proven.

2. You attempted to conceal your relationship with Pupil A including by:

c. asking Pupil A to lie to Danum Academy about your relationship.

The panel notes that Ms Jenkins denies the facts of this allegation in her response to the Notice of Proceedings signed by Ms Jenkins on 5 January 2017 (p. 10) and in the Statement of Agreed Facts signed by Ms Jenkins on 13 March 2017 (p. 16 to p. 20).

The panel notes that from the text messages exchanged between Pupil A and Ms Jenkins in or around October 2015, there was some evidence that the relationship had been concealed from the School but there was no evidence to suggest that this was at the request of Ms Jenkins (p. 149).

Pupil A does confirm in her statement given to the School on 2 December 2015 that she was asked by Ms Jenkins to confirm that their relationship started in August 2007 (p. 40). However, the panel finds this is not expressly corroborated anywhere else in the evidence before it.

The panel is therefore unable to draw sufficient inference from the evidence before it to find the facts of this allegation proven on the balance of probabilities.

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

Having found a number of the allegations to have been proven, the panel has gone on to consider whether the facts of those proven allegations amount to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In doing so, the panel has had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: The prohibition of teachers, which the panel refers to as “the Advice”. The panel notes that unacceptable professional conduct is defined as misconduct of a serious nature, falling significantly short of the standard of behaviour expected of a teacher. In making a judgement as to whether the behaviour demonstrated falls significantly short of the standard expected of a teacher, the panel has drawn on its own knowledge and experience of the teaching profession as well as the Teachers’ Standards.

The panel is satisfied that the conduct of Ms Jenkins in relation to the facts found proven, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considers that by reference to Part Two, Ms Jenkins 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;
- 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 is satisfied that the conduct of Ms Jenkins fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession. In this respect, Ms Jenkins should have been aware that Pupil A was still a pupil of the School at the time that the inappropriate relationship began.

The panel finds that excessive and repeated informal communication broke down professional barriers and led to an escalation of inappropriate behaviour toward Pupil A. Given the climate of safeguarding at the time, the panel found it difficult to believe that Ms Jenkins was so naïve about the safeguarding of pupils that she got herself into this situation without being aware that this behaviour was inappropriate.

The panel considers it important that professional boundaries between teachers and pupils are maintained. The panel notes that Ms Jenkins had also discussed her own problems with a vulnerable pupil whilst she was in a position of responsibility and trust and considers this inappropriate behaviour.

The panel has also considered whether Ms Jenkins' conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 8 and 9 of the Advice. The panel did not consider that this was a case involving serious dishonesty as, although it has found Ms Jenkins behaviour dishonest in respect of allegation 2.a. only, it found that such behaviour was at the lower end of the "dishonesty spectrum". Such dishonesty could also have been influenced by a concern about her own children or the School finding out about the relationship between her and Pupil A because of embarrassment that she was engaging in such activity with a member of the same sex when she was in a heterosexual relationship.

The panel therefore is satisfied that Ms Jenkins is guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

With reference to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, the panel has taken into account how the teaching profession is viewed by others and considers the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel has taken account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils'

lives and that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way they behave.

The panel considers that Ms Jenkins' conduct in the familiarity of her relationship with Pupil A whilst still a pupil, and then her subsequent sexual activity with Pupil A and others amounts to conduct which would likely have a negative impact on her status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public perception of the profession.

The panel finds that Ms Jenkins' actions constitute conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct/conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, it is 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 has to consider whether it is an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it is 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 has considered the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and having done so has found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely the protection of pupils, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In light of the panel's findings against Ms Jenkins, which involved an inappropriate relationship with a potentially vulnerable pupil whilst that pupil was still on the School's roll and sexual activity with Pupil A, there is a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils given the serious findings of inappropriate relationships with children.

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

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

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 Jenkins.

In carrying out the balancing exercise the panel has considered the public interest considerations both in favour of and against prohibition as well as the interests of Ms Jenkins. 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 proven.

In the list of such behaviours, those that are relevant in this case are:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving vulnerable pupils) or violation of the rights of pupils;
- dishonesty especially where there have been serious consequences, and/or it has been repeated and/or covered up;

Even though there were behaviours that would point to a prohibition order being appropriate, the panel went on to consider whether or not there were sufficient mitigating factors to militate against a prohibition order being an appropriate and proportionate measure to impose, particularly taking into account the nature and severity of the behaviour in this case.

There was no evidence that the teacher's actions were not deliberate. There was no evidence to suggest that the teacher was acting under duress, and in fact the panel found the teacher's actions were planned and secretive.

The panel notes that Ms Jenkins alleges she was a good teacher prior to her involvement with Pupil A but the panel has not seen any independent evidence to support this.

The panel was persuaded by the presenting officer's argument that Ms Jenkins only had a good history of teaching after her relationship with Pupil A started because of her deception in failing to disclose the details of her relationship, which allowed her to avoid the consequences of her actions and continue to teach.

The panel is of the view that prohibition is both proportionate and appropriate. The panel has decided that the public interest considerations outweigh the interests of Ms Jenkins in this case. Ms Jenkins' deception, the inappropriate nature of her relationship with a vulnerable pupil and the sexual activity engaged in with Pupil A was a significant factor in forming that opinion.

Accordingly, the panel makes 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 to decide to recommend that a review period of the order should be considered. The panel was mindful that the Advice advises 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 panel finds it important that Ms Jenkins continues to blame her actions on a lack of safeguarding training she had had at the time. Additionally, by continuing to try to be friends with Pupil A some years later in the exchange of text messages in October 2015, Ms Jenkins has continued to demonstrate a lack of understanding of her responsibilities as a teacher and a failure to understand the harm she caused. This leads the panel to consider that Ms Jenkins has not learned from her actions. Accordingly, there may be a risk that such behaviour could occur again in the future.

The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proven, would militate against a review period being recommended. One of these behaviours include serious sexual misconduct, e.g. where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons, particularly where the individual has used their professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons.

Ms Jenkins initiated a relationship with a vulnerable pupil whilst she was still on the School roll. Furthermore, the inappropriate relationship was only possible because Ms Jenkins was in a position of trust as a teacher. The panel has therefore found that Ms Jenkins was responsible for sexual conduct with a vulnerable pupil which was sustained over a period of time. Furthermore, when Ms Jenkins was contacted by Pupil A in October 2015, she showed little restraint in keeping an appropriate distance from Pupil A and actively seemed to be pursuing a relationship again. The panel is therefore concerned about the lack of insight, particularly as Ms Jenkins had received safeguarding training by that time, of the behaviour displayed by Ms Jenkins in the text messages in October 2015. Further the panel notes that there are inconsistencies in the evidence about Ms Jenkins account of her relationship with Pupil A in 2007 which demonstrates a lack of willingness to engage appropriately disciplinary and regulatory processes.

The panel felt 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 recommendations made to me by the panel both in respect of sanction and review.

In reaching my decision on this case I have also taken careful account of the advice that is published by the Secretary of State concerning the prohibition of teachers.

In this case there were a number of allegations that the panel found proven and a number where they were found not proven. In considering my decision in this case I have put from my mind all of the allegations that were found not proven. The panel has been very clear in setting out their findings on every element of the allegations.

The panel has nonetheless found a number of allegations proven and has also found that those allegations amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. In particular the panel has found that Ms Jenkins 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;
- 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 is satisfied that the conduct of Ms Jenkins fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession. In this respect, Ms Jenkins should have been aware that Pupil A was still a pupil of the School at the time that the inappropriate relationship began.

Having found that some of the allegations amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute the panel has gone on to recommend a prohibition order and set out its reasons for that. In making my decision I have taken into account the advice published and I have also weighed carefully the public interest and the interests of the teacher.

I consider that the following behaviours are relevant in this case:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving vulnerable pupils) or violation of the rights of pupils;
- dishonesty especially where there have been serious consequences, and/or it has been repeated and/or covered up.

I have considered carefully whether in this case a published finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute is a sufficient and proportionate way of concluding this case. There may be occasions where a teacher has so much to offer the profession that it is in the public interest to allow them to continue to teach.

I have decided that because of the very serious nature of the misconduct in this case that such a conclusion would not be in the public interest. In particular the serious nature of the misconduct and the vulnerability of the pupil make me conclude that a prohibition order is in the public interest and is also proportionate.

I therefore support the recommendation of the panel.

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. I have taken into account the panel's comments on previous good performance and also the level of insight and remorse shown by the teacher. In this case the panel explicitly point out:

"Ms Jenkins initiated a relationship with a vulnerable pupil whilst she was still on the School roll. Furthermore, the inappropriate relationship was only possible because Ms Jenkins was in a position of trust as a teacher. The panel has therefore found that Ms Jenkins was responsible for sexual conduct with a vulnerable pupil which was sustained over a period of time."

I have taken careful account of the advice published and in my view, having considered the public interest and the need to be proportionate it is my conclusion that there should be no review period.

This means that Ms Françoise Jenkins is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. Furthermore, in view of the seriousness of the allegations found proved against her, I have decided that Ms Françoise Jenkins shall not be entitled to apply for restoration of her eligibility to teach.

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

Ms Francoise Jenkins has a right of appeal to the Queen's Bench Division of 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 'Alan Meyrick', written in a cursive style.

Decision maker: Alan Meyrick

Date: 6 April 2017

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