



National College for
Teaching & Leadership

Mrs Francesca Rogers: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

June 2017

Contents

A. Introduction	3
B. Allegations	4
C. Preliminary applications	4 - 6
D. Summary of evidence	6 - 7
Documents	6
Witnesses	6 - 7
E. Decision and reasons	7 - 11
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	11 -13
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	13 -15

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

Teacher: Mrs Francesca Rogers
Teacher ref number: 9939270
Teacher date of birth: 16 June 1978
NCTL case reference: 15409
Date of determination: 28 June 2017
Former employer: Larkhill Primary School, Wiltshire

A. Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the National College for Teaching and Leadership (“the National College”) convened on 26 and 27 June 2017 at 53 to 55 Butts Road, Earlsdon Park, Coventry CV1 3BH and on 28 June 2017 at The Ramada Hotel, The Butts, Earlsdon, Coventry, CV1 3GG to consider the case of Mrs Francesca Rogers.

The panel members were Mr Tony James (former teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Kathy Thomson (teacher panellist) and Mrs Mahfia Watkinson (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Graham Miles of Blake Morgan LLP solicitors.

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

Mrs Rogers was present and was represented by Mr Laith Dilaimi of counsel, instructed by NUT Solicitors.

The hearing took place in private, save for the announcement of the panel’s decision, which was announced in public and recorded.

B. Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Proceedings dated 22 February 2017.

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

Whilst employed as a teacher at Larkhill Primary School in Wiltshire in 2015 – 2016 she:

1. Entered into a personal relationship with Individual A who she knew was being investigated for viewing indecent images of children;
2. Failed to inform Larkhill Primary School of her personal relationship with Individual A until on or around 8 January 2016;
3. Denied to authorities on one or more occasions that she was in a relationship with Individual A when in fact she was, including when she was questioned by Wiltshire Police on or around 11 December 2015;
4. In doing 3 above, her conduct was dishonest in that she was trying to conceal her personal relationship with Individual A.

Mrs Rogers denied the facts in allegation 1, but admitted allegation 2 (as amended). In relation to allegation 3, Mrs Rogers admitted that there was one occasion only when she denied to Wiltshire Police that she was in a relationship with Individual A. Mrs Rogers said that this was on 17 December 2015 rather than 11 December 2015. In relation to allegation 4, Mrs Rogers admitted that her actions were dishonest.

Unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute were denied.

C. Preliminary applications

Application for hearing to be held in private

The panel considered an application made on behalf of Mrs Rogers that the hearing should be held in private in order to protect the interests of her children. [Redacted] It was submitted that holding the hearing in private would not be contrary to the public interest. An application was also made on behalf of Mrs Rogers for a direction that the school should not be named. The applications were opposed by Mr Perkins.

After receiving legal advice and retiring to consider the application, the Chair announced the decision of the panel as follows:

'The panel has considered the application for the hearing to be held in private. There is a public interest in hearings taking place in public. The panel has started from the premise that the hearing should take place in public unless there are compelling reasons for it to be held in private. The panel has weighed in the balance this public interest against the rights of privacy of Mrs Rogers and members of her family, especially her children. The panel has noted that it will hear evidence about matters of a sensitive and personal nature relating to Mrs Rogers' relationship with her husband and with Individual A and the potential impact on the children of the family. The panel is satisfied that there are matters of a very sensitive nature in respect of which the right to privacy outweighs the public interest. The panel considered whether it would be possible to hold parts of the hearing in private and the remainder in public. However, the panel has concluded that this would be impracticable given that the matters of a sensitive personal nature permeate the proceedings and cannot be isolated to the evidence of a particular witness. Accordingly, the panel has concluded that the hearing will take place in private. The panel's decisions on facts and unacceptable professional conduct will be announced in public, in any event.

The panel also considered an application that the school should not be referred to by name, but the panel concluded that there was no justification for such a direction.'

Application to amend allegations

The panel considered an application by Mr Perkins to amend allegation 2 by replacing the words, 'Failed to' with 'Did not'. In addition, as the allegation of dishonesty was not numbered in the Notice of Proceedings, Mr Perkins applied to amend the allegation by numbering it as allegation 4. Mr Dilaimi confirmed that no objection was made to either application. After receiving legal advice, the panel agreed to the proposed amendments.

Application to admit additional documents

Mr Dilaimi made an application to admit additional documents. These documents included full copies of documents that were already in the bundle, but not in complete form, namely the documents entitled:

- 'Guidance for safer working practice for those working with children and young people for those working with children and young people.'
- 'Disqualification under the Childcare Act 2006.'

In addition, Mr Dilaimi applied to introduce a document entitled 'cast list' (a list of individuals), a chronology, the Wiltshire Council school term and holiday dates 2015/16 and reports of domestic incidents relating to Mrs Rogers from Wiltshire Police. Mr Perkins did not object to any of these documents being admitted and the panel agreed to admit them.

D. Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology – page 1-2

Section 2: Notice of Proceedings and Response – pages 4 to 10

Section 3: NCTL witness statements – pages 12 to 16

Section 4: NCTL documents – pages 18 to 184

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 186 to 430

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

- Guidance for safer working practice for those working with children and young people – pages 117A to 117Y
- Disqualification under the Childcare Act 2006 – pages 397 to 420A
- Cast list – page 431
- Chronology – page 433
- Wiltshire Council school term and holiday dated 2015/16 – page 435
- Reports from Wiltshire Police – pages 437 to 441

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

Witnesses

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

- Witness A, Detective Sergeant of Wiltshire Police
- Witness B, Headteacher of Larkhill School

The panel also heard oral evidence from:

- Mrs Francesca Rogers

E. Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

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

Mrs Francesca Rogers qualified as a teacher in 2000 and started working at Larkhill Primary School ("the school") on 1 September 2010. Mrs Rogers is separated from her husband and lives alone with her two children. In early 2015, Mrs Rogers entered into a personal relationship with Individual A. Prior to the commencement of that relationship, Individual A had been arrested in May 2014 and was on bail. Mrs Rogers states that she was informed by Individual A's mother that Individual A had been arrested for chatting on line with a girl who turned out to be 16 years old. Individual A's mother informed Mrs Rogers that Individual A's actions had been an innocent mistake and that he had not known the girl's age. Mrs Rogers states that she was given the same explanation by Individual A himself. In October 2015, the police investigation relating to Individual A's on line chat with a 16 year old girl was dropped, but he was charged with offences of making indecent images of children. Mrs Rogers' position is that she did not know about these charges in October 2015.

Mrs Rogers was contacted by a Detective Constable from the Public Protection Unit of Wiltshire Police regarding the Child Sex Offender Disclosure Scheme (CSODS), otherwise known as 'Sarah's Law'. The aim of the scheme is to provide parents, guardians and carers with information that will enable them to better safeguard their children's safety and welfare. The scheme permits anyone formally to ask the police if someone with access to a child has a record for child sexual offences. The police can then release details confidentially to the person or persons most able to protect the child if the police consider that this is in the child's interests. It is not in dispute that, in this case, the application under Sarah's Law was made by Mrs Rogers' husband. Mrs Rogers requested that another officer should speak to her as the Detective Constable who had contacted her was known to her husband, who used to be a police officer. The matter was then allocated to Witness A, Detective Sergeant who attended Mrs Rogers' home on two occasions in December.

On 11 December 2015, Individual A appeared in the Crown Court when he pleaded guilty to making indecent photographs of children. Having pleaded guilty, the case against Individual A was adjourned to a later date for sentence.

On the second visit, Witness A, made a disclosure to Mrs Rogers of the offences to which Individual A had pleaded guilty. It is alleged that during one of these visits, Mrs Rogers told Witness A, that she was not, and had never been, in a relationship with Individual A.

On 8 January 2016 Individual A's sentencing hearing took place in the Crown Court and he was given a 36 month Community Order with a supervision requirement. A Sexual Harm Prevention Order was made and Individual A was placed on the Sex Offenders Register for five years. On the evening of 8 January 2016, Mrs Rogers disclosed her relationship with Individual A to, deputy headteacher at the school. Witness B, the headteacher had become aware of this on 7 January 2016 when he was contacted by the Designated Officer for Allegations (DOfA).

The school then conducted a disciplinary investigation, during which Mrs Rogers was interviewed.

Findings of fact

The panel's findings of fact are as follows

Whilst employed as a teacher at Larkhill Primary School in Wiltshire in 2015 – 2016 she:

1. Entered into a personal relationship with Individual A who you knew was being investigated for viewing indecent images of children;

Mrs Rogers denied this allegation. Mrs Rogers admits that a personal relationship with Individual A commenced in early 2015. The panel has considered the evidence as to what Mrs Rogers knew about the police investigation into Individual A at that time. Mrs Rogers stated in her evidence that, prior to the personal relationship commencing, she was aware that Individual A had been arrested for chatting with a girl on line who turned out to be 16 years old. When giving evidence Mrs Rogers acknowledged that she had assumed that there had been an exchange of images between Individual A and that these were of a sexual nature. Mrs Rogers also said that she had wrongly assumed that a 16 year old was not regarded as a child for these purposes.

The panel considered Mrs Rogers' responses to questions at the school's disciplinary interview. The panel noted that Mrs Rogers was asked about how the relationship developed. In that context, she was asked if she knew what the charges against Individual A were at that time and she responded 'it was viewing indecent images of children'. The panel also noted that Mrs Rogers stated in her responses that when she and Individual A started seeing each other, she was aware that Individual A was receiving counselling and 'she could see how much good it was doing.' The panel noted the letter from the counsellor to the effect that the counselling commenced in December 2014 and was to explore triggers and patterns for sexually addictive behaviour including the use of internet pornography. The panel considered that the fact that Mrs Rogers was able to comment on Individual A's progress indicated that she was aware of this from the outset of the relationship.

The panel concluded that it is more likely than not that, prior to entering the personal relationship with Individual A, Mrs Rogers knew that Individual A was being investigated for viewing indecent images of children.

Accordingly, the panel finds the facts of allegation 1 proved.

2. Did not inform Larkhill Primary School of your personal relationship with Individual A until on or around 8 January 2016;

Mrs Rogers admitted that she did not inform the school of her personal relationship with Individual A until on or around 8 January 2016. The panel has carefully considered whether Mrs Rogers was under an obligation to inform the school of this relationship.

The panel considered the Guidance for safer working practice for those working with children and young people in educational settings (page 117H of the bundle). Under the heading, 'Standards of behaviour' it states:

There may be times where an individual's actions in their personal life come under scrutiny from the community, the media or public authorities, including with regard to their own children, or children or adults in the community. Staff should be aware that their behaviour, in or out of the workplace, could compromise their position within the work setting in relation to the protection of children, loss of trust and confidence, or bringing the employer into disrepute.

The same guidance also states:

This means that staff should...be aware that behaviour by themselves, those with whom they share a household, or others in their personal lives, may impact on their work with children.

Although Mrs Rogers states that Individual A did not live in the same household as her, he was involved in her personal life. The panel notes that in her responses to Witness B in the disciplinary interview, Mrs Rogers stated 'it was OK as [Individual A] is not seeing [Mrs Rogers'] children and [Mrs Rogers] does not take any children home.' The panel regards this as a demonstration of Mrs Rogers' assessment of potential risk posed by Individual A.

The panel is satisfied that the school should have been informed by Mrs Rogers at the point that the relationship became a personal one in order that the school had the opportunity to assess any potential risks.

The panel finds the facts of allegation 2 proved.

3. Denied to authorities on one or more occasions that you were in a relationship with Individual A when in fact you were, including when you were questioned by Wiltshire Police on or around 11 December 2015;

Mrs Rogers admitted that there was one occasion when she denied to Wiltshire Police that she was in a relationship with Individual A. Mrs Rogers said that this was on 17 December 2015, rather than 11 December 2015. It was accepted on Mrs Rogers' behalf that, whether the meeting with the police was on 11 or 17 December 2015 the date was covered by the words 'on or about 11 December 2015' in allegation 3.

The panel finds the facts of allegation 3 proved.

4. In doing 3 above, your conduct was dishonest in that you were trying to conceal your personal relationship with Individual A.

Mrs Rogers admitted that her conduct in allegation 3 was dishonest. Through her representative, Mrs Rogers admits that her actions were dishonest by the ordinary standards of reasonable and honest people and that Mrs Rogers must have realised that by those standards her conduct was dishonest.

The panel finds allegation 4 proved.

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

Having found 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 relation to allegation 1, although the panel has found that Mrs Rogers entered into a relationship knowing that Individual A was being investigated for viewing indecent images of children, the panel concluded that this allegation does not amount to unacceptable professional conduct or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel concluded that the seriousness of Mrs Rogers' conduct is that, having entered into a personal relationship with Individual A, Mrs Rogers did not disclose this relationship to the school, thereby allowing the school the opportunity to assess the potential risk.

In considering the facts found proved in allegations 2, 3 and 4, the panel has had regard to the document Teacher Misconduct: The Prohibition of Teachers, which the panel refers to as "the Advice".

The panel is satisfied that the conduct of Mrs Rogers in relation to the facts found proven, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considers that by reference to Part Two, Mrs Rogers 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
 - 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 has also considered whether Mrs Rogers' conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 8 and 9 of the Advice. The panel has found that none of these offences are relevant.

Nevertheless, the panel is satisfied that Mrs Rogers' conduct, which included dishonesty, was misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession. Accordingly, unacceptable professional conduct has been established in relation to allegations 2, 3 and 4.

The panel has taken into account how the teaching profession is viewed by others and considered 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 findings of misconduct are serious and the conduct displayed would likely have a negative impact on Mrs Rogers' status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public perception.

The panel therefore finds that Mrs Rogers' actions in allegations 2, 3 and 4 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 and 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. The panel also acknowledged

that there may be a public interest in an effective teacher being able to continue in their chosen profession.

There is a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils in failing to disclose her personal relationship with Individual A over the course of a year and the potential safeguarding concerns.

Similarly, the panel considers that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mrs Rogers 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 Mrs Rogers was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

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

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 Mrs Rogers. 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;
- dishonesty.

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.

The panel has found Mrs Rogers' actions in denying to a police officer that she was in a personal relationship with Individual A were dishonest. The panel has taken into consideration Mrs Rogers' explanation that she wanted to conceal this relationship from her husband from whom she was separated and with whom she had an acrimonious relationship. [Redacted] The panel also noted that Witness A, said that Mrs Rogers' denial had not obstructed his investigation.

The panel noted that Mrs Rogers has a previously good record, having worked as a teacher for 15 years. Witness B, headteacher, said that he would provide her with a good reference. The panel noted the positive character references provided by ex-colleagues.

During the hearing, Mrs Rogers showed increasing levels of insight into, and reflection on, her actions. Subsequent to her dismissal, Mrs Rogers has undertaken a five-day Inform course run by the Lucy Faithful Foundation. This was a course for partners, relatives and friends of anyone who has committed internet offences, including accessing indecent images of children on line. The course helps to provide practical strategies to plan for the future. Mrs Rogers confirmed in her evidence that she ended her relationship with Individual A over a year ago.

Whilst recognising these mitigating factors, the panel has decided that the public interest considerations outweigh the interests of Mrs Rogers. The panel considered whether the public declaration of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute would be sufficient to protect the public interest. The panel has concluded that a prohibition order is necessary.

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 indicates that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances in any given case that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than two years.

The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proven, would militate against a review period being recommended. One of these behaviours is serious dishonesty. Although the panel has made a finding of dishonesty, the panel has not found that this was persistent and the mitigating factors around the dishonesty allowed the panel to view this in Mrs Rogers' context.

The panel felt the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and as such decided that it would be proportionate in all the circumstances for the prohibition order to be recommended with provision for a review after a period of three years.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

In considering this case I have given very careful attention to the advice that is published by the Secretary of State concerning the prohibition of teachers.

In this case the panel has found the allegations proven and found that three of those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. In the first element where the panel has not found the proven facts to amount to unacceptable professional conduct I have put that from my mind when reaching my decision. The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mrs Rogers should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of three years.

In particular the panel has found that Mrs Rogers 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
 - 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 has also considered whether Mrs Rogers' conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 8 and 9 of the Advice. The panel has found that none of these offences are relevant.

Nevertheless, the panel is satisfied that Mrs Rogers' conduct, which included dishonesty, was misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of dishonesty.

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 or not a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Mrs Rogers, and the impact that will have on her, is proportionate.

In this case I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children. The panel has said that there is “a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils in failing to disclose her personal relationship with Individual A over the course of a year and the potential safeguarding concerns. A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present. I have also taken into account the panel’s comments on insight and remorse which the panel sets out as follows, “During the hearing, Mrs Rogers showed increasing levels of insight into, and reflection on, her actions.”

I have given some weight to this statement in my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, “ that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mrs Rogers were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.” 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 failure to impose a prohibition order might be regarded by the public 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, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mrs Rogers herself. I have noted the mitigating factors set out by the panel in this case and the comments on Mrs Rogers’ teaching. I have noted the particular circumstances of the case.

A prohibition order would prevent Mrs Rogers from continuing to teach for the period that it is in force.

I have taken into account the comment of the panel that a prohibition order is necessary in this case. I have also noted in particular the comment of the panel “the seriousness of Mrs Rogers’ conduct is that, having entered into a personal relationship with Individual A, Mrs Rogers did not disclose this relationship to the school, thereby allowing the school the opportunity to assess the potential risk.”

On balance I have concluded that a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest in order to achieve the aims which a prohibition order is intended to achieve.

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case the panel has recommended a 3 year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments "The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proven, would militate against a review period being recommended. One of these behaviours is serious dishonesty. Although the panel has made a finding of dishonesty, the panel has not found that this was persistent and the mitigating factors around the dishonesty allowed the panel to view this in Mrs Rogers' context." Nonetheless Mrs Rogers did deny to a police officer that she was in a relationship with Individual A.

The panel has also said that a 3 year review period would be proportionate.

I have considered whether a 3 year review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, there are three factors that in my view mean that a two year review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the dishonesty found and the fact that this meant the school were unable to carry out a proper assessment of the risks. The guidance is clear that serious dishonesty should lead to no review. In my view there are mitigating factors that mean that a review is appropriate and proportionate.

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

This means that Mrs Francesca Rogers 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 7 July 2020, 3 years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If she does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Mrs Francesca Rogers remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mrs Francesca Rogers has a right of appeal to the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this order.



Decision maker: Alan Meyrick

Date: 30 June 2017

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

