



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Terry Parsloe: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome**

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

**July 2023**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	4
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	8
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	11

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

<b>Teacher:</b>	Mr Terry Parsloe
<b>Teacher ref number:</b>	9946261
<b>Teacher date of birth:</b>	18 December 1975
<b>TRA reference:</b>	20099
<b>Date of determination:</b>	10 July 2023
<b>Former employer:</b>	Poltair School, Cornwall

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 10 July 2023 by virtual means, to consider the case of Mr Parsloe.

The panel members were Ms Penny Griffith (lay panellist – in the chair), Mr Alan Wells (former teacher panellist) and Ms Gerida Montague (teacher panellist).

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

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

The meeting took place in private.

## **Allegations**

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 7 July 2023.

It was alleged that Mr Parsloe was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst employed by Teaching Personnel as a teacher at the Poltair School he:

1. Between 27 November 2020 and 18 January 2021, engaged in inappropriate communication online with individuals who informed him that they were under the age of 16.
2. His conduct at paragraph 1 above was sexually motivated.

Mr Parsloe admitted both the alleged facts and that he was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

## **Preliminary applications**

There were no preliminary applications.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section 1: Chronology and list of key people – pages 3 to 4

Section 2: Notice of referral, correspondence and notice of meeting – pages 5 to 15

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 16 to 18

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 19 to 66

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

### **Statement of agreed facts**

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Parsloe on 18 May 2023.

## Decision and reasons

The panel carefully considered the case and reached a decision.

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

On 9 November 2020, Mr Parsloe worked at Poltair School as a fully qualified teacher via a supply agency, Teaching Personnel. Mr Parsloe ceased working for Teaching Personnel on 18 January 2021. On 19 January 2021, the police executed a search warrant at Mr Parsloe's home and he attended a voluntary police interview. A second voluntary police interview took place on 4 October 2021. On 15 July 2022, the police confirmed no further action would be taken against Mr Parsloe.

## Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

### **Whilst employed by Teaching Personnel as a teacher at the Poltair School you:**

- 1. Between 27 November 2020 and 18 January 2021, engaged in inappropriate communication online with individuals who informed you that they were under the age of 16.**

Mr Parsloe admitted this allegation in the statement of agreed facts. Mr Parsloe admitted that his electronic devices including his mobile phone and tablet were examined by the police forensics unit. He also admitted that the police search of his electronic devices identified conversations of a sexual nature that he had undertaken with individuals who identified themselves as being under 16 years of age.

Mr Parsloe admitted that he was told by individuals that he was conversing with online that they were under the age of 16 and that he had continued to message them. He also admitted that the content of his online messages was sexual in nature. Extracts of the online conversations that forensic examination found on Mr Parsloe's devices were provided to the panel. The panel was content to admit this evidence since it was not the sole or decisive evidence in support of the allegations. The panel considered that in those conversations, Mr Parsloe understood the person to have stated they were under 16 years, yet he continued to have a sexual conversation with them. The panel therefore found allegation 1 proven.

## **2. Your conduct at paragraph 1 above was sexually motivated.**

Mr Parsloe admitted this allegation in the statement of agreed facts.

The panel examined the nature of Mr Parsloe's communications and the very nature of them was sexual.

The panel has seen the report to the Crown Prosecutor which summarises comments made by Mr Parsloe when the police attended his house.

Given Mr Parsloe's admission and the explicit content of the messages, the panel considered that it was more likely than not that Mr Parsloe's conduct was in pursuit of sexual gratification. The panel therefore found this allegation proven.

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

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

In doing so, the panel had regard to the document Teacher Misconduct: The Prohibition of Teachers, which is referred to as "the Advice".

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Parsloe, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Parsloe was in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
  - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
  - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Parsloe fell significantly short of the standard of behaviour expected of a teacher.

The panel also considered that Mr Parsloe's conduct breached the obligation to safeguard and promote the welfare of children as required by Keeping Children Safe in Education (KCSIE).

The panel also considered whether Mr Parsloe's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice.

The panel found that the offences of sexual activity; voyeurism; and sexual communication with a child were relevant. With regard to voyeurism, the panel noted that one of Mr Parsloe's messages referred to looking down a female's top.

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

The panel noted that the allegations took place outside of the education setting. The conduct found proven demonstrated a sexual interest in children, and therefore affects the trust that can be placed in Mr Parsloe in a teaching role.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mr Parsloe was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel went on to consider whether Mr Parsloe's conduct may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel took into account the way the teaching profession is viewed by others, the responsibilities and duties of teachers in relation to the safeguarding and welfare of pupils and considered the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel also took account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils' lives and the fact that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way that they behave.

The panel also considered whether Mr Parsloe's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice.

As referred to above, the panel found that the offences of sexual activity; voyeurism and sexual communication with a child were relevant.

The Advice indicates that where behaviours associated with such an offence exist, a panel is likely to conclude that an individual's conduct would amount to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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

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

The panel therefore found that Mr Parsloe's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

## **Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State**

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct; and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order is appropriate, the panel had to consider the public interest, the seriousness of the behaviour and any mitigation offered by Mr Parsloe and whether a prohibition order is necessary and proportionate. Prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

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

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of engaging in sexually motivated communications online with individuals who informed him that they were under the age of 16.

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

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

The panel had no evidence of Mr Parsloe's ability as an educator. The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Parsloe in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the behaviour, noting that the Advice states that the expectation of both the public and pupils, is that members of the teaching profession maintain an exemplary level of integrity and ethical standards at all times. The panel considered that Mr Parsloe's online behaviour seriously contravened his safeguarding obligations.

The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a panel will likely consider a teacher's behaviour to be incompatible with being a teacher if there is



evidence of one or more of the factors that begin on page 15. In the list of such factors, those that were relevant in this case were:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are "relevant matters" for the purposes of the Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosure;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving vulnerable pupils);
- sexual misconduct, for example, involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature ...; and
- failure in their duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk or failing to promote the safety and welfare of the children (as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE).

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, taking account of the public interest and the seriousness of the behaviour and the likely harm to the public interest were the teacher be allowed to continue to teach, the panel went on to consider the mitigation offered by the teacher; and whether there were mitigating circumstances.

Mr Parsloe's actions were deliberate

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Parsloe was acting under extreme duress, eg a physical threat or significant intimidation and, in fact, the panel found Mr Parsloe's actions to be calculated and motivated.

The panel has seen no evidence of Mr Parsloe's history as a teacher. There is also no evidence of Mr Parsloe having demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both his personal and professional conduct and having contributed significantly to the education sector.

Mr Parsloe has not provided any statements attesting to his character or ability as a teacher.

Mr Parsloe has referred to the situation having caused him stress and anxiety but has expressed no remorse, nor any insight as to the consequences for a child who received messages of the nature Mr Parsloe sent. Mr Parsloe has admitted the allegations but his email to the TRA referred to being "worried because [he] did not want this matter to go to a hearing of any kind", and sought a meeting "so that media are not involved at all". When the police exercised the search warrant at Mr Parsloe's property, Mr Parsloe

referred to having “something that is going on” and “what is it in me” and “it’s my own fault”. Despite this, the panel has seen no evidence of any remedial steps that Mr Parsloe ought to have taken to address his conduct.

The panel first considered whether it would be proportionate to conclude this case with no recommendation of prohibition, considering whether the publication of the findings made by the panel would be sufficient.

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

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Parsloe given Mr Parsloe’s fundamental breach of his safeguarding obligations. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate for it to decide to recommend a review period of the order. The panel was mindful that the Advice states that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances, in any given case, that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 2 years.

The Advice indicates that there are cases involving certain conduct where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period. These cases include serious sexual misconduct, eg where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons...; and any sexual misconduct involving a child. The panel found that Mr Pasloe was guilty of sending sexually motivated communications to a person who informed him they were under the age of 16.

In the absence of any evidence of remorse, insight or any steps taken to avoid such conduct in the future, the panel could not be assured that there was no risk of repetition.

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

## Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

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

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

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Parsloe is in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
  - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
  - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Parsloe involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE).

The panel finds that the conduct of Mr Parsloe fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding that Mr Parsloe had sent sexually motivated communications to a person who informed him they were under the age of 16.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher.

I have also asked myself, whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Mr Parsloe, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children and safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, "The conduct found proven demonstrated a sexual interest in children, and therefore affects the trust that can be placed in Mr Parsloe in a teaching role." A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, "Mr Parsloe has referred to the situation having caused him stress and anxiety but has expressed no remorse, nor any insight as to the consequences for a child who received messages of the nature Mr Parsloe sent. Mr Parsloe has admitted the allegations but his email to the TRA referred to being "worried because [he] did not want this matter to go to a hearing of any kind", and sought a meeting "so that media are not involved at all". When the police exercised the search warrant at Mr Parsloe's property, Mr Parsloe referred to having "something that is going on" and "what is it in me" and "it's my own fault". Despite this, the panel has seen no evidence of any remedial steps that Mr Parsloe ought to have taken to address his conduct." In my judgement, the lack of insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe that "public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Parsloe was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession." I am particularly mindful of the finding that his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

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

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

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mr Parsloe himself. A prohibition order would prevent Mr Parsloe from teaching. A prohibition order would also clearly deprive the public of his contribution to the profession for the period that it is in force. However the panel notes that “There is also no evidence of Mr Parsloe having demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both his personal and professional conduct and having contributed significantly to the education sector.” The panel also noted that Mr Parsloe did provide any statements attesting to his character or ability as a teacher.

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments concerning the lack of insight or remorse. The panel has said, “In the absence of any evidence of remorse, insight or any steps taken to avoid such conduct in the future, the panel could not be assured that there was no risk of repetition.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that Mr Parsloe’s conduct displayed behaviours associated with the offences of sexual activity, voyeurism and sexual communication with a child.

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

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

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

I have considered the panel’s comments that “The Advice indicates that there are cases involving certain conduct where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period. These cases include serious sexual misconduct, eg where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons...; and any sexual misconduct involving a child. The panel found that Mr Parsloe was guilty of sending sexually motivated communications to a person who informed him they were under the age of 16.”

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

I have considered whether not allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient

to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are engaging in sexually motivated communications online with someone under the age of 16, and the lack of either insight or remorse.

I consider therefore that allowing for no review period is necessary to maintain public confidence and is proportionate and in the public interest.

**This means that Mr Terry Parsloe 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 him, I have decided that Mr Parsloe shall not be entitled to apply for restoration of his eligibility to teach.

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

Mr Terry Parsloe has a right of appeal to the King's Bench Division of the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this order.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D Oatley', with a large, sweeping flourish at the end.

**Decision maker: David Oatley**

**Date: 10 July 2023**

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