



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr William John Kingsland: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome**

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

**April 2021**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	5
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	11
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	14

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

<b>Teacher:</b>	Mr William John Kingsland
<b>Teacher ref number:</b>	0456358
<b>Teacher date of birth:</b>	22 January 1980
<b>TRA reference:</b>	19234
<b>Date of determination:</b>	20 April 2021
<b>Former employer:</b>	Harrietsham Church of England Primary School, Kent

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened virtually on 20 April 2021, to consider the case of Mr William Kingsland.

The panel members were Mr Maurice McBride (lay panellist – in the chair), Dr Martin Coles (former teacher panellist) and Mrs Melissa West (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Claire Watson 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 Kingsland that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr William Kingsland 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 Ms Ruth Miller, Mr Kingsland, or his representative Mr Simon Pettet.

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

## Allegations

The panel considered the allegation(s) set out in the notice of meeting dated 30 March 2021.

It was alleged that Mr William Kingsland was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst working as a teacher at Harrietsham Church of England Primary School, West St, Harrietsham, Maidstone, Kent, ME15 7SL:

1. On 25 January 2020, sent private messages to a 16 year old acquaintance (Person A) on Instagram. These messages were inappropriate and sexually explicit in nature. These messages included;
  - a) "U got a gf or girls for fun?" or words to that effect;
  - b) "Just interested.. u should get plenty of action" or words to that effect;
  - c) "Not denying it! lol How many girls have licked ur cock? lol" or words to that effect;
  - d) "U look good. Girls must be gagging for ur dick." or words to that effect;
  - e) "Or u into porn more?" or words to that effect; and
  - f) "Ur a hot lad and just interested. No need to be shy" or words to that effect.
2. By his conduct in paragraph 1, failed to comply with the terms of
  - a) the School's ICT Acceptable Use Policy which includes "I will ensure that my online reputation and use of IT and information are compatible with my professional role, whether using school or personal systems" and "I will not create, transmit, display, publish or forward any material online that is likely to harass, cause offence, inconvenience or needless anxiety to any other person, or anything that could bring my professional role, the School or the County Council into disrepute";
  - b) The School's Online Safety Policy which includes a responsibility to "model good practice when using technology and maintain a professional level of conduct in [your] personal use of technology both on and off site" and an expectation to engage in social media in a positive, safe, and appropriate manner; and
  - c) The School's Code of Conduct, which includes 'Each employee has an individual responsibility to act in a manner which upholds the School's interests and protects its reputation'.
3. His conduct as set out in paragraph 1, was sexually motivated.

Mr Kingsland admitted the facts of the allegations and 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 1 to 2

Section 2: Notice of Referral, response and Notice of Meeting – pages 3 to 19

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 20 to 25

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency Documents – pages 26 to 156

Section 5: Teacher Documents – pages 157 to 163

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 Kingsland on 11 January 2021.

The copy of the statement of agreed facts provided to the panel in the bundle in advance of the meeting was not signed by the presenting officer. The panel had sight of a copy of the statement of agreed facts signed by both Mr Kingsland and the presenting officer during the meeting.

## **Decision and reasons**

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

The panel carefully considered the case and reached a decision.

In advance of the meeting, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr William Kingsland 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.

The panel noted that allegation 1 used the wording “these messages included” and allegation 2 stated “includes”. The panel considered whether it would be in the interests of justice to adjourn to allow the allegations to be amended to clarify whether any additional messages or part of the School’s policies were to be considered by the panel. However, the panel noted that the screenshots it was provided with, of private messages between Mr Kingsland and Person A, were limited to those as stated in allegations 1.a) to 1.f). The panel did not consider that it would be fair for it to consider whether there were additional messages or breaches of parts of the School’s policies given the right of the teacher to be informed promptly and in detail of the nature of the allegations. The panel considered that it was in the interest of justice for this matter to reach a conclusion, and therefore determined to continue with the meeting and confine its consideration to the messages specifically alleged and the School’s policies as quoted.

Mr Kingsland had been employed as a teacher at Harrietsham Church of England Primary School (“the School”) from 1 September 2015. On 25 January 2020, Mr Kingsland sent messages on Instagram to Person A, a 16 year old acquaintance he met outside of the education setting at a gym. Screenshots of these messages were then put up on social media. Mr Kingsland immediately contacted the School when made aware of this and admitted to sending the messages. An internal investigation was carried out and Mr Kingsland resigned from his position on 10 March 2020.

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

The panel found the following particulars of the allegation(s) against you proved, for these reasons:

- 1. On 25 January 2020, sent private messages to a 16 year old acquaintance (Person A) on Instagram. These messages were inappropriate and sexually explicit in nature. These messages included;**
  - a. "U got a gf or girls for fun?" or words to that effect;**
  - b. "Just interested.. u should get plenty of action" or words to that effect;**
  - c. "Not denying it! lol How many girls have licked ur cock? lol" or words to that effect;**
  - d. "U look good. Girls must be gagging for ur dick." or words to that effect;**

- e. **"Or u into porn more?" or words to that effect; and**
- f. **"Ur a hot lad and just interested. No need to be shy" or words to that effect.**

The panel had sight of a screenshot of a conversation between Mr Kingsland and Person A, in which messages as set out in the allegations were sent by Mr Kingsland. It is noted that these messages were provided by Mr Kingsland to the School as part of the School's disciplinary hearing. In his signed statement, Mr Kingsland acknowledges that Person A was 16 years old as his Instagram profile stated he was 16 and Person A had told him this within previous private messages.

Although the screenshots of the messages were not dated, Mr Kingsland admitted that the messages were sent on 25 January 2020 and the panel noted that the bundle also included signed statements from former colleagues, provided as part of the School's disciplinary hearing, which state that Mr Kingsland had informed them that he had sent messages to Person A on that day.

The panel considered these private messages to be inherently sexually explicit. The panel noted that Mr Kingsland was aware of Person A's age and, whilst not a pupil of the School, Person A was of secondary school age and considered it inappropriate for a teacher to send such sexually explicit messages to anyone of that age.

The allegations were admitted and were supported by evidence presented to the panel within the bundle, the allegations were therefore, found proved.

## **2. By your conduct in paragraph 1, failed to comply with the terms of**

- a. **the School's ICT Acceptable Use Policy which includes "I will ensure that my online reputation and use of IT and information are compatible with my professional role, whether using school or personal systems" and "I will not create, transmit, display, publish or forward any material online that is likely to harass, cause offence, inconvenience or needless anxiety to any other person, or anything that could bring my professional role, the School or the County Council into disrepute";**

The panel had sight of a copy of the School's ICT Acceptable Use Policy, which states that the staff member accepts that "I will ensure that my online reputation and use of IT and information are compatible with my professional role, whether using school or personal systems" and "I will not create, transmit, display, publish or forward any material online that is likely to harass, cause offence, inconvenience or needless anxiety to any other person, or anything that could bring my professional role, the School or the County Council into disrepute".

Although the copy of the School's ICT Acceptable Use Policy provided is unsigned by Mr Kingsland the panel considered it likely that Mr Kingsland was aware of the ICT Acceptable Use Policy. This was referenced throughout the disciplinary hearing, Mr Kingsland has admitted the facts of the allegation and Mr Kingsland had acknowledged the serious nature of his actions soon after sending the private messages to Person A, bringing this to the School's attention.

The panel noted that the scope of the School's ICT Acceptable Use Policy covered both personal and school systems. Although these were intended to be private messages, the messages were shared widely on social media, including on local community pages. Mr Kingsland and the School were identified on social media in association with the sexually explicit messages, damaging Mr Kingsland's, and the School's reputation.

Although the panel did not have sight of any evidence as to how the messages had impacted Person A, the panel noted that the screenshots of the conversation show that Person A had limited engagement with the conversation and the screenshots had been shared with others, following which Mr Kingsland was contacted via social media and warned to stop messaging Person A.

The allegation was admitted and was supported by evidence presented to the panel within the bundle, the allegation was therefore, found proved.

**b. The School's Online Safety Policy which includes a responsibility to "model good practice when using technology and maintain a professional level of conduct in [your] personal use of technology both on and off site" and an expectation to engage in social media in a positive, safe and appropriate manner; and**

The panel had sight of a copy of the School's Online Safety Policy, which includes a responsibility for all members of staff to "model good practice when using technology and maintain a professional level of conduct in their personal use of technology, both on and off site" and an expectation on all members of the School community to "engage in social media in a positive, safe and responsible manner".

Although the copy of the School's Online Safety Policy provided is unsigned by Mr Kingsland the panel considered it likely that Mr Kingsland was aware of the Online Safety Policy. Mr Kingsland has admitted the facts of the allegation and Mr Kingsland had acknowledged the serious nature of his actions soon after sending the private messages to Person A, bringing this to the School's attention.

The panel considered that the inappropriate and sexually explicit private messages, sent in a personal capacity to a 16 year old did not model good practice and contravened the School's Online Safety Policy.

The allegation was admitted and was supported by evidence presented to the panel within the bundle, the allegation was therefore, found proved.



**c. The School's Code of Conduct, which includes 'Each employee has an individual responsibility to act in a manner which upholds the School's interests and protects its reputation'.**

The panel had sight of a copy of the School's Code of Conduct for teaching and support staff, which states that "Each employee has an individual responsibility to act in a manner which upholds the School's interests and protects its reputation".

Although the copy of the Code of Conduct provided is unsigned by Mr Kingsland the panel considered it likely that Mr Kingsland was aware of the Code of Conduct. This was referenced in the disciplinary hearing, Mr Kingsland has admitted the facts of the allegation and Mr Kingsland had acknowledged the serious nature of his actions soon after sending the private messages to Person A, bringing this to the School's attention. The panel had sight of a signed interview note taken during the School's disciplinary hearing, in which a former colleague recalled Mr Kingsland's telephone call on 25 January 2020 and the School's Code of Conduct being mentioned.

The panel considered that Mr Kingsland had acted contrary to the School's interests and damaged its reputation. The panel noted that the private messages, which were inappropriate and sexually explicit in nature, had been shared on social media and the School had been identified as Mr Kingsland's place of work. The panel also noted concern amongst the local community as to the content of the messages. For example, the panel had sight of a signed file note from a parent of a pupil at the School, [REDACTED], which described the messages as "very graphic and worrying". The panel also had sight of an email from a moderator of a Facebook page which acknowledged that the messages could harm the School and described the "persistence" of the author of the posts sharing the messages online.

Although Mr Kingsland had not intended for the messages to become public, the panel considered that the School's reputation had been negatively impacted.

The allegation was admitted and was supported by evidence presented to the panel within the bundle, the allegation was therefore, found proved.

**3. Your conduct as set out in paragraph 1, was sexually motivated.**

Mr Kingsland admitted during the School's disciplinary hearing that the comments made were sexual. In his statement, he references that he was "more sexually explicit" in his questions, having previously sent messages to Person A in December, and admits "fully that I acted completely inappropriately with sexual comments".

The panel considered the very nature of the language used to be sexual and the content of the messages to be sexually motivated. In the disciplinary hearing Mr Kingsland explained his motivation, which a reasonable person would consider to be a sexual one.

The allegation was admitted and was supported by evidence presented to the panel within the bundle, the allegation was therefore, found proved.

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

Having found a number 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 Kingsland in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Kingsland 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.
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Kingsland fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel had found that Mr Kingsland had sent inappropriate and sexually explicit private messages to a 16 year old and that the messages were sexually motivated.

The panel also considered whether Mr Kingsland’s conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 10 and 11 of the Advice.

The panel found that none of these offences was relevant.

The panel noted that the allegations took place outside the education setting. Mr Kingsland had been identified from his social media account as being an educator and, when screenshots of the conversation with Person A were shared on social media, the School was identified. The panel had found that the messages were sexually explicit in nature. The panel also noted that rumours circulated amongst pupils at the School as to the reason for Mr Kingsland’s absence, which the School then addressed. Therefore, the panel considered that Mr Kingsland’s actions had affected the way in which he fulfilled his teaching role and potentially led to pupils being exposed to or influenced by the behaviour in a harmful way.

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

The panel took into account the way 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 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 they behave.

The findings of misconduct were serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public perception. Mr Kingsland had been identified from his social media account as working in education and, when screenshots of the conversation with Person A were shared on social media, the School was identified. The panel had found the messages to be inappropriate and sexually explicit and noted the negative perception of the messages in the local community.

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

Having found the facts of the allegations proved, the panel further found that Mr Kingsland's conduct amounted to both unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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

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

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be made, the panel had to consider whether it would be an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it would be in the public interest to do so. Prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

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

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Kingsland, which involved sending messages that were inappropriate and sexually explicit in nature to Person A and failing to comply with the School's policies and Code of Conduct, there was a strong public

interest consideration in the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

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

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

The panel also decided that there was a strong public interest consideration in retaining the teacher in the profession, since no doubt had been cast upon his abilities as an educator.

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 Mr Kingsland.

In carrying out the balancing exercise, the panel had regard to the public interest considerations both in favour of, and against, prohibition as well as the interests of Mr Kingsland. The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours of a teacher have been proved. In the list of such behaviours, those that are relevant in this case are:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- sexual misconduct, for example, involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature;

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors. Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

Mr Kingsland did have a previously good history and the panel considered that the incident was out of character. The panel noted that Mr Kingsland had immediately reported his actions to the School when he was aware that the private conversation had been shared on social media. It is also noted in the bundle that Mr Kingsland had immediately recognised that his actions were "stupid" and wanted to apologise to his colleagues.

Although no references were provided to the panel, attesting to Mr Kingsland's abilities as a teacher, the panel noted that in his statement, Mr Kingsland references his "good record of achievement" and that he has "developed a positive relationship with staff, children and parents". This was further supported by a signed file note, provided as part

of the School's disciplinary hearing, from a parent of a pupil who reported Mr Kingsland's actions to the School, [REDACTED], that Mr Kingsland had done an "excellent job" teaching his daughter and that she had been "thriving under his teaching and guidance". Mr Kingsland had taught at the School since 2015 and it is noted in the School's disciplinary report that he was an experienced teacher and the references provided as part of his appointment were "positive and strong". It was also noted by the School that Mr Kingsland had been considered "a good teacher".

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 was sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Kingsland 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 Kingsland. The finding of sexual motivation was a significant factor in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate to recommend that a review period of the order should be considered. 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 behaviours that, if proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. One of these behaviours is serious sexual misconduct, such as 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 his professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons. Although the panel had found that Mr Kingsland had acted for sexually motivated reasons when sending the inappropriate messages to Person A, the panel did not consider that this amounted to serious sexual misconduct. The panel noted that Person A was not a pupil at the School or formerly taught by Mr Kingsland and Mr Kingsland had not used his professional position to influence or exploit Person A.

The panel considered that Mr Kingsland had shown a deep level of insight into his actions. Mr Kingsland had reported and admitted his actions to the School, within hours of sending the private messages. He had also written a meaningful apology to

colleagues, as well as reiterated how sorry he was throughout the disciplinary hearing. The panel considered this remorse to be genuine. The panel also noted that Mr Kingsland had fully cooperated with the School throughout the disciplinary hearing and the TRA's investigation. Mr Kingsland had reflected on his actions and the panel considered the incident to be a one-off incident. Mr Kingsland had explained during the School's disciplinary hearing that he had been [REDACTED]. The panel noted from the bundle that Mr Kingsland was [REDACTED] at the time of the incident.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period of 2 years would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate in all the circumstances for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a review period after 2 years.

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

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

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

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

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr William Kingsland should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of 2 years.

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

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding which involved sending messages that were inappropriate and sexually explicit in nature to Person A and failing to comply with the School's policies and Code of Conduct.

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 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 Mr Kingsland, and the impact that will have on him, is proportionate and in the public interest.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, "The panel considered that Mr Kingsland had shown a deep level of insight into his actions. Mr Kingsland had reported and admitted his actions to the School, within hours of sending the private messages. He had also written a meaningful apology to colleagues, as well as reiterated how sorry he was throughout the disciplinary hearing. The panel considered this remorse to be genuine".

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, "The findings of misconduct were serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public perception. Mr Kingsland had been identified from his social media account as working in education and, when screenshots of the conversation with Person A were shared on social media, the School was identified. The panel had found the messages to be inappropriate and sexually explicit and noted the negative perception of the messages in the local community".

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, 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 Kingsland himself and the panel comment "Mr Kingsland had taught at the School since 2015 and it is noted in the School's disciplinary report that he was an experienced teacher and the references provided as part of his appointment were "positive and strong". It was also noted by the School that Mr Kingsland had been considered "a good teacher".

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Kingsland 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.

In considering this case, although the conduct took place outside the education setting, I have placed considerable weight on the following comments “The panel considered that the inappropriate and sexually explicit private messages, sent in a personal capacity to a 16 year old did not model good practice and contravened the School’s Online Safety Policy” and that “the panel considered that Mr Kingsland’s actions had affected the way in which he fulfilled his teaching role and potentially led to pupils being exposed to or influenced by the behaviour in a harmful way”.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Kingsland 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, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended a 2 year review period.

I have considered the panel’s comments “Mr Kingsland had reflected on his actions and the panel considered the incident to be a one-off incident. Mr Kingsland had explained during the School’s disciplinary hearing that he had been [REDACTED]. The panel noted from the bundle that Mr Kingsland was [REDACTED] at the time of the incident”. The panel has also said that “it would be proportionate in all the circumstances for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a review period after 2 years”.

I consider that a 2 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.

**This means that Mr William Kingsland is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children’s home in England.** He may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 27 April 2023, 2 years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If he does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Mr Kingsland remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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



Mr Kingsland 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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'SABuxcey', with a horizontal line underneath.

**Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey**

**Date: 22 April 2021**

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