



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Shawn Kendall: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

August 2024

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	10
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	13

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

Teacher:	Mr Shawn Kendall
Teacher ref number:	2068576
Teacher date of birth:	2 December 1996
TRA reference:	22295
Date of determination:	16 August 2024
Former employer:	Norton Hill School, Bath

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ('the panel') of the Teaching Regulation Agency ('the TRA') convened on 16 August 2024 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Shawn Kendall.

The panel members were Mr Francis Murphy (teacher panellist – in the chair), Ms Jayne Bamford (lay panellist) and Ms Chloe Nash (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Abigail Reynolds of Birketts 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 Kendall that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Kendall provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, Ms Kate Baggs of Kingsley Napley LLP, Mr Kendall or his representative or any representative for Mr Kendall.

The meeting took place in private by way of a virtual meeting.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 20 June 2024.

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

1. Between around July 2022 and August 2022, he acted in an inappropriate manner in relation to Child A, in that he:
 - a) Was alone in his car with Child A on one or more occasion(s);
 - b) Exchanged text messages of a personal nature and/or over-familiar nature;
 - c) Suggested and/or arranged to meet up with Child A outside of the Scouts Association

The panel noted that Mr Kendall admitted to the particulars of allegations 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c), and further admitted that his behaviour amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, as set out in the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Kendall on 23 May 2024.

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 4 to 6
- Section 2: Notice of referral and notice of meeting – pages 7 to 16
- Section 3: Statement of agree facts – pages 17 to 20
- Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 21 to 164
- Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 165 to 166

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 Kendall on 23 May 2024, and subsequently signed by the presenting officer on 6 June 2024.

Decision and reasons

The panel carefully considered the case and reached the following decision and reasons:

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

In August 2018, Mr Kendall commenced the role of Scout Leader with The Scouts Association ('the Scouts').

In September 2021, Mr Kendall was employed as an English teacher at Norton Hill School ('the School').

Between July and August 2022, Mr Kendall was allegedly alone in his car with Child A on one or more occasion. Mr Kendall also allegedly suggested and/or arranged to meet up with Child A outside of the Scouts. [REDACTED].

On 30 August 2022, Mr Kendall informed the School that he had been suspended from his role as a Scout Leader after an allegation had been made against him.

On 10 January 2023, the Scouts completed an exclusion request form.

On 6 March 2023, Mr Kendall was suspended from the School pending an investigation. Mr Kendall subsequently resigned from the School on the 24 April 2023.

The matter was referred to the TRA on 14 July 2023.

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:

1. Between around July 2022 and August 2022, you acted in an inappropriate manner in relation to Child A, in that you:

a) Were alone in your car with Child A on one or more occasion(s)

The panel noted that Mr Kendall admitted allegation 1(a) in the statement of agreed facts signed by him on 23 May 2024. Notwithstanding this, the panel considered the evidence presented to it and made a determination.

The panel considered the notes of an investigation interview with Mr Kendall dated 17 May 2023.

The panel noted that, during the investigation interview, Mr Kendall admitted that he gave Child A 'lifts' home from their meeting point for the Scouts, although Mr Kendall stated that this was with the *"full knowledge and understanding of the parents"*. Notwithstanding this, Mr Kendall admitted that this was a breach of the Scout's Yellow Card Code of Conduct, which the panel understood to be the Scout's safeguarding rules and which prohibited one to one conduct with people under the age of 18.

During the interview, Mr Kendall stated that he had known Child A since she was a scout and he was a Young Leader. [REDACTED]. As such, Mr Kendall stated he took on a supportive role, something that had been modelled to him by a previous section leader.

Mr Kendall stated that the conversations during the lifts were *"supportive"*.

The panel also considered an email dated 10 December 2023, sent by Mr Kendall to Kingsley Napley LLP in relation to these proceedings. In this email, Mr Kendall stated that it was *"normal"* for adult leaders to act as support for young leaders, and that this was the reason for one to one time during car journeys. Mr Kendall acknowledged that the training he received as a teacher should have *"overwritten the influence of this culture and reinforced the need to never be alone and refer through safeguarding channels, but it did not."*

The panel considered that the evidence indicated that, on more than one occasion, Mr Kendall had been alone with Child A in his car.

The panel concluded that Mr Kendall's actions in spending time alone in a car with Child A, being aged under 18, were inappropriate in all of the circumstances. [REDACTED]. The panel also noted that Mr Kendall was in a position of authority, being a Scout Leader. Further, the panel was provided with no evidence to confirm Mr Kendall's assertion that it was *"normal"* for adult Scouts leaders to act in this manner and did not consider that, even if Mr Kendall was replicating the behaviour of others, this would detract in any way from the inappropriate nature of Mr Kendall's conduct.

The panel found allegation 1(a) proven.

b) Exchanged text messages of a personal nature and/or over-familiar nature;

The panel noted that Mr Kendall admitted allegation 1(b) in the statement of agreed facts signed by him on 23 May 2024. Notwithstanding this, the panel considered the evidence presented to it and made a determination.

The panel considered the screenshots of the text messages between Mr Kendall and Child A provided within the bundle. The panel noted in particular the following messages sent by Mr Kendall:

- *“...And what dogs would we have together?”*
- *“Lady and the tramp is a bit like we would be”*
- *“...My dream day would probably be a lazy morning of cuddles before getting up and having a wander around Nashville, listening to some live music and getting you kitted out in cowgirl clothes ready for a Chris Stapleton concert that evening... We’d try lots of different food and things before going back to the hotel and facetimeing our dog back in the UK...”*
- *“Probably have to wait until you are at uni, but I’m game if you are!”*
- *“Feel free not to answer, but your version of your hope for the future – do I fit in anywhere?”*
- *“I don’t want to hog you tho!”, to which Child A replied “well I want you too”*
- *“Just so I know when to stop texting – don’t particularly want them snatching your phone and reading anything [laughing crying emoji]”*
- *“Are we ok after the whole laying low thing yesterday?... You are my favourite after all so I just want to make sure you’re happy”*
- *“Ok. Nothing needs to happen – we can carry on as we have been in person, just with maybe a little more physical comfort (cuddles etc.) I mean we haven’t really said any more than that (I think we’re on the same page or else I’m making an ass of myself), and we both agreed that you need to find yourself. I don’t want to get in the way of that at all! You don’t owe me a single thing. I’m happy to fit into your life in whatever way you want [smiley face].”*
- *“But you aren’t looking for anything at the moment, so shall we just see what happens when we see each other? It’s probably much easier to sort out in person.” to which Child A replied “yeah I just feel like i’m not in the right place now for anything.”*
- *“I agree completely. I’m just here to be whatever you need me to be, and just know that I really care about you and that won’t change no matter what. Explore*

who you are, go out and study your butt off and follow your dreams, love uni when you get there, make loads of new friends, try different kinds of relationships... basically do whatever you want to do. I'll be here to be whatever you need in the moment, just like I've always tried to be."

- *"I am looking forward to a cuddle tho [smiley face]."*

The panel further considered the notes of the interview with Mr Kendall on 17 May 2023. During the interview, Mr Kendall stated that Child A had expressed concerns to him and other leaders [REDACTED]. Mr Kendall stated that he and other leaders agreed that they would *"help keep '[Child A]' occupied for the rest of the summer by organising things"*. Mr Kendall stated that, while organising the events, he texted Child A to let her know what they were doing and where they were meeting. Mr Kendall stated that the messages developed to *"checking up on each other"*, and then became conversational.

Mr Kendall admitted that what he wrote in his messages may have suggested to Child A that he would like the relationship to be *"more"* but denied that he wanted a romantic relationship. Mr Kendall stated that he was looking for a friend and companion. However, Mr Kendall admitted that, when his messages with Child A became conversational, *"it became clear to me [REDACTED] that she had suggested having some sort of feeling for me. I knew I should put a stop to it but I ignored that."* Mr Kendall indicated that he was aware he should have stopped communication, but that he was her support network, so it was *"delicate"* and he *"didn't want to shut down her support"*.

In his email dated 26 May 2023 sent in response to receipt of the notes of the interview, Mr Kendall stated that there was no physical or sexual component to the relationship between himself and Child A. Mr Kendall reiterated that the relationship was one of support. However, the panel did not accept this submission; it was apparent that, at least in respect of Mr Kendall's reference to *"cuddles"*, a physical relationship was contemplated.

The panel noted that the messages referred to, amongst other things, dogs Mr Kendall and Child A would own together, Child A being *"kitted out in cowgirl clothes"* on a trip to Nashville, and that Mr Kendall expressed his wish for *"physical comfort"* in the form of *"cuddles"*. The panel considered that such messages were undoubtedly personal and overfamiliar in nature.

As set out in respect of allegation 1(a) above, the panel found that Mr Kendall held a position of authority, and that Child A was a [REDACTED] child. The panel considered that sending overfamiliar and personal messages to a [REDACTED] child under the age of 18 when holding a position of authority was undoubtedly inappropriate in all the circumstances. Further, the panel considered that Mr Kendall was aware that his conduct was inappropriate yet failed to prevent this from continuing further.

The panel found allegation 1(b) proven.

c) Suggested and/or arranged to meet up with Child A outside of the Scouts Association

The panel noted that Mr Kendall admitted allegation 1(c) in the statement of agreed facts signed by him on 23 May 2024. Notwithstanding this, the panel considered the evidence presented to it and made a determination.

The panel noted that from the messages contained within the bundle it was clear that Mr Kendall had suggested and/or arranged to meet up with Child A. The panel noted the following messages sent by Mr Kendall in particular:

- *“Would you be up for watching the second mamma Mia later in the week? We could watch both if you wanted”*
- *“fair! I’ve got news as well – I’m all yours this Saturday if you’re around and want me. We’ve cancelled our stop off at Snowdon so we’re home Friday evening instead.”*

As set out above, Child A was a [REDACTED] child [REDACTED]. Mr Kendall, in his position of authority, had extended invitations to ‘meet up’ at weekends and to watch films, invitations which evidently did not relate to Scouts activities. The panel considered that there was no good reason why such invitations should be extended, particularly to a [REDACTED] child, and therefore found that Mr Kendall had acted inappropriately.

The panel found allegation 1(c) proven.

Findings as to unacceptable professional conduct and/or 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.

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

- 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 Kendall fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

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

The panel found that none of these offences was relevant.

The panel noted that allegations 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c) took place outside the education setting and went on to consider whether the allegations were relevant to Mr Kendall's position as a teacher. The allegations found proven, which involved inappropriate communication with a child under the age of 18, being alone with a child under the age of 18 in a car and arranging to meet a child under the age of 18, clearly touched upon Mr Kendall's profession as a teacher. The panel considered that there was a clear link between Mr Kendall's position of authority as a Scout Leader and his position of authority as a teacher.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mr Kendall 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.

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

Having found the facts of particulars 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c) proved, the panel further found that Mr Kendall'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 safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession, declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct and that prohibition strikes the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest, if they are in conflict.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Kendall, which involved being alone in his car with Child A, exchanging messages of a personal and overfamiliar nature with Child A and suggesting and/or arranging to meet Child A outside of Scouts, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Kendall 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 Kendall 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 Mr Kendall. The panel was mindful of the need to strike the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest.

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 Kendall. 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;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils); 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, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors. Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

There was no evidence that Mr Kendall's actions were not deliberate.

There was no evidence that Mr Kendall was acting under extreme duress.

There was no evidence that Mr Kendall demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both personal and professional conduct and has contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel considered the notes of the interview with Mr Kendall dated 17 May 2023 in which Mr Kendall described that, in respect of the inappropriate communication, this took place when [REDACTED].

The panel also considered the written submissions of Mr Kendall, in which he described his regret, guilt and self-loathing over his behaviour and the impact that it has had.

However, Mr Kendall described a number of factors he believed influenced his behaviour. Mr Kendall stated that the behaviour in giving 'lifts' on a one-to-one basis was not abnormal within his scouting group, and that he had experienced the same thing when he was a young leader. Notwithstanding this, Mr Kendall acknowledged that the training he received as a teacher should have overwritten the influence of this *"culture"*.

Mr Kendall submitted that his instinct was to help and that he did not consider the *"slippery slope"* he had embarked upon, although stated that he *"fully recognise[s] how this contributed to later events, although this was not recognised at the time"*.

Mr Kendall submitted that he has now begun a new career, and that he poses no risk *"now or in the future"*. Mr Kendall described the experience as the *"worst...of [his] life"*.

The panel acknowledged Mr Kendall's regret in respect of his actions. However, the panel found that Mr Kendall showed little insight as regards the effect or potential effect of his actions on Child A, with Mr Kendall's submissions focusing largely on the impact of his conduct on his own life and career. The panel therefore considered that any insight shown by Mr Kendall was limited and fell short of the level expected by the panel.

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 Kendall 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 Kendall. The seriousness of the behaviour was a significant factor in forming that opinion. The panel was of the view that Mr Kendall ought to have appreciated the potential impact of his actions.

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 two years.

The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. The panel found none of these behaviours to be relevant.

The Advice also indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer review period. The panel found none of these behaviours to be relevant.

The panel decided that 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 provisions for a review period after two years. The panel considered that a review period of two years may allow Mr Kendall the opportunity to reflect on the panel's findings and develop greater insight in respect of his actions.

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 Shawn Kendall should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of two years.

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

- 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 Kendall, 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 Kendall fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding of inappropriate and overfamiliar communication with Child A, being alone with Child A in his car and arranging to meet Child A.

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 or 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 Kendall 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/safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, "In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Kendall, which involved being alone in his car with Child A, exchanging messages of a personal and overfamiliar nature with Child A and suggesting and/or arranging to meet Child A outside of Scouts, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public." 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, "The panel also considered the written submissions of Mr Kendall, in which he described his regret, guilt and self-loathing over his behaviour and the impact that it has had." And the panel also said that "Mr Kendall described a number of factors he believed influenced his behaviour. Mr Kendall stated that the behaviour in giving 'lifts' on a one-to-one basis was not abnormal within his scouting group, and that he had experienced the same thing when he was a young leader. Notwithstanding this, Mr Kendall acknowledged that the training he received as a teacher should have overwritten the influence of this *"culture"*.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, "the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Kendall were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession." I am particularly mindful of the finding of inappropriate communications with a child in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

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

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of unacceptable professional conduct or 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 Kendall himself and the panel comment "There was no evidence that Mr Kendall demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both personal and professional conduct and has contributed significantly to the education sector."

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Kendall 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 this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel's comments concerning the lack of insight. The panel has said, ""The panel acknowledged Mr Kendall's regret in respect of his actions. However, the panel found that Mr Kendall showed little insight as regards the effect or potential effect of his actions on Child A, with Mr Kendall's submissions focusing largely on the impact of his conduct on his own life and career. The

panel therefore considered that any insight shown by Mr Kendall was limited and fell short of the level expected by the panel.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding that “The panel was of the view that Mr Kendall ought to have appreciated the potential impact of his actions.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Kendall 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 full 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 a 2 year review period.

I have considered the panel’s comments “The panel considered that a review period of two years may allow Mr Kendall the opportunity to reflect on the panel’s findings and develop greater insight in respect of his actions.”

I agree with the panel and have decided that a two year review period is proportionate and in the public interest for this case.

This means that Mr Shawn Kendall 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 23 August 2026, 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 Kendall remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr Kendall 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.



Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey

Date: 21 August 2024

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