



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Thomas Marriott: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

January 2025

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	4
Decision and reasons	4
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	7
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

Teacher:	Thomas Marriott
Teacher ref number:	1719208
Teacher date of birth:	12 October 1985
TRA reference:	02678
Date of determination:	31 January 2025
Former employer:	Princethorpe College, Warwickshire

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened virtually on 31 January 2025, to consider the case of Mr Thomas Marriott.

The panel members were Dr Louise Wallace (lay panellist – in the chair), Dr Andrew Harries (lay panellist) and Mrs Georgina Bean (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Tania Dosoruth of Blake Morgan 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 Marriott that the allegation be considered without a hearing. Mr Marriott provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted conviction of relevant offences. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, Mr Marriott or any representative instructed on his behalf.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 28 October 2024.

It was alleged that Mr Marriott was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:

1. On 21 April 2023, he was convicted at York Crown Court of the following offence:
 - a. Three counts of sexual activity with a child by a person of trust, contrary to Section 16(1) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003

Mr Marriott admitted the facts of the allegation and that the conviction was a relevant offence.

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 and response – pages 5 to 22

Section 3: Signed statement of agreed facts and presenting officers' representation – pages 23 to 25

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 26 to 119

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 110 to 137

Section 6: Notice of meeting pages 138 to 139

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Marriott on 3 October 2024.

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 Marriott for the allegation 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.

Between September 2007 and August 2011, Mr Marriott had been employed at St Peter's School ("the School"). During his employment at the School, Mr Marriott was employed as a teacher of history and was also a rowing coach.

Pupil A was a pupil at the School between [REDACTED] who boarded at the School. In the academic year [REDACTED], Mr Marriott had coached Pupil A in rowing. The following academic year Mr Marriott taught Pupil A [REDACTED] whilst she was in the first year of sixth form. During this time Mr Marriott became closer to Pupil A and an inappropriate relationship developed. The relationship became sexual in [REDACTED], whilst Pupil A remained a pupil at the School.

The relationship continued between Mr Marriott and Pupil A after she left the School into [REDACTED]. Mr Marriott and Pupil A remained in contact for a number of years after this though by this time the sexual relationship between them was at an end.

On 9 November 2021, Pupil A reported the matter to the police who opened an investigation and referred the matter to the Local Authority Designated Safeguarding Officer ('LADO'). By this time Mr Marriott was employed as a Deputy Head Teacher at Princethorpe College, having worked there since 1 September 2021. Mr Marriott ceased working at Princethorpe College on 3 December 2021.

The matter was referred to the TRA on 24 March 2022.

Mr Marriott pleaded guilty at York Crown Court to three counts of sexual activity with a child on 21 April 2023 and was sentenced on 5 July 2023.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

- 1. On 21 April 2023, you were convicted at York Crown Court of the following offence:**
 - a. Three counts of sexual activity with a child by a person of trust, Contrary to Section 16(1) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003**

The allegation was admitted in full by Mr Marriott.

The panel was presented with a certificate of conviction from York Crown Court, police disclosure and a transcript of Mr Marriott's sentencing hearing from July 2023. The panel also had sight of Mr Marriott's statement dated 25 August 2024.

These documents confirmed that Mr Marriott was convicted on 21 April 2023 of three counts of sexual activity with a child contrary to s16(1) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003.

The documents also confirmed that Mr Marriott was sentenced to 21 months imprisonment suspended for a period of 2 years with a requirement for rehabilitation activity and unpaid work. Mr Marriott's name was also added to the sexual offenders register for a period of 10 years.

The panel carefully considered all of the evidence within the hearing bundle relating to the circumstances of the offences.

The panel accepted the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of the commission of the offences by Mr Marriott. The panel also considered that the transcript of the sentencing hearing and the police disclosure which confirmed the nature of the offences related to Mr Marriott's sexual activity with Pupil A on three occasions at the School and whilst she was a pupil.

The panel accordingly found the allegation proved.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

Having found the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether Mr Marriott's conviction was for a relevant criminal offence, which he also admitted.

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 Marriott in relation to the facts it found proved involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that by reference to Part 2, Mr Marriott 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
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory

frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offences occurred in the School environment and involved a pupil whom Mr Marriott was teaching at the time. The panel noted the impact which the offences had had on Pupil A and was of the view that Mr Marriott's conduct could have had an impact on the safety of pupils and/or members of the public.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Marriott's behaviour in committing the offence would affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel was of the view that members of the public would be shocked to learn that Mr Marriott had engaged in sexual activity with a pupil and that this had occurred on multiple occasions on the School's premises.

The panel noted that Mr Marriott's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, (albeit that it was suspended), which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed.

The panel took into account details of evidence of mitigating circumstances, such as the written evidence that attested to Mr Marriott's good record as a teacher in the years since the offences that had occurred. The panel also read Mr Marriott's detailed response and reflection in which he had accepted that his conduct was wrong and expressed remorse.

The panel found that the evidence of Mr Marriott's teaching proficiency to be of note, but not exceptional. The panel also found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Marriott's ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that whilst Mr Marriott had accepted full responsibility for what had occurred, a finding that this conviction was for a relevant offence was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of a conviction of a relevant offence, 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 protection of pupils
- the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct

The panel decided that there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils given the factual circumstances of the conviction, namely that Mr Marriott had engaged in a relationship which became sexual in nature with Pupil A whilst she was at the School.

The panel noted that Mr Marriott's offences related to only one pupil who was in the sixth form at the point at which the relationship became sexualised, and that the offences had occurred approximately [REDACTED] years ago. The panel was nonetheless of the view that there was still a significant age gap between Mr Marriott and Pupil A at the time. The panel considered that there was an imbalance of power given the teacher pupil relationship which existed at the time that the relationship started.

Further to this the panel was also of the view that there was evidence of Mr Marriott and Pupil A forming an attachment much earlier on before the sexual offences took place at which stage Pupil A would have been younger. For all of these reasons the panel considered that there was a strong public interest consideration related to the protection of pupils going forward.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Marriott were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession. In particular the panel noted that the public confidence in the profession was likely to be seriously undermined in circumstances where Mr Marriott had begun a sexual relationship with a Pupil whom he taught which also involved multiple instances of sexual activity taking place on the School's premises.

The panel also 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 Marriott for all of the reasons stated above and that his conduct 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 Marriott.

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

Marriott. The panel took further account of the Advice, which states 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:

- an abuse of any trust, knowledge, or influence gained through their professional position in order to advance a romantic or sexual relationship with a pupil or former pupil;
- sexual misconduct, e.g. involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature and/or that use or exploit the trust, knowledge or influence derived from the individual's professional position;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- 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 disclosures;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- 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);
- violation of the rights of pupils;

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 whether there were any mitigating factors which could indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

The panel noted that the circumstances which had led to the conviction had occurred many years ago and that since that time there had been no indication that Mr Marriott had repeated his conduct. In addition to this the panel was also provided with a number of testimonials from pupils who had been taught by Mr Marriott in the intervening period which attested to his positive impact on them as a teacher. The panel were also provided with testimonials from a number of teaching professionals who had since worked with Mr Marriott all of whom attested to his good work as a teacher since the time that these incidents had occurred.

The panel also carefully considered the statements provided by Mr Marriott in which he explained and reflected on what had occurred with Pupil A. The panel noted that Mr

Marriott accepted full responsibility for his conduct, that his conduct was wrong, and that he had identified the factors which in his view had led to the offences occurring.

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

The panel's view was that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order despite the mitigating factors. 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 Marriott of prohibition. The panel was of this view given the nature of the offences that Mr Marriott had been convicted of which related to an abuse of trust of his position as a teacher.

The circumstances of the formation of the relationship with Pupil A was a significant factor in forming that opinion. The panel noted that the relationship began when Pupil A was [REDACTED]. At that time there was evidence of sexual motivation by Mr Marriott. The relationship become fully sexual in nature whilst Pupil A was in the sixth form. The panel also noted that Mr Marriott had planned for the relationship to become a full sexual relationship when Pupil A turned 18 and that prior to this he required Pupil A to keep the relationship secret which suggested an element of planning and grooming.

In addition to this the panel were also concerned by Mr Marriott's reckless and unprofessional actions in conducting sexual activity on School premises on multiple occasions. The panel gave weight to the detrimental impact on Pupil A of the relationship not just at the time, but much later in her life.

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. The behaviours which listed in the Advice which are of relevance to this case include:

- serious sexual misconduct e.g. where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons, particularly where the individual has used their professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons;

- any sexual misconduct involving a child;

The panel carefully considered the mitigating factors that it had identified in this case. These were namely that these offences had occurred approximately [REDACTED] years ago and that there had been no repetition of Mr Marriott's conduct since; the evidence of Mr Marriott's good work as a teacher since that time; and the fact that Mr Marriott had accepted his wrongdoing, was remorseful, and he had reflected on what had caused it at the time. The panel put less weight on some of the external circumstances which Mr Marriott had outlined for which there was no independent evidence which would enable the panel to test these claims. These included that he had not understood that his conduct was illegal at the time as a result of having been recruited into the School straight from university without a PGCE or equivalent teaching qualification.

However, despite the mitigating factors that it identified, the Panel were not of the view that Mr Marriott had full insight into what had occurred and why.

In particular the panel were of the view that Mr Marriott had not for example reflected on the fact that he had sexual activity with Pupil A on the premises. The Panel also considered that Mr Marriott had delayed the relationship from becoming fully sexual until Pupil A turned 18 which suggested that he had known what he was doing was wrong, even if he had not known the full extent of his wrongdoing. In addition to this the panel accepted that Mr Marriott was new to teaching at the time, but considered that it was his responsibility to ensure that he conducted himself responsibly and acted in the interests of pupils. The panel formed that view that there was some deflection of this responsibility in Mr Marriott's statement. The panel further noted that the offending would not have come to light had Pupil A not taken the decision to report the matters to the police.

Finally, the panel were conscious of the impact of the offences on Pupil A as described during the course of Mr Marriott's sentencing hearing in York Crown Court, the panel noted that significant long-term harm had been caused to Pupil A by the relationship. The panel considered the fact that Pupil A had suffered such harm meant that public confidence in the profession was likely to be severely undermined by Mr Marriott's conduct despite the mitigating factors.

The panel therefore 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 provisions for a review period.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

I have given very careful consideration to this case and to the 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 the allegation proven and found that those proven facts amount to a relevant conviction.

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

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - Treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have 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 Marriott 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 Marriott fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of a conviction for the relevant offence of sexual activity with a child by a person of trust.

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 a relevant conviction, 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 Marriott, 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 panel decided that there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils given the factual circumstances of the conviction, namely that Mr Marriott had engaged in a relationship which became sexual in nature with Pupil A whilst she was at the School.”

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 has set out as follows:

“The panel carefully considered the mitigating factors that it had identified in this case. These were namely that these offences had occurred approximately [REDACTED] years ago and that there had been no repetition of Mr Marriott’s conduct since; the evidence of Mr Marriott’s good work as a teacher since that time; and the fact that Mr Marriott had accepted his wrongdoing, was remorseful, and he had reflected on what had caused it at the time. The panel put less weight on some of the external circumstances which Mr Marriott had outlined for which there was no independent evidence which would enable the panel to test these claims. These included that he had not understood that his conduct was illegal at the time as a result of having been recruited into the School straight from university without a PGCE or equivalent teaching qualification.”

“However, despite the mitigating factors that it identified, the Panel were not of the view that Mr Marriott had full insight into what had occurred and why.”

“In particular the panel were of the view that Mr Marriott had not for example reflected on the fact that he had sexual activity with Pupil A on the premises. The Panel also considered that Mr Marriott had delayed the relationship from becoming fully sexual until Pupil A turned 18 which suggested that he had known what he was doing was wrong, even if he had not known the full extent of his wrongdoing. In addition to this the panel accepted that Mr Marriott was new to teaching at the time, but considered that it was his responsibility to ensure that he conducted himself responsibly and acted in the interests of pupils. The panel formed that view that there was some deflection of this responsibility in Mr Marriott’s statement. The panel further noted that the offending would not have come to light had Pupil A not taken the decision to report the matters to the police.”

In my judgement, the lack of full 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 has observed:

“Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Marriott were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession. In particular the panel noted that the public confidence in the profession was likely to be seriously undermined in circumstances where Mr Marriott had begun a sexual relationship with a Pupil whom he taught which also involved multiple instances of sexual activity taking place on the School’s premises.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of sexual activity with a child while she was a pupil at the school 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 a relevant conviction, 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 Marriott himself. The panel has commented that it “found that the evidence of Mr Marriott’s teaching proficiency to be of note, but not exceptional.” The panel also noted that it had been provided with a number of positive testimonials about Mr Marriott from former pupils and teaching colleagues.

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Marriott 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 findings of the panel about the serious nature of Mr Marriott’s conduct and its impact on Pupil A. The panel has said:

“The panel noted that the relationship began when Pupil A was [REDACTED]. At that time there was evidence of sexual motivation by Mr Marriott. The relationship became fully sexual in nature whilst Pupil A was in the sixth form. The panel also noted that Mr Marriott had planned for the relationship to become a full sexual relationship when Pupil A turned 18 and that prior to this he required Pupil A to keep the relationship secret which suggested an element of planning and grooming.”

“In addition to this the panel were also concerned by Mr Marriott’s reckless and unprofessional actions in conducting sexual activity on School premises on multiple occasions. The panel gave weight to the detrimental impact on Pupil A of the relationship not just at the time, but much later in her life.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the panel's comments concerning the lack of full insight.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Mr Marriott 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 that no provision should be made for a review period.

The panel has noted that the Advice indicates that behaviours that militate against the recommendation of a review period include both serious sexual misconduct and any sexual misconduct involving a child. Mr Marriott was convicted of three counts of sexual activity with a child, for which he was sentenced to 21 months imprisonment suspended for 2 years.

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 the serious nature of the offences of which Mr Marriott was convicted and the lack of full insight.

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 Thomas Marriott 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 allegation found proved against him, I have decided that Mr Marriott 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 Thomas Marriott 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 be 'D. J. ...', written in a cursive style.

Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 3 February 2025

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