



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Mark Migallos: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

March 2025

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	5
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Witnesses	6
Decision and reasons	6
Findings of fact	7
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	20
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	25

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

Teacher: Mr Mark Migallos

Teacher ref number: 1863418

Teacher date of birth: 30 April 1994

TRA reference: 21515

Date of determination: 11 March 2025

Former employer: [REDACTED] (“the School”)

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 10 and 11 March 2025 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Mark Migallos.

The panel members were Mrs Karen Graham (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Carl Lygo (lay panellist) and Mrs Emma Hendry (lay panellist).

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

The presenting officer for the TRA was Miss Matilda Hesleton of Browne Jacobson LLP solicitors.

Mr Migallos was present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in private and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 12 December 2024.

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

1. He failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries and/or engaged in/developed an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A in or around [REDACTED], by:
 - a. Communicating with Pupil A using electronic messages;
 - b. Conducting one or more video calls with Pupil A;
 - c. Meeting Pupil A outside of the school's premises;
 - d. Providing Pupil A with cannabis and/or smoking cannabis with Pupil A;
 - e. Sitting outside of Pupil A's home in his vehicle on one or more occasions;
 - f. Attending Pupil A's group [REDACTED] on one or more occasions;
 - g. Engaging in kissing and/or sexual activity with Pupil A
2. He placed Pupil A at risk of injury and/or harm by failing to act adequately or at all [REDACTED] during a video call with him on or around [REDACTED];
3. He failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with Pupil B by:
 - a. Contacting Pupil B by Instagram and/or WhatsApp;
 - b. Asking Pupil B to facilitate a conversation with Pupil A
4. He drove a vehicle after consuming an amount of alcohol which affected his ability to drive and/or which wholly or partly resulted in him crashing his vehicle in or around [REDACTED];
5. He was present at the School on one or more occasions after consuming alcohol and/or took alcohol onto the School's premises in or around [REDACTED];
6. He consumed and/or were in possession of one or more illegal drugs, namely;
 - a. Cocaine (Class A drug);
 - b. Ketamine (Class B drug);

c. Cannabis (Class B drug);

7. His conduct at allegation 1 was of a sexual nature and/or sexually motivated.

Mr Migallos admitted the allegations and that he is guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into dispute.

Preliminary applications

Application to exclude the public

The panel considered an application by the presenting officer for the hearing to be held in private. The presenting officer referred to a letter [REDACTED] for the hearing to be held in private, given the potential consequences [REDACTED] in the event [REDACTED] during the course of the hearing.

The panel decided to exclude the public from the hearing on the basis that it was in the interests of justice to do so. The panel was concerned that the facts in this case may [REDACTED] and that anonymisation of her and the School would not be sufficient to prevent this. In the circumstances, the panel considered that protecting the identity of pupils in this case overrides the public interest of the hearing taking place in public. A public announcement of the panel's findings will be made in due course, fulfilling the purpose of declaring proper standards of conduct and maintaining confidence in the regulation of the profession.

Application to anonymise the name of the School

The presenting officer drew the panel's attention to the concern of [REDACTED]. The presenting officer made clear that, in light of the hearing taking place in private, the TRA did not seek that the name of the School be anonymised.

The panel decided that it was in the interest of justice and not contrary to the public interest to decide that the name and identity of the school will not be disclosed during the hearing. The panel reached this view given the concern about the identification of [REDACTED]. The panel emphasised that it has no power to influence the matters published by the decision maker on behalf of the secretary of state in due course.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology and anonymised pupil list – pages 6 to 8

Section 2: Notice of referral, response notice of proceedings and response – pages 9 to 60

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 61 to 148

Section 4: Statement of Agreed Facts - pages 149 to 255

Section 5: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 256 to 301

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 302 to 304

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

A slowed down version of a recording provided in the panel bundle - page 305

A preliminary applications bundle - pages 306 to 323

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the hearing, the additional documents that the panel decided to admit and viewed the recording.

In the consideration of this case, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession 2020, (the “Procedures”).

Witnesses

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

Witness A – [REDACTED]

The panel also heard oral evidence from Mr Migallos.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

The panel carefully considered the case before it and reached a decision.

Mr Migallos was employed as a teacher of mathematics at the School from [REDACTED]. On [REDACTED], Witness A was informed of allegations regarding Mr Migallos. Mr Migallos was suspended from the School on [REDACTED]. On [REDACTED], a disciplinary hearing was held. Mr Migallos’s employment at the School was terminated on [REDACTED].

Mr Migallos signed a statement of agreed facts on 22 August 2024.

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. You failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries and/or engaged in/ developed an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A in or around [REDACTED], by:

a. Communicating with Pupil A using electronic messages;

Mr Migallos admitted this allegation in his response to the notice of referral in this case.

In the statement of agreed facts, Mr Migallos admitted this allegation and that google classroom messages exhibited to the statement of agreed facts were between him and Pupil A. Mr Migallos maintained his admission of this allegation at the misconduct hearing and in his oral evidence.

Witness A produced a statement that she prepared on [REDACTED] of a disclosure she received from [REDACTED] Mr Migallos the previous evening. It was arranged that [REDACTED] and Mr Migallos would meet with her on [REDACTED]. Witness A produced a statement she prepared of the matters discussed at that meeting. This stated that Mr Migallos made various disclosures including that he had started helping Pupil A with her maths in the common room and canteen, both public areas of the school. He also disclosed that he had set up a google classroom on the school system so that they could communicate through private messages.

In oral evidence, Witness A stated that the School's Code of Conduct required that teachers limit their contact with pupils to matters relating to their academic work, or formal activities organised by the school, such as extracurricular clubs.

In oral evidence, Mr Migallos stated that Pupil A had sought assistance with her mathematics which he had previously taught her, and he had set up the google classroom as a means of communicating with her regarding the tutoring.

The panel saw messages exchanged via google classroom between Mr Migallos and Pupil A. In oral evidence, Mr Migallos agreed that the messages were largely of a personal rather than academic nature.

The panel reviewed the messages and noted that 22 pages of messages were exchanged between Mr Migallos and Pupil A between [REDACTED]. They included:

- messages assuring Pupil A that his experience of using google classroom was that the messages were not monitored;

- a message from Mr Migallos stating that he had “never had any filter or anything to hide from [Pupil A];
- a message from Mr Migallos stating “I don’t go around telling every student my deepest darkest secrets, just the ones I trust and think need to hear it”;
- reference to Mr Migallos having a bottle of rum next to his bed;
- Mr Migallos suggesting that a forged note from Pupil A’s parents was provided to allow Pupil A to step out of a lesson to take a phone call; and
- a message referring to Mr Migallos having to get up early to collect his car, because he left it at school to “go drink (priorities)”.

The panel considered that Mr Migallos had communicated with Pupil A using electronic messages. Using google classroom to communicate with Pupil A on a one to one basis was inappropriate given that the matters discussed did not relate to her academic studies, and the content indicated that matters were being shared over and above what would be expected in a professional relationship between teacher and pupil. This indicated a breach of professional boundaries and the development of an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A.

b. Conducting one or more video calls with Pupil A;

Mr Migallos admitted this allegation in his response to the notice of referral in this case.

In the statement of agreed facts, Mr Migallos admitted this allegation, stating that he had video calls with Pupil A on a regular and daily basis between [REDACTED].

Witness A produced a statement she prepared of the matters disclosed by Mr Migallos in the meeting she had with him on [REDACTED]. This included that Mr Migallos made video calls to Pupil A most nights.

Pupil B provided a witness statement for the purpose of the present misconduct proceedings. She produced a video of the messages they exchanged, and screenshots of the message exchanged between Mr Migallos and herself. This included a message from Mr Migallos in which Mr Migallos was discussing Pupil A and said “She left our VC earlier and then came back...”

Mr Migallos confirmed in oral evidence that VC was an abbreviation for video call. He admitted that the video calls were inappropriate as they had no academic purpose. He stated that the video calls had started after their relationship transitioned from a tutoring one to a personal one.

The panel considered that Mr Migallos had used video calls to communicate with Pupil A. This was inappropriate given that matters discussed did not relate to her academic studies. This indicated a breach of professional boundaries and the development of an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A.

c. Meeting Pupil A outside of the school's premises;

Mr Migallos admitted this allegation in his response to the notice of referral in this case.

In the statement of agreed facts, Mr Migallos admitted this allegation.

Witness A produced a statement she prepared of the matters disclosed by Mr Migallos in the meeting she had with him on [REDACTED]. This included that Mr Migallos had met Pupil A off-site in his car and taken part in sexual activity (not intercourse) but masturbation over clothes, kissing and touching.

In oral evidence, Mr Migallos accepted that by meeting Pupil A outside of the School's premises he was treating Pupil A very differently from other pupils at the school, and that there was no academic purpose to meeting her.

The panel noted that Mr Migallos has been consistent in his admissions, and the panel considered that it was more likely than not that Mr Migallos had met with Pupil A outside of the School's premises.

The panel considered that meeting with Pupil A outside of the School's premises was inappropriate given that the meetings did not relate to her academic studies. This indicated a breach of professional boundaries and the development of an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A.

d. Providing Pupil A with cannabis and/or smoking cannabis with Pupil A;

Mr Migallos admitted this allegation in his response to the notice of referral in this case.

In the statement of agreed facts, Mr Migallos admitted this allegation. He acknowledged that he supplied Pupil A with cannabis which they smoked together in his vehicle.

Witness A produced a statement she prepared of the matters disclosed by Mr Migallos in the meeting she had with him on [REDACTED]. This included that Mr Migallos had supplied Pupil A with cannabis which they smoked together in his car.

In oral evidence, Mr Migallos stated that Pupil A had repeatedly said that she wanted to try cannabis and whilst he had been hesitant to provide her with it, he thought it best that she try the drug with someone who "knows what they're doing and can practise safe usage" to "teach her how it works". Mr Migallos confirmed he had no medical qualification. He accepted that providing Pupil A with cannabis could have caused Pupil A harm. However, his view that Pupil A was actively seeking to source the drug and that he convinced her to be the first that she tried it with to "practice harm reduction if necessary". He stated that he had always had the view that if someone wanted to try a drug, they are going to, that he tried and failed to convince her not to, but that he relented and that was why he resorted to smoking it with her.

Mr Migallos accepted that he should have reported to the school that Pupil A sought to use cannabis but had not as they were in a personal relationship and “it all got deeper and deeper.”

Given Mr Migallos’s frank admissions the panel considered that it was more likely than not that Mr Migallos had provided Pupil A with cannabis and smoked it with her. This was a breach of professional boundaries and the development of an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A.

e. Sitting outside of Pupil A’s home in your vehicle on one or more occasions;

Mr Migallos admitted this allegation in his response to the notice of referral in this case.

In the statement of agreed facts, Mr Migallos admitted this allegation.

Witness A produced a statement she prepared of the matters disclosed by Mr Migallos in the meeting she had with him on [REDACTED]. This included that Mr Migallos had on two occasions sat outside Pupil A’s house in his car.

There was also contemporaneous evidence of Mr Migallos having sat outside Pupil A’s house. Pupil B provided a witness statement for the purpose of the present misconduct proceedings. She produced a video of the messages they exchanged, and screenshots of the messages exchanged between Mr Migallos and herself. This included a message from Mr Migallos in which Mr Migallos was discussing Pupil A and said, “But I’ve been sat here just to see [REDACTED]” and “I was gonna stay here until I see some confirmation that she’s okay”.

In oral evidence, Mr Migallos confirmed that there had been no academic purpose for him to have sat outside Pupil A’s house.

Given the admissions of Mr Migallos and his message alluding to sitting outside Pupil A’s house, the panel considered that it was more likely than not that he had sat outside Pupil A’s house on one or more occasions.

The panel considered that this was inappropriate given that it had no purpose relating to her academic studies. This indicated a breach of professional boundaries and the development of an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A.

f. Attending Pupil A’s group [REDACTED] on one or more occasions;

Mr Migallos admitted this allegation in his response to the notice of referral in this case.

In the statement of agreed facts, Mr Migallos admitted this allegation.

On [REDACTED], Witness A arranged a meeting with Pupil A. Pupil A's father attended the meeting and her father referred to having seen Mr Migallos at a car park [REDACTED] and Mr Migallos had attended the same [REDACTED].

Since Pupil A's father did not attend the hearing to give oral evidence, the panel exercised caution given that this was hearsay evidence, albeit it was not the sole and decisive evidence in light of Mr Migallos's admission. The panel asked Witness A how Pupil A's father had identified Mr Migallos as being the person he saw at the car park [REDACTED] and she explained that Mr Migallos had taught Pupil A and her father had met him at a parent's evening.

Witness A confirmed that the School had not been previously made aware that Mr Migallos and [REDACTED]. She stated that this was a matter that she would have expected Mr Migallos to have raised with the designated safeguarding lead or headteacher and that there was a clear conflict of interest. She stated that the sharing of personal and private information [REDACTED] would not have been appropriate under the School's code of conduct.

The panel also noted that Witness 1 sent an email on [REDACTED] to the headteacher in which Witness 1 referred to having spoken with a [REDACTED] and facilitator at the [REDACTED]. Witness 1 asked if Pupil A and Mr Migallos could be in different groups, and the [REDACTED]/ facilitator is noted as having responded that she "had no idea that they even knew each other". The panel again exercised caution given that the [REDACTED]/ facilitator did not give oral evidence but noted that there was no record of the [REDACTED]/ facilitator having disputed that Pupil A and Mr Migallos had [REDACTED].

The panel noted that both the father's comment [REDACTED]/ facilitator provided some corroboration of Mr Migallos's own admissions.

In oral evidence, Mr Migallos stated that he had previously been part of this group but had stopped attending. In [REDACTED], he stated that Pupil A had told him that she was going to be joining the same group that he had mentioned that he used to attend. He stated that the "idea came about that [he] rejoin the group so they could [REDACTED]. Mr Migallos accepted that the group was [REDACTED], and not for an academic purpose.

The panel considered that it was more likely than not that Mr Migallos had attended Pupil A's group [REDACTED] on one or more occasions.

The panel considered that this was inappropriate given that it had no purpose relating to her academic studies. This indicated a breach of professional boundaries and the development of an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A.

g. Engaging in kissing and/or sexual activity with Pupil A

Mr Migallos admitted this allegation in his response to the notice of referral in this case.

In the statement of agreed facts, Mr Migallos admitted this allegation. He accepted that he met Pupil A in his vehicle, whereby they engaged in masturbation over clothing, kissing and sexual touching. Mr Migallos also admitted that he kissed Pupil A on the School's premises.

Witness A produced a statement she prepared of the matters disclosed by Mr Migallos in the meeting she had with him on [REDACTED]. This included that Mr Migallos had met Pupil A offsite in his car and taken part in sexual activity (not intercourse) but masturbation over clothes, kissing and touching.

On [REDACTED], Witness A arranged a meeting with Pupil A. Witness A recorded their discussion in an email sent to the headteacher on the same day. This stated that she had told Pupil A that they needed to talk about Mr Migallos. Pupil A had confirmed "that they had a romantic relationship with some sexual contact".

Since Pupil A did not attend the hearing to give oral evidence, the panel exercised caution given that this was hearsay evidence, albeit it was not the sole and decisive evidence in light of Mr Migallos's admission.

The panel also noted that the Instagram messages produced by Pupil B provided some corroboration that Mr Migallos and Pupil A were or had been in a relationship.

The panel considered that Pupil A's comment and the Instagram messages produced by Pupil B provided corroboration of Mr Migallos's admission and that it was more likely than not that Mr Migallos had engaged in kissing and/or sexual activity with Pupil A.

The panel considered that this was a breach of professional boundaries, and an inappropriate relationship had developed with Pupil A.

2. You placed Pupil A at risk of injury and/or harm by failing to act adequately or at all [REDACTED] during a video call with you on or around [REDACTED];

Mr Migallos admitted this allegation in his response to the notice of referral in this case.

In the statement of agreed facts, Mr Migallos admitted this allegation. Mr Migallos acknowledged that at the time Pupil A [REDACTED] during the video call, he did not notify the School or Pupil A's parents, neither did he contact emergency services.

Witness A produced a statement she prepared of the matters disclosed by Mr Migallos in the meeting she had with him on [REDACTED]. This included that Mr Migallos had been on a video call to Pupil A [REDACTED] and did not call for help.

Pupil B provided a witness statement for the purpose of the present misconduct proceedings. She stated that Mr Migallos had contacted her on Instagram [REDACTED]. She stated that Mr Migallos wanted her to check up on Pupil A. She produced a video of the messages they exchanged, and screenshots of the message exchanged between Mr Migallos and herself.

The panel had sight of the messages exchanged between Mr Migallos and Pupil B via Instagram. The first stated “This is an emergency. Don’t say I told you anything or that you know anything. But you absolutely need to check and message [Pupil A] today, go to her house even... She can’t know I told you. But she’s pushing me away and I can’t do anything.” There then followed a lengthy exchange regarding Pupil A [REDACTED].

The panel noted that Mr Migallos first sought to contact Pupil B at 07:23 referring to the emergency and attempted two audio calls at 07:47 and 09:57. It did not appear that contact was established with Pupil B until around 10:16. [REDACTED]. The messages indicated Mr Migallos had been monitoring Pupil A’s online activity [REDACTED]”

[REDACTED]. He stated that she had asked if he would uphold that, and although he responded “yes”, it had bothered him. Nevertheless, in light of that discussion, Mr Migallos admitted that he had not called [REDACTED] and that it had been a hope more than an expectation that they would be called. He stated that he waited outside for a while, that he did not believe that the [REDACTED] came, and that he went home.

The panel was satisfied that Mr Migallos placed Pupil A at risk of injury and/or harm by failing to act adequately or at all [REDACTED] during a video call with him on or around [REDACTED]. Involving Pupil B in checking on Pupil A was not an adequate action, as Pupil A’s parents should have been alerted and emergency services called.

3. You failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with Pupil B by:

a. Contacting Pupil B by Instagram and/or WhatsApp;

b. Asking Pupil B to facilitate a conversation with Pupil A;

Mr Migallos admitted this allegation in his response to the notice of referral in this case.

In the statement of agreed facts, Mr Migallos admitted this allegation. Mr Migallos accepted that the screenshots of the messages and the video exhibited to the statement of agreed facts showed the Instagram message he exchanged with Pupil B.

Witness A produced a statement she prepared of the matters disclosed by Mr Migallos in the meeting she had with him on [REDACTED]. This included that Mr Migallos had sought out another Pupil, Pupil B on Instagram [REDACTED].

Pupil B provided a witness statement for the purpose of the present misconduct proceedings. She stated that Mr Migallos spoke of Pupil A and how he made her feel.

She stated that Mr Migallos had contacted her on Instagram [REDACTED]. She stated that Mr Migallos wanted her to check up on Pupil A. She produced a video of the messages they exchanged, and screenshots of the message exchanged between Mr Migallos and herself.

The panel had sight of the messages exchanged between Mr Migallos and Pupil B via Instagram. The first stated "This is an emergency. Don't say I told you anything or that you know anything. But you absolutely need to check and message [Pupil A] today, go to her house even... She can't know I told you. But she's pushing me away and I can't do anything." There then followed a lengthy exchange regarding Pupil A [REDACTED]. He sent a message stating "[REDACTED]" Mr Migallos also discussed details of his relationship with Pupil A. At one point during the conversation, Mr Migallos instructed Pupil B to send a copy of a discussion Pupil B had had with Pupil A and was persistent in this request. He referred to carrying on drinking, and Pupil B suggested he get some water and questioned whether that was really going to help. The messages evidence that an audio call took place between Mr Migallos and Pupil B between 01:37 and 02:25 in the morning.

The panel was satisfied, having read the messages that Mr Migallos had contacted Pupil B by Instagram, and that he had asked Pupil B to facilitate a conversation with Pupil A. The panel was satisfied that the entire conversation evidenced a failure to maintain proper boundaries with Pupil B. He involved her in a safeguarding issue and revealed personal information about Pupil A that he should never have divulged to a student. He sought to involve her in having responsibility for Pupil A's welfare and indicated [REDACTED] which was entirely inappropriate.

5. You were present at the School on one or more occasions after consuming alcohol and/or took alcohol onto the School's premises in or around [REDACTED];

Mr Migallos admitted this allegation in his response to the notice of referral in this case.

In the statement of agreed facts, Mr Migallos admitted this allegation. He acknowledged that he attended School under the influence of alcohol and brought in coffee with rum to drink during the school day in or around [REDACTED].

Witness A produced a statement she prepared of the matters disclosed by Mr Migallos in the meeting she had with him on [REDACTED]. This included that Mr Migallos had attended school drunk in March and had brought in coffee laced with rum to drink during the school day.

Mr Migallos confirmed his admission of this allegation in oral evidence.

Given the consistency of Mr Migallos's admissions, the panel was satisfied that Mr Migallos had more likely than not consumed alcohol on the School's premises and took alcohol onto the School's premises in or around [REDACTED].

6. You consumed and/or were in possession of one or more illegal drugs, namely;

- a. Cocaine (Class A drug);**
- b. Ketamine (Class B drug);**
- c. Cannabis (Class B drug);**

Mr Migallos admitted this allegation in his response to the notice of referral in this case.

In the statement of agreed facts, Mr Migallos admitted this allegation. He admitted that around [REDACTED] he consumed cocaine, ketamine and cannabis. He admitted that the police found him in possession of cannabis on [REDACTED] for which he was issued with a penalty of £90.

Witness A produced a statement she prepared of the matters disclosed by Mr Migallos in the meeting she had with him on [REDACTED]. This included that Mr Migallos had on two occasions sat outside Pupil A's house in his car, one occasion having been the previous day and he had been drunk, and an accident occurred. The police attended due to a report that he was taking drugs in the car. Mr Migallos denied this, but police found cannabis in his car and he was arrested. Mr Migallos also disclosed that Mr Migallos had supplied Pupil A with cannabis which they smoked together in his car.

During Witness A's meeting with Mr Migallos and [REDACTED] on [REDACTED], [REDACTED] shared with Witness A, away from Mr Migallos, that he knew Mr Migallos took ketamine, cocaine and "smoked weed" at the weekend. The panel exercised caution with regard to this evidence given that it was hearsay. Nevertheless, it provided some, albeit limited, corroboration of Mr Migallos's admission.

On [REDACTED], Witness A arranged a meeting with Pupil A. Pupil A's father then attended the meeting and her father shared that Pupil A had told him in the past that Mr Migallos took drugs. The panel exercised caution with regard to this evidence given that it was hearsay, and was not even something that Pupil A's father had witnessed. Nevertheless, it provided some, albeit limited, corroboration for Mr Migallos's admission.

The panel also saw a police case summary which confirmed that a small quantity of cannabis had been located in the boot of Mr Migallos's car on [REDACTED].

In oral evidence, Mr Migallos confirmed his admission of this allegation.

In light of the consistency of Mr Migallos's admissions, together with the police report with respect to the possession of cannabis, the panel considered that it was more likely than not that Mr Migallos had consumed and/or been in possession of cocaine, ketamine and cannabis.

7. Your conduct at allegation 1 was of a sexual nature and/or sexually motivated.

Mr Migallos originally denied in his response to the notice of referral that his conduct at allegation 1 was of a sexual nature and/or sexually motivated but amended his response to admit allegation 7 having been informed that the case could only proceed to a professional conduct panel meeting if all allegations were admitted.

Having been provided with a definition of what is sexual in nature and sexual motivation, Mr Migallos admitted this allegation in the statement of agreed facts.

In oral evidence, Mr Migallos stated that when he read the bundle, he realised that he could not refute that his actions had been sexually motivated.

On [REDACTED], Witness A arranged a meeting with Pupil A. In that meeting Pupil A confirmed that she and Mr Migallos had had a romantic relationship with some sexual contact and that this had started as a teacher pupil relationship, then they became friends, then more and that she "felt he was more invested than her."

Pupil B provided a witness statement for the purpose of the present misconduct proceedings. This stated that during sixth form she felt that there had been more of a friendship with Mr Migallos than a teacher pupil relationship, she stated that Mr Migallos spoke of Pupil A and how he made her feel. She produced a video of the messages they exchanged, and screenshots of the message exchanged between Mr Migallos and herself. In that exchange when referencing Pupil A Mr Migallos stated "Do I even say I love you? Would she notice if I didn't?", that he "almost broke it off with her.", "I've always (maybe deluded) [sic] that the happiness and love and care I give her is worth it" and "wtf I'm a 28 year old teacher and she's an [REDACTED] student, and she had an affair with me and seemingly an affair from me."

The panel has found proven that Mr Migallos engaged in kissing and/or sexual activity with Pupil A. This was conduct that was, by its very nature sexual.

Whilst the relationship may have once started as a tutoring relationship, Mr Migallos confirmed in oral evidence that the relationship had quickly become a personal one in October or November. He explained that the boundaries had been breached as they shared aspects of their personal lives, that he became aware of her vulnerabilities and that he justified his actions by believing that he was helping her to show she was not alone in the issues she was having. He could not recall exactly when the relationship became a personal one but stated that this was something he had lost control of.

In light of the sentiments expressed by Mr Migallos in his exchange with Pupil B, the panel considered that Mr Migallos had pursued a sexual relationship with Pupil A. The panel therefore considered that Mr Migallos's conduct had been sexually motivated.

The panel found the following allegation against you not proven:

4. You drove a vehicle after consuming an amount of alcohol which affected your ability to drive and/or which wholly or partly resulted in you crashing your vehicle in or around [REDACTED];

Mr Migallos admitted this allegation in his response to the notice of referral in this case.

In the statement of agreed facts, Mr Migallos admitted this allegation.

Witness A produced a statement she prepared of the matters disclosed by Mr Migallos in the meeting she had with him on [REDACTED]. This included that Mr Migallos had on two occasions sat outside Pupil A's house in his car, one occasion having been the previous day and he had been drunk, and an accident occurred. The police attended due to a report that he was taking drugs in the car. Mr Migallos denied this, but police found cannabis in his car and he was arrested.

The police noted the police report of this incident, and a subsequent clarification email sent from the police to the presenting officer. This stated that there was no mention of Mr Migallos being intoxicated upon police arrival in the crime report.

In oral evidence, Mr Migallos stated that the police had been called, and they had located cannabis in his car. He stated that the police returned him home, and issued him with a fine, and said that he should be ok to get a bus to collect his car and drive home. He stated that it was around this time [REDACTED], but shortly afterwards crashed his car driving too fast around a corner.

In light of there being no record in the police report of Mr Migallos being intoxicated, and his account in oral evidence that the police had allowed him to return to collect his car, the panel considered that there was insufficient evidence to find that it was more probable than not that Mr Migallos had driven a vehicle after consuming an amount of alcohol that affected his ability to drive and/ or which wholly or partly resulted in him crashing his vehicle.

The panel found this allegation not proven.

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

Having found allegations 1 – 3 and 5 – 7 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 first considered whether the conduct of Mr Migallos, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Migallos was in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher’s professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils’ well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs
 - ensuring that personal beliefs are not expressed in ways which exploit pupils’ vulnerability or might lead them to break the law
- 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 Migallos in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education (“KCSIE”). He failed to abide by his obligation to safeguard the welfare of Pupil A and Pupil B or to act in their best interests.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Migallos in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Working Together to Safeguard Children. Mr Migallos failed

to report safeguarding issues, to enable the relevant agencies and emergency services to take relevant action.

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

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

The panel found that the offences of controlling or coercive behaviour; possession, supply or production of class A drugs; possession with intent to supply; and supply or production of illegal substances of any classification were relevant.

The panel noted that the proven allegations largely took place outside the education setting. Mr Migallos abused his position of trust by engaging in a personal and sexual relationship with Pupil A and potentially caused her harm. Similarly, he breached the professional boundaries in his contact with Pupil B and potentially caused her harm by seeking to attribute responsibility to Pupil B for Pupil A's welfare.

[REDACTED].

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Migallos amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

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

In relation to whether Mr Migallos's actions amounted to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, the panel took into account the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. It considered the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel also took account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils' lives and the fact that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way that they behave.

In considering the issue of disrepute, the panel also considered whether Mr Migallos's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice.

As set out above in the panel's findings as to whether Mr Migallos was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that the offences of controlling or coercive behaviour; possession, supply or production of class A drugs; possession with intent to supply; and supply or production of illegal substances of any classification were relevant.

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

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

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Migallos's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

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

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order 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 a punitive effect.

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

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of developing an inappropriate sexual relationship with Pupil A, placing Pupil A at the risk of harm in providing her with cannabis and smoking it with her; and in failing to act adequately or at all [REDACTED]. Mr Migallos also revealed to Pupil B sensitive personal information pertaining to Pupil A and he failed to maintain appropriate boundaries with Pupil B. This had the potential to cause her harm and adversely affect her friendship with Pupil A.

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

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

In addition to the public interest considerations set out above, the panel went on to consider whether there was a public interest in retaining Mr Migallos in the profession. Whilst Mr Migallos may have had some ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Migallos in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and he abused his position of trust.

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the behaviour, noting that the Advice states that the expectation of both the public and pupils, is that members of the teaching profession maintain an exemplary level of integrity and ethical standards at all times. The panel noted that a teacher's behaviour that seeks to exploit their position of trust should be viewed very seriously in terms of its potential influence on pupils and be seen as a possible threat to the public interest.

In view of 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 Migallos.

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 were relevant in this case were:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of the Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- 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;
- failure to act on evidence that indicated a child's welfare may have been at risk e.g. failed to notify the designated safeguarding lead and/or make a referral to children's social care, the police or other relevant agencies when abuse, neglect and/or harmful cultural practices were identified;

- 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;
- ... or other deliberate behaviour that undermines pupils, the profession, the school or colleagues;
- actions or behaviours that ...undermine fundamental British values of democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty...
- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour;
- ... lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions...especially where these behaviours have been repeated or had serious consequences, or involved the coercion of another person to act in a way contrary to their own interests;
- collusion or concealment including:
 - ...
 - failure to challenge inappropriate actions, defending inappropriate actions or concealing inappropriate actions;
 - encouraging others to break rules;
 - ...

The panel noted that the behaviours associated with safeguarding failures above referred to a “child”. Although Pupil A was [REDACTED] at the time of the misconduct found proven, Pupil A was a pupil of the School, and as such the panel considered Mr Migallos to have been in a position of trust, and to have duties to safeguard her welfare.

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 evidence that Mr Migallos’s actions were deliberate, and the panel has found sexual motivation. Furthermore, his decision not to alert the relevant agencies when [REDACTED].

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Migallos was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation. [REDACTED].

There were no previous disciplinary orders against Mr Migallos but there was no evidence of having demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both his personal and

professional conduct or of having contributed significantly to the education sector. Mr Migallos stated that he thought teaching had been something he could enjoy and “feel good about for the rest of his career and life”. He stated that he had not been “in a great place” whilst he was teaching and tried to remedy that by putting everything into teaching. He stated that he believed that he was a “great teacher” and had a “fantastic rapport with peer and pupils”, that he “was popular” and that he felt like he was having a “great impact”. He stated that he did a good job when he was “acting within reason and rational” and likes to think of those he inspired and taught and hoped that this is remembered.

[REDACTED].

The panel saw evidence that showed Mr Migallos had previously received an informal written warning around maintaining professional boundaries.

No character statements were adduced by Mr Migallos attesting to his character or to his ability as a teacher. The panel noted that two positive references were provided to the School when he applied for the position but the panel placed little weight on them given that they were provided several years ago, and were not provided for the purpose of these misconduct proceedings.

In an email dated [REDACTED], Mr Migallos stated that he had accepted responsibility for his actions and the consequences of them. He stated that he knew that what he had done was reckless and irresponsible. He stated that he accepted the “certainty of [his] prohibition from teaching”.

Mr Migallos stated in representations to the panel that he had only ever considered one outcome and that he did not imagine that he would receive less than a prohibition order, that it would be fair and within his expectation.

Mr Migallos admitted all but one of allegations when he responded to the notice of referral, subsequently admitted the remaining allegation and he provided a statement of agreed facts admitting the allegations. The panel noted that it was as a result of his full and frank disclosures to the School that these matters came to light. Mr Migallos apologised for his betrayal of the position of trust he was in, to the School, the parents who had trusted him as a teacher and accepted that his actions were damaging to Pupil A, the School, the community, his colleagues and the profession itself.

With regard to the risk of repetition, Mr Migallos stated that every time he makes a mistake, he tries to learn from it. However, he stated that whilst he could only hope that he would stop doing “such idiotic things”, [REDACTED].

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

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings would be sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Migallos 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 Migallos. The degree of seriousness of the misconduct found proven and the potential impact on Pupil A 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 for it to decide to recommend a review period of the order. The panel was mindful that the Advice states that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances, in any given case, that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 2 years.

The Advice indicates that there are certain types of case where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period.

These 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;
- child cruelty and/or neglect;

The panel found serious sexual misconduct that was sexually motivated, and that Mr Migallos had used his professional position to develop that relationship. The panel also found that Migallos had neglected to take steps to take action to safeguard Pupil A when she was at risk of harm.

The Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate.

These include:

- possession (including for personal use) of any class A drug;

- possession with intent to supply another person, supply (selling, dealing or sharing) and production of any class A, B, C or unclassified drugs.

The panel found proven that Mr Migallos had taken cocaine, ketamine and cannabis and that he had supplied cannabis to Pupil A.

Although Mr Migallos had expressed remorse, and some insight as to his actions, the panel was concerned that he could not provide any adequate assurance regarding the risk of repetition.

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

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

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

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

In this case, the panel has found some of the allegations not proven (including allegation 4). I have therefore put that matter entirely from my mind.

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

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

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

- not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs
- ensuring that personal beliefs are not expressed in ways which exploit pupils' vulnerability or might lead them to break the law
- 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 Migallos involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE) and involved breaches of Working Together to Safeguard Children.

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding that Mr Migallos breached professional boundaries with pupils including by engaging in sexual activity with one pupil.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Mr Migallos, 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:

“There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of developing an inappropriate sexual relationship with Pupil A, placing Pupil A at the risk of harm in providing her with cannabis and smoking it with her; and in failing to act adequately or at all [REDACTED]. Mr Migallos also revealed to Pupil B sensitive personal information pertaining to Pupil A and he failed to maintain appropriate boundaries with Pupil B.

This had the potential to cause her harm and adversely affect her friendship with Pupil A.”

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. The panel has commented:

“Mr Migallos admitted all but one of allegations when he responded to the notice of referral, subsequently admitted the remaining allegation and he provided a statement of agreed facts admitting the allegations. The panel noted that it was as a result of his full and frank disclosures to the School that these matters came to light. Mr Migallos apologised for his betrayal of the position of trust he was in, to the School, the parents who had trusted him as a teacher and accepted that his actions were damaging to Pupil A, the School, the community, his colleagues and the profession itself.”

“With regard to the risk of repetition, Mr Migallos stated that every time he makes a mistake, he tries to learn from it. However, he stated that whilst he could only hope that he would stop doing “such idiotic things”, [REDACTED]”

In my judgement, whilst Mr Migallos has shown some insight and remorse, there is a risk of 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 that “public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Migallos were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of sexual activity with a pupil 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 and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mr Migallos himself. The panel has commented:

“There were no previous disciplinary orders against Mr Migallos but there was no evidence of having demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both his personal and professional conduct or of having contributed significantly to the education sector. Mr Migallos stated that he thought teaching had been something he could enjoy and “feel good about for the rest of his career and life”. He stated that he had not been “in a great place” whilst he was teaching and tried to remedy that by putting everything into teaching. He stated that he believed that he was a “great teacher” and had a “fantastic rapport with peer and pupils”, that he “was popular” and that he felt like he was having a “great impact”. He stated that he did a good job when he was “acting within reason and rational” and likes to think of those he inspired and taught and hoped that this is remembered.”

The panel has also noted that it “saw evidence that showed Mr Migallos had previously received an informal written warning around maintaining professional boundaries.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Migallos 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 seriousness of the misconduct found proven, which included failing to maintain professional boundaries with pupils, engaging in sexual activity with one pupil, putting a pupil at risk of harm, consuming alcohol on school premises, and consuming and possessing illegal drugs. I have also placed considerable weight on the risk that Mr Migallos might repeat this behaviour.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Mr Migallos 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 that no provision should be made for a review period. The panel has commented:

“The Advice indicates that there are certain types of case where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period.”

“These 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;
- child cruelty and/or neglect;”

“The panel found serious sexual misconduct that was sexually motivated, and that Mr Migallos had used his professional position to develop that relationship. The panel also found that Migallos had neglected to take steps to take action to safeguard Pupil A when she was at risk of harm.”

“The Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate.”

“These include:

- possession (including for personal use) of any class A drug;
- possession with intent to supply another person, supply (selling, dealing or sharing) and production of any class A, B, C or unclassified drugs.”

“The panel found proven that Mr Migallos had taken cocaine, ketamine and cannabis and that he had supplied cannabis to Pupil A.”

“Although Mr Migallos had expressed remorse, and some insight as to his actions, the panel was concerned that he could not provide any adequate assurance regarding the risk of repetition.”

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 misconduct found proven and risk of repetition of this behaviour.

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 Mark Migallos is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children’s home in England. Furthermore, in view of the seriousness of the allegations found proved against him, I have decided that Mr Migallos 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 Mark Migallos has a right of appeal to the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this order.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D Oatley', written in a cursive style.

Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 12 March 2025

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