



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Shane Lycett: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

May 2025

Contents

Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	12
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	15

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

Teacher: Mr Shane Lycett

Teacher ref number: 3438414

Teacher date of birth: 2 December 1985

TRA reference: 23814

Date of determination: 23 May 2025

Former employer: Dane Court Grammar School, Broadstairs, Kent

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 23 May 2025 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Shane Lycett.

The panel members were Mrs Michelle Chappell (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Carl Lygo (lay panellist), and Ms Jan Stoddard (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Lara Small of Birketts LLP Solicitors.

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Lycett that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Lycett provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer Ms Matilda Heselton, Mr Lycett or any representative for Mr Lycett.

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

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 7 October 2024.

It was alleged that Mr Lycett was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that while working as Head of Computing at Dane Court Grammar School between 2017 and 2024:

1. He failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with Pupil A in that he:
 - a. added her as a friend on Facebook and/ or accepted her friend request on Facebook.
 - b. Sent her one or more messages on [REDACTED] in or around July 2023
 - c. Made one or more inappropriate comments to her, such as by;
 - i. Commenting on her appearance
 - ii. Saying 'When we go out for drinks next year'
 - iii. Making reference to drinking alcohol
 - iv. Making reference to using illegal drugs
 - v. Offering to supply Pupil A with illegal drugs
 - vi. Swearing
2. His behaviour in allegation 1 was sexually motivated and/or sexual in nature
3. He took Ketamine, a class A drug, on one or more occasions between 2022 and 2024.

Mr Lycett admitted the facts of allegations 1 to 3 and that his behaviour amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute falling short of the standards expected of a teacher, as set out in the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Lycett on 4 December 2024.

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 4 to 5

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 7 to 11

Section 3: Statement of Agreed Facts and Presenting Officer Representations– pages 17 to 46

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 48 to 107

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 107 to 110

In addition, the panel was provided with an audio recording of Mr Lycett’s police interview on 18 March 2024.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the hearing. The panel confirmed that they had also listened to the audio recording of Mr Lycett’s police interview on 18 March 2024.

In the consideration of this case, the panel had regard to the “Procedures”.

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Lycett on 4 December 2024 and subsequently signed by the presenting officer on 5 December 2024.

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

Decision and reasons

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

Mr Lycett was employed at Dane Court Grammar School (‘the School’) from 2017 until 17 May 2024 as a teacher in the role of Head of Computing.

On 7 March 2024, concerns were raised by two sixth form pupils that Mr Lycett had been watching Pupil A’s [REDACTED] (a social media/ gaming platform) in exchange for money and had said “*her hair looked better at school*”. It was also alleged that Mr Lycett made comments on his drinking habits.

Individual A, [REDACTED] at the School, met with Pupil A on 7 March 2024. Pupil A stated that Mr Lycett had accepted her friend request on Facebook and sent her a photo of other staff under the name of Shane Lycett. Pupil A also explained that Mr Lycett had been messaging her on the [REDACTED] platform, saying that he would buy her a ‘ticket of

cocaine' and later said that when Pupil A was 18, they should go out drinking just the two of them.

Pupil A provided the school with screenshots of the [REDACTED] messages she had received from Mr Lycett. Her account was taken on 12 March 2024 by the police and social services.

On 18 March 2024, Mr Lycett was interviewed by the police under caution, but no further action was taken by the police due to insufficient evidence.

Following a disciplinary interview on 28 March 2024 where Mr Lycett maintained he was not the author of the [REDACTED] messages, Mr Lycett requested a second meeting which took place on the same day. During this meeting Mr Lycett declared he had been addicted to Ketamine for the past two years, reporting that on average that he takes the drug every other day. He said this allegedly clouds his judgement and results in a '*K Hole*', and therefore he could not remember sending the [REDACTED] messages to Pupil A but that he believed it must be that the inappropriate online content was him.

The matter was referred to the TRA on 28 May 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:

Between 2017 while working as head of computing at Dane Court Grammar school:

- 1. You failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with Pupil A in that:**
 - a. You added her as a friend on Facebook and/ or accepted her friend request on Facebook.**
 - b. Sent her one or more messages on [REDACTED] in or around July 2023**

The panel noted that Mr Lycett had admitted to allegations 1(a) and 1(b) in the statement of agreed facts. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the evidence available to it.

The panel referred to Pupil A's witness account provided as part of the police disclosure and noted her comments that Mr Lycett '*accepted my friend request on Facebook and sent me a photo of staff under the name Shane Lycett*' on 28 July 2023. In Pupil A's account, she described that Mr Lycett watched her [REDACTED].

The panel had sight of screenshots taken by Pupil A showing messages sent by Mr Lycett to Pupil A on [REDACTED].

The panel also had sight of the interview on 28 March 2024 in which Mr Lycett stated with *'all that evidence today, that's me. It's got to be'*, when questioned whether he was the author of the [REDACTED] messages.

The witness account of Pupil A attested to the same, stating that when Pupil A questioned the author of the messages, asking *'is that you Shane?'*, he responded *'Yes but shh, no-one is meant to know...'*

On examination of the documents before the panel, and the admissions in the signed statement of agreed facts, the panel was satisfied that allegations 1(a) and 1(b) were proven.

c. Made one or more inappropriate comments to her, such as by;

- i. Commenting on her appearance**
- ii. Saying 'When we go out for drinks next year'**
- iii. Making reference to drinking alcohol**
- iv. Making reference to using illegal drugs**
- v. Offering to supply Pupil A with illegal drugs**
- vi. Swearing**

The panel noted that Mr Lycett had admitted to allegation 1(c) in the statement of agreed facts. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the evidence available to it.

The panel considered the screenshots of the [REDACTED] messages and the witness account of Pupil A and in particular noted the following inappropriate comments made by Mr Lycett to Pupil A:

- i. As extracted from Pupil A's witness account:*
 - a. 'He started talking about a staff night out to Gadds Brewery and said that he was really drunk'.*
 - b. 'On my [REDACTED] birthday [REDACTED] he said that he would buy me a ticket of cocaine. I said no thanks. Then he said when I'm 18, we should go out drinking. Just us two.'*
- ii. "your hair looks better down"*

- iii. *He said, 'I'm going to Dreamland to do pills with [REDACTED] this weekend.'*
- iv. *'We drunk every day since last day'*
- v. *'Stoned all the time'*
- vi. *'Fuck'*
- vii. *'You fucking TILF'*
- viii. *"I'll send the drugs...all apart from cress(a)ck and hero(one)...I get my best shit from ex-student"*
- ix. *'Getting picked and mix drugs...3 for 100 and a bag of md or pills'*

In the statement of agreed facts, Mr Lycett accepted that he failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with Pupil A in adding her as a friend on Facebook, sending messages on [REDACTED] in or around July 2023, and making various inappropriate comments.

On examination of the documents before the panel, and the admissions in the signed statement of agreed facts, the panel was satisfied that allegation 1(c) was proven.

The panel found allegation 1 proven.

2. Your behaviour in allegation 1 was sexually motivated and/or sexual in nature

The panel noted that Mr Lycett had admitted to allegation 2 in the statement of agreed facts. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the evidence available to it.

The panel referred to Pupil A's written account which stated that she disclosed to the police and social worker that Mr Lycett's behaviour made her uncomfortable.

The panel noted that in the statement of agreed facts Mr Lycett admitted that his actions outlined in allegation 1 were sexually motivated and/or sexual in nature.

The panel's attention was drawn to section 78 *Sexual Offences Act 2003* and to the cases of *Sait v The General Medical Council [2018]*, *Basson v General Medical Council [2018]* and *The General Medical Council v Haris [2020] EWHC 2518*.

The panel considered whether the conduct was sexually motivated. It noted that in *Basson* it was stated that, *"A sexual motive means that the conduct was done either in pursuit of sexual gratification or in pursuit of a sexual relationship"*.

The panel was also mindful of the Court of Appeal's conclusion in *General Medical Council v Haris [2021] EWCA Civ 763*. The court found in that case that, "*In the absence of a plausible innocent explanation for what he did, the facts spoke for themselves.*"

The panel considered that the content of some of the messages Mr Lycett had sent to Pupil A were inherently sexual in nature. In particular, the panel noted that there were several messages Mr Lycett had sent to Pupil A via [REDACTED] calling her a 'TILF' which stands for a 'Teenager I'd Like to Fuck'.

Taking into account all of the circumstances, the panel did consider that Mr Lycett's conduct in contacting Pupil A frequently via [REDACTED] messages and through adding her as a friend on Facebook, he could potentially have been in pursuit of a sexual and/or romantic relationship. The panel noted in particular that Mr Lycett had messaged Pupil A with indications that he wanted to go for a drink with her once she had left the School.

The panel considered whether there was a "*plausible innocent explanation*" for Mr Lycett's behaviour. The panel did not accept that there was any plausible innocent explanation as to why he had acted in the way he had with Pupil A. The panel did not consider that Mr Lycett's excuse of 'being in a 'K hole"' was a plausible justification for his actions.

The panel considered the screenshots of [REDACTED] messages which show a consistently inappropriate tone and content of messages, including swearing and references to drinking and drugs - for example Mr Lycett referred to being '*stoned all the time*'.

The panel did not consider that Mr Lycett had provided a credible, professional justification for the language used within his messages to Pupil A.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel considered that Mr Lycett's motivation in his conduct towards Pupil A went as far as to be capable of being considered sexual.

Taking into account all of the evidence before it and drawing on its professional judgement, the panel found that the conduct found proven against Mr Lycett in respect of allegations 1a, 1b and 1c was sexually motivated.

The panel found allegation 2 proven.

3. You took Ketamine, a class B drug, on one or more occasions between 2022 and 2024.

The panel noted that in the statement of agreed facts Mr Lycett admitted allegation 3, that he took Ketamine, a class B drug, on one or more occasions between 2022 and 2024. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the evidence available to it.

The panel noted Mr Lycett's comments in the School interview conducted on 28 March 2024. Mr Lycett admitted to having a 'crippling addiction to ketamine' over the previous two years and that he had taken it most days.

On examination of the documents before the panel, and the admissions in the signed statement of agreed facts, the panel was satisfied that allegation 3 was proven.

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

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

In doing so, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: The prohibition of teachers, which is referred to as "the Advice".

The panel first considered whether the conduct of Mr Lycett, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Lycett 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
 - 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 Lycett, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe in Education ("KCSIE"). Under KCSIE, staff should always act in the best interests of the child.

The panel considered that Mr Lycett was in breach of the following provisions of KCSIE: that he behaved towards a child in a way that indicates he may pose a risk of harm to

children and/or behaved in a way that indicates he may not be suitable to work with children [para 356 KCSIE 2023].

The panel also considered whether Mr Lycett'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 following offences were relevant: sexual communication with a child; possession (including for personal use) and/or possession with intent to supply...any class A drugs; and possession with intent to supply another person...any class B drugs.

The panel considered the content of the messages Mr Lycett sent to be disturbing, in particular the fact that he normalised swearing and taking drugs and used sexualised language towards a pupil at the School. The panel considered these messages to be highly inappropriate for a teacher to send to a pupil.

The panel noted that the allegations took place outside the education setting. However, the panel noted that Mr Lycett was working as a head of department at the School with the additional responsibility of supervising Pupil A's [REDACTED] which was a required part of their course. The panel believed that Mr Lycett's conduct was intrinsically linked to his profession as a teacher, given the nature of the role he was undertaking at the time, and the fact that Pupil A was a student at the school, undertaking a project linked to their course.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Lycett 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 Lycett was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Mr Lycett'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 Lycett'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 Lycett was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that the following offences were relevant: sexual communication with a child; possession (including for personal use) and/or possession with intent to supply...any class A drugs; and possession with intent to supply another person...any class B drugs.

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 Lycett's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Lycett'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 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.

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Lycett, which involved a failure to maintain appropriate boundaries with a pupil and the making of numerous highly inappropriate comments involving sexualised language and referring to taking drugs, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious nature of the findings.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Lycett 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 Lycett 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 Lycett in the profession. The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Lycett in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and the panel was of the view that he had sought to exploit 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 Lycett.

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;
- 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);
- 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 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 the mitigating factors. Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

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

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

The panel had seen no evidence that Mr Lycett had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or had contributed significantly to the education sector. There was no evidence before the panel that the incident was out of character.

The panel noted the lack of insight and remorse on the part of Mr Lycett, other than his acknowledgment of his addiction problems within the interview conducted by the School. The panel considered that there was no evidence of any understanding by Mr Lycett on the consequences and potential impact of his actions on Pupil A.

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 Lycett 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 Lycett. 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:

- any sexual misconduct involving a child;

The panel found that allegation 2 was proven, and therefore that Mr Lycett's failure to maintain appropriate professional boundaries was sexually motivated and/or sexual in nature.

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; and
- 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 allegation 3 proven, that Mr Lycett took Ketamine on one or more occasions, proven. The panel also noted in their findings that Mr Lycett offered drugs to a pupil. The panel was of the view that these findings and all the circumstances of the case weighed in favour of a longer review period or prohibition without a review period.

The panel noted that Mr Lycett demonstrated a lack of insight into his actions, with no remorse expressed.

The panel noted the seriousness of the allegations and considered that there was sufficient evidence in the bundle to suggest a risk of future repetition of such behaviour, particularly given the link between Mr Lycett's behaviour and his addiction problems. The panel did note that Mr Lycett expressed some regret of his addiction, although did not believe that there was sufficient evidence to suggest that there was a low risk of future repetition of this behaviour at this point in time.

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 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 all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Lycett 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
 - 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 Lycett 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 Lycett fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they involved a failure to maintain appropriate boundaries with a pupil, making inappropriate comments, using sexualised language and referring to taking drugs, conduct found to be sexually motivated.

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 Lycett, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children/safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, "In light of the panel's findings against Mr Lycett, which involved a failure to maintain appropriate boundaries with a pupil and the

making of numerous highly inappropriate comments involving sexualised language and referring to taking drugs, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious nature of the findings.” A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel’s comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, “The panel noted the lack of insight and remorse on the part of Mr Lycett, other than his acknowledgment of his addiction problems within the interview conducted by the School. The panel considered that there was no evidence of any understanding by Mr Lycett on the consequences and potential impact of his actions on Pupil A.” In my judgement, the lack of full insight or remorse means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour, and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, “the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Lycett were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of sexual motivated behaviour 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 Lycett himself and the panel comment “The panel had seen no evidence that Mr Lycett had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or had contributed significantly to the education sector. There was no evidence before the panel that the incident was out of character.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Lycett 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 following “The panel considered the content of the messages Mr Lycett sent to be disturbing, in particular the fact that he

normalised swearing and taking drugs and used sexualised language towards a pupil at the School. The panel considered these messages to be highly inappropriate for a teacher to send to a pupil.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding that “The panel noted that the allegations took place outside the education setting. However, the panel noted that Mr Lycett was working as a head of department at the School with the additional responsibility of supervising Pupil A’s [REDACTED] which was a required part of their course. The panel believed that Mr Lycett’s conduct was intrinsically linked to his profession as a teacher, given the nature of the role he was undertaking at the time, and the fact that Pupil A was a student at the school, undertaking a project linked to their course.”

I have given considerable weight to the following “The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Lycett in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and the panel was of the view that he had sought to exploit his position of trust.”

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

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

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

I have considered the panel’s comments “The panel noted the seriousness of the allegations and considered that there was sufficient evidence in the bundle to suggest a risk of future repetition of such behaviour, particularly given the link between Mr Lycett’s behaviour and his addiction problems. The panel did note that Mr Lycett expressed some regret of his addiction, although did not believe that there was sufficient evidence to suggest that there was a low risk of future repetition of this behaviour at this point in time.”

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 seriousness of the findings and the lack of full insight or remorse.

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

This means that Mr Shane Lycett 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 Lycett 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 Lycett 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 'SABuxcey', with a horizontal line underneath the first part of the signature.

Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey

Date: 1 June 2025

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