



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Dale Millar-Evans: Professional conduct panel hearing outcome

Panel decision and reasons

July 2025

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	16

Professional conduct panel decision

Teacher:	Mr Dale Millar-Evans
Teacher ref number:	0843440
Teacher date of birth:	22 June 1990
TRA reference:	23399
Date of determination:	10 July 2025
Former employer:	Bells Farm Primary School, Birmingham

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 9 to 10 July 2025 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Millar-Evans.

The panel members were Mrs Shabana Robertson (Lay Panellist – in the Chair), Mrs Beverley Williams (Teacher Panellist) and Ms Janette McCormick (Lay Panellist).

The Legal Adviser to the panel was Mrs Alice Sully of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP Solicitors.

The Presenting Officer for the TRA was Mr Felix Keating of Three Raymond Buildings.

Mr Millar-Evans was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 31 March 2025.

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

1. Between 10 July 2023 and 19 July 2023, he exchanged messages of an inappropriate nature with Child A (who was in fact an undercover officer), in that he:
 - a) asked Child A for a photo, or words to that effect; and/or
 - b) called Child A “babe”, or words to that effect; and/or
 - c) asked about boyfriends and/or “older guys”, or words to that effect; and/or
 - d) asked to meet up with Child A, or words to that effect;
2. His conduct at paragraph 1 occurred despite Child A informing him they were 13 years old.
3. Between 30 August 2023 and 4 September 2023, he exchanged messages of an inappropriate nature with Child B (who was in fact an undercover officer), in that he:
 - a) asked Child B for a photo and/or video, or words to that effect; and/or
 - b) made a comment(s) about “horny/inexperienced boys”, or words to that effect; and/or
 - c) asked Child B about her experience with boys and/or her sexual experiences;
4. His conduct at paragraph 3 occurred despite Child B informing him they were 13 years old.
5. His conduct at paragraph 1 and/or 3 was of a sexual nature and/or sexually motivated.

Mr Millar-Evans admitted the allegations save for allegations 1d) and 5 which he denied. However, in his absence, this remains a disputed case.

Summary of evidence

Documents

In advance of the hearing, the panel received a bundle of documents ('PCPH Bundle') which included:

Section 1: Chronology and List of Key People – pages 4 to 7

Section 2: Notice of Hearing and Response – pages 8 to 15

Section 3: Witness statements – pages 16 to 26

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency Documents – pages 27 to 650

The panel also agreed to accept a separate Service Bundle – pages 1 to 42.

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the Late Papers Bundle – pages 2 to 3.

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

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 witness called by the presenting officer:

Witness A – [REDACTED].

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 Millar-Evans joined the School as a Teacher on 1 September 2022.

On 15 September 2023, Mr Millar-Evans was suspended after the School was informed that an allegation against him was being investigated by the Police.

On 16 January 2024, the School commenced an internal disciplinary investigation against Mr Millar-Evans.

On 7 March 2024, Mr Millar-Evans resigned from the School.

On 11 March 2024, the School held the disciplinary hearing against Mr Millar-Evans.

On 14 March 2024, a referral was made to the TRA.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

The panel considered the representations and statements from Mr Millar-Evans given that he did not attend to give oral evidence. The panel was satisfied that these were relevant to Mr Millar-Evans' defence and/or explanations in respect of the allegations, albeit the panel took a cautious approach when considering this evidence given that the panel and/or the TRA were unable to test this evidence at the hearing. That said, the panel was mindful to attach appropriate weight to this evidence, in particular Mr Millar-Evans' representations to the TRA given that he had provided these in his absence at the hearing.

The panel found the following particulars of the allegations against you proved, for these reasons:

- 1. Between 10 July 2023 and 19 July 2023, you exchanged messages of an inappropriate nature with Child A (who was in fact an undercover officer), in that you:**

- a) asked Child A for a photo, or words to that effect; and/or**

The panel noted that Mr Millar-Evans had admitted this allegation within the Notice of Hearing form dated 22 April 2025.

The panel also reviewed the police issued screenshots of messages between Mr Millar-Evans and the undercover police officer posing as Child A, one of which came from Mr Millar-Evans on 11 July 2023 stating: "Can I see live pic of you?" and another on the same day stating: "Snap a pic so I can see its you."

The panel therefore found this allegation proven.

- b) called Child A "babe", or words to that effect; and/or**

The panel noted that Mr Millar-Evans also admitted this allegation within the Notice of Hearing form dated 22 April 2025.

The panel also reviewed the police issued screenshots of messages between Mr Millar-Evans and the undercover police officer posing as Child A, and noted that on 17 July 2023 Mr Millar-Evans messaged Child A: "Okay babe".

The panel therefore found this allegation proven.

c) asked about boyfriends and/or “older guys”, or words to that effect; and/or

The panel noted that Mr Millar-Evans had also admitted this allegation within the Notice of Hearing form dated 22 April 2025.

The panel also reviewed the police issued screenshots of messages between Mr Millar-Evans and the undercover police officer posing as Child A, and noted that on 11 July 2023, Mr Millar-Evans asked Child A: “So, do you talk to lots of older guys?” and “So do you have a bf your age?”

The panel therefore found this allegation proven.

d) asked to meet up with Child A, or words to that effect;

The panel reviewed the police issued screenshots of messages between Mr Millar-Evans and the undercover police officer posing as Child A, and noted that on 12 July 2023, Mr Millar-Evans asked Child A: “Can I see you today?”.

The panel noted that Mr Millar-Evans had denied this allegation within his Notice of Referral Form dated 14 October 2024 and within his representations to the TRA he explained that the phrase “Can I see you today?” was used in reference to a picture rather than asking to meet up with Child A. The panel also reviewed the LADO Managing Allegation Strategy Meeting Notes dated 9 November 2023 in which it was noted that Mr Millar-Evans: “said he was unsure why he said this. If he asked for a picture, He said he wanted a picture, but not in a sexual way.”

The panel considered this evidence and referred back to Mr Millar-Evans’ previous request for a picture from Child A in which he explicitly asked for a “pic” on two occasions on 11 July 2023. This was therefore significantly different to the phrase used on 12 July 2023 regarding: “Can I see you today?”

The panel also considered the wider context of the conversation with Mr Millar-Evans asking: “Off home now?” and “Any plans?” before asking: “Can I see you today?” When Child A confirmed that she was going home, Mr Millar-Evans responded: “Ah nice, sounds good”. This suggested to the panel that Mr Millar-Evans was asking to see Child A in-person rather than a picture.

As such, on the balance of probabilities, the panel determined that Mr Millar-Evans was asking to meet up with Child A.

The panel therefore found this allegation proven.

The panel then considered whether allegations 1a) to 1d) were of an inappropriate nature. The panel considered the messages in light of this. The panel conducted a wider

review of the conversations and noted that Mr Millar-Evans stated that he “could get in lots of trouble” for speaking to Child A and sent a variety of emojis with a finger up to the lips and a zipped mouth, in addition to noting that “everything deletes here” on the platform they were chatting on. The panel inferred from these comments that Mr Millar-Evans knew what he was doing was wrong at the time.

The panel noted that the tone of the conversations was flirtatious in nature with Mr Millar-Evans sending winking and heart emojis to Child A. Although Mr Millar-Evans claimed that he was letting Child A “steer” the conversations, he allowed them to turn flirtatious and instigated a number of comments as seen in allegations 1a) to 1d) which the panel considered a reasonable person would find inappropriate.

The panel also considered the safeguarding training and school policies which were in force at the time Mr Millar-Evans was sending these messages. The panel heard from Witness A that Mr Millar-Evans had attended the annual safeguarding training the previous year and attended the training again in September 2023 a few months after these messages were sent. There was also regular training throughout the academic year and all staff were subject to policies prohibiting them from speaking to children online in the way found proven, including the Staff Code of Conduct which states that: “Staff must exercise caution when using information technology, in particular, social media, and be aware of the risks to themselves and others”. Mr Millar-Evans signed the Staff Acceptable Use Agreement Form on 5 September 2022 which stated that: “I will not engage in any on-line activity that may compromise my professional responsibilities”. The panel also considered that Mr Millar-Evans was a teacher with over a decade of experience and should reasonably have been aware of the obligations on teachers and online contact with children.

Finally, the panel considered Mr Millar-Evans’ own representations to the TRA in which he admitted that what he did was “irresponsible, immoral and not the behaviour that is expected of anyone, let alone someone in a position of trust.”

The panel therefore concluded that the messages in allegations 1a) to 1d) were of an inappropriate nature.

2. Your conduct at paragraph 1 occurred despite Child A informing you they were 13 years old.

The panel noted that Mr Millar-Evans had admitted this allegation within the Notice of Hearing form dated 22 April 2025 .

Having reviewed the police issued screenshots of messages between Mr Millar-Evans and the undercover police officer posing as Child A, the panel noted that on 10 July 2023, Child A informed Mr Millar-Evans that she was 13 years old: “13 f London x” in response to Mr Millar-Evans’ message that he was “M 33 Birmingham”. Mr Millar-Evans then stated: “Sorry didn’t realise you were so young” and on 11 July 2023, Mr Millar-

Evans noted that he was: “a lot older”.

The panel therefore found this allegation proven.

3. Between 30 August 2023 and 4 September 2023, you exchanged messages of an inappropriate nature with Child B (who was in fact an undercover officer), in that you:

a) asked Child B for a photo and/or video, or words to that effect; and/or

The panel noted that Mr Millar-Evans had admitted this allegation within the Notice of Hearing form dated 22 April 2025.

The panel also reviewed the police issued screenshots of messages between Mr Millar-Evans and the undercover police officer posing as Child B, and noted that on 30 August 2023, Mr Millar-Evans sent Child B: “Can send me the new look” and “Can I see?” When Child B offered to send “a vid of my dance / If u want / U probably don’t actually forget that” on 1 September 2023, Mr Millar-Evans responded: “No that would be cool to see”.

The panel therefore found this allegation proven.

b) made a comment(s) about “horny/inexperienced boys”, or words to that effect; and/or

The panel noted that Mr Millar-Evans had admitted this allegation within the Notice of Hearing form dated 22 April 2025.

The panel also reviewed the police issued screenshots of messages between Mr Millar-Evans and the undercover police officer posing as Child B, and noted that on 1 September 2023, Mr Millar-Evans sent a message to Child B stating: “Horny/inexperienced boys aren’t a good mix haha”.

The panel therefore found this allegation proven.

c) asked Child B about her experience with boys and/or her sexual experiences;

The panel noted that Mr Millar-Evans had admitted this allegation within the Notice of Hearing form dated 22 April 2025.

The panel also reviewed the police issued screenshots of messages between Mr Millar-Evans and the undercover police officer posing as Child B, and noted that on 1 September 2023, Mr Millar-Evans asked Child B: “Have you had any experience with boys?” and when Child B responded: “A bit a parties lol”, Mr Millar-Evans asked: “What have you done?” When Child B replied: “Kissed n fingered”, Mr Millar-Evans stated: “Least you have some experience then”.

The panel therefore found this allegation proven.

The panel then considered whether allegations 2a) to 2c) were of an inappropriate nature. The panel considered the messages in light of this. The panel conducted a wider review of the conversations and noted that Mr Millar-Evans stated that he “could get in lots of trouble” for speaking to Child B. This suggested to the panel that he knew what he was doing was wrong.

Mr Millar-Evans also stated: “Looking good” when Child B shared a photograph with him and: “Yeah you look good / I’m obviously a lot older haha”. He then proceeded to ask Child B to rate a photograph of him. When discussing Child B’s haircut, Mr Millar-Evans asked: “Can send me the new look” with a winking emoji. This all demonstrated to the panel the flirtatious nature of the conversation.

In accordance with the conduct found proven at allegation 1, the panel also considered the training that Mr Millar-Evans had undertaken as a teacher in addition to the school policies that he was subject to around communications with children.

In addition, the panel took into account Mr Millar-Evans’ own representations in respect of his actions as it did for the conduct found proven at allegation 1.

The panel therefore concluded that the messages in allegations 3a) to 3c) were of an inappropriate nature.

4. Your conduct at paragraph 3 occurred despite Child B informing you they were 13 years old.

The panel noted that Mr Millar-Evans had admitted this allegation within the Notice of Hearing form dated 22 April 2025. .

Having reviewed the police issued screenshots of messages between Mr Millar-Evans and the undercover police officer posing as Child B, the panel noted that on 30 August 2023, Child B asked how old Mr Millar-Evans was and when Mr Millar-Evans answered: “33 You?”, Child B responded: “13”. He also referred to the “big age gap” on 1 September 2023.

The panel therefore found this allegation proven.

5. Your conduct at paragraph 1 and/or 3 was of a sexual nature and/or sexually motivated.

The panel noted that Mr Millar-Evans denied this allegation. As with all findings of fact, the panel considered whether this allegation could be proven on the balance of probabilities. The panel was mindful that the burden of proof was upon the TRA. The panel considered that this was a serious allegation and regard should be had, to whatever extent appropriate, to inherent probabilities. The panel had in mind that if it is improbable to have acted in the way alleged, the stronger the evidence should be before

the panel could conclude that the allegation had been proven on the balance of probabilities. The panel was aware that this did not mean that the allegations had to be proven to a higher standard of probabilities. The panel considered that it was common sense to start from an assumption that Mr Millar-Evans was unlikely to act in the way alleged given the serious consequences that would follow from such actions, but the panel was aware that that assumption could be dispelled by other evidence, and of course the panel is aware that teachers do commit serious acts of misconduct. In circumstances where there had been no previous concerns regarding Mr Millar-Evans' professional conduct nor any previous allegations of a sexual nature and/or of sexually motivated conduct, the panel considered that it should start from the position that he was unlikely to have acted in the way alleged and paid close scrutiny to whether the evidence demonstrated that the allegations were established on the balance of probabilities.

When considering the conduct found proven in each allegation in paragraphs 1 and 3 for the purposes of paragraph 5, the panel reviewed the police issued screenshots of the messages between Mr Millar-Evans and Child A and Child B. The panel also considered Mr Millar-Evans' evidence within the LADO Managing Allegation Strategy Meeting Notes, Scoping Meeting Minutes and Notes of disciplinary interview. The panel also considered Mr Millar-Evans' Disciplinary Statement and his representations for the purposes of this hearing.

The panel noted that Mr Millar-Evans was consistent in his evidence that his conduct was not of a sexual nature and/or sexually motivated. Mr Millar-Evans claimed that he asked for a picture so that he could see who he was talking to and make sure that it wasn't a "bot" or a 50-year-old man. He stated that calling them "babe" was not sexual and in relation to the chat about sexual experiences, he thought that he was being asked for help and advice, and when Child B mentioned her experiences, he felt uncomfortable and didn't know what to say.

The panel therefore considered the messages in light of this. The panel conducted a wider review of the conversations taking into account the evidence the panel considered as to whether the messages were inappropriate.

In addition, the panel noted that within the chats, Mr Millar-Evans sent several emojis including winking faces and faces with hearts.

Within the chats with Child A, they appeared flirtatious with the panel noting that when he asked for a "live pic" and Child A responded: "U can send 1", Mr Millar-Evans replied: "I will when you do" proceeding to send a photograph of himself.

Another example of the flirtatious tone of the conversation in relation to the age gap was his comment: "do you talk to lots of older guys" and it is was his reply: "You liked that yesterday though" when Child A referred to herself as a lot younger. It was also Mr Millar-Evans who initiated the conversation about "bf".

The panel did not therefore find Mr Millar-Evans' explanations plausible in the circumstances.

The panel found that Mr Millar-Evans' conduct at 1a) was sexual in nature by virtue of them swapping photographs and having flirtatious conversations as already outlined. For this reason, the panel also concluded that Mr Millar-Evans was seeking sexual gratification and/or in pursuit of a sexual relationship by asking for a photo from Child A and was not persuaded by Mr Millar-Evans' explanations in this regard.

The panel also reflected on its findings at 1b) and 1c) and concluded that any reasonable person would conclude that these comments were directly sexual in nature.

When considering the context of the conversations in general, the panel also concluded that by virtue of their flirtatious nature, Mr Millar-Evans was seeking sexual gratification and/or in pursuit of a sexual relationship from them and therefore his conduct found proven at 1b) and 1c) was sexually motivated.

The panel therefore considered that these messages were of a sexual nature and were sexually motivated taking into account the wording, their tone and wider context, and was not persuaded by Mr Millar-Evans explanations given the evidence available to it.

The panel also considered its findings in relation to allegation 1d) in respect of whether this was of a sexual nature and/or there was any sexual motivation.

Again, the panel considered the context of the conversations and determined that asking to meet up in this context was conduct of a sexual nature.

The panel inferred that it was more likely than not in the context of the wider conversations as previously referred to, Mr Millar-Evans was seeking sexual gratification or pursuing a future sexual relationship when he asked to meet up with Child A. The panel therefore found Mr Millar-Evans conduct as found proven in allegation 1d was sexually motivated.

Turning to the messages with Child B as found proven in allegation 3, the panel again considered the wider conversations and noted that Mr Millar-Evans made comments such as: "Always good to have people you can chat to when bored/fancy a flirt" in addition to "When you're in the mood, hard to stop" when referring to sexual experiences. The panel found that these comments were strong evidence to demonstrate that the tone of Mr Millar-Evans' conversations with Child B as found proven was of a sexual nature.

Mr Millar-Evans also explicitly asked: "Have you had any experience with boys" and when Child B confirmed she had, he asked: "What have you done?" When Child B responded: "Kissed n fingered", Mr Millar-Evans continued the conversation. The panel was not therefore persuaded by Mr Millar-Evans' explanation that he felt uncomfortable and didn't know what to say. Furthermore, whilst it was noted that Mr Millar-Evans stated: "like helping you" and he was Child B's "older helper", he was clearly seeking out

information of a sexual nature from Child B during the conversations with her. Taking account of the surrounding evidence, the panel inferred that it was more probable than not that Mr Millar-Evans was either seeking sexual gratification or a future sexual relationship. For these reasons, the panel found that these conversations found proven in allegation 3 were also sexually motivated.

The panel therefore found this allegation 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 Millar-Evans, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards.

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher’s professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils’ well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- 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 Millar-Evans, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education (“KCSIE”) and Working Together to Safeguard Children.

The panel also considered whether Mr Millar-Evans 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 offence of sexual communication with a child was relevant.

The panel noted that the allegations took place outside the education setting but were relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting because the allegations relate to communications of a sexual nature and/or sexually motivated with individuals which Mr Millar-Evans believed were children. In doing so, he disclosed that he was a teacher.

The panel therefore noted that the conduct would have been likely to have had an impact on the safety and/or security of pupils. Had the individuals actually been a child of the age Mr Millar-Evans believed, those individuals would have been of school age.

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

In relation to whether Mr Millar-Evans' 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 Millar-Evans' 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 Millar-Evans was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found that the offence of sexual communication with a child was 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 for the reasons already outlined namely that had the individuals actually been a child of the age Mr Millar-Evans believed, those individuals would have been of school age and that he had disclosed that he was a teacher within the communications with them.

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

For these reasons, the panel found Mr Millar-Evans' 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 the light of the panel's findings against Mr Millar-Evans, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils given the serious findings of exchanging messages of an inappropriate nature with Child A and Child B who had informed him that they were 13 years old and which were of a sexual nature.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Millar-Evans 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 Millar-Evans 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 Millar-Evans in the profession. Whilst there is evidence that Mr Millar-Evans had ability as an educator with Witness A describing him as an "excellent teacher", the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr

Millar-Evans in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and he sought to exploit his position of trust. The panel found that he had done this by informing both Child A and Child B that he was a teacher early on in his communications with them.

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. The panel also noted that it should attach appropriate weight and seriousness to online behaviours including, but not limited to: online misconduct facilitating online abuse; or facilitating inappropriate relationships (including both online only relationships and where online relationships move into contact relationships). In this case, Mr Millar-Evans sought to establish an inappropriate relationship with children and sought to move to a contact relationship.

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 Millar-Evans.

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.

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

There was no evidence that Mr Millar-Evans' actions were not deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Millar-Evans was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation. However, Mr Millar-Evans had referred to within the statements submitted by the TRA and by him that he was having

some serious [REDACTED] at the time the conduct took place, albeit did not provide any evidence of these concerns.

There were no previous disciplinary findings against Mr Millar-Evans. The panel were presented with satisfactory references with positive comments from his previous employers. The panel also heard from Witness A who described Mr Millar-Evans as an “excellent teacher”, “salt of the earth” and generally a “good egg”. However, there was no evidence that Mr Millar-Evans had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector. Mr Millar-Evans did not provide any references and/or other evidence to this effect.

The panel also noted that Mr Millar-Evans referred to “self-reflection and [REDACTED] to learn from my mistakes”, albeit again provided no evidence of any [REDACTED] undertaken or its efficacy.

Mr Millar-Evans also previously admitted a number of the allegations and had referred to remorse, regret and embarrassment in a number of the statements and meeting notes and stated that he had lost his job/career, house, [REDACTED] and relationships with friends and family. He also positively engaged with the TRA throughout the process. Mr Millar-Evans did however dispute that the conduct was sexually motivated and/or of a sexual nature.

The panel could not therefore be satisfied that Mr Millar-Evans was fully remorseful and/or had a sufficient level of insight into the seriousness of the conduct that he had committed. The regret he expressed related to the personal consequences of exposure of his actions rather than demonstrating that he understood the impact of online behaviours on children. The panel did note that Mr Millar-Evans had recognised the impact of his actions on the School.

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 Millar-Evans 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 Millar-Evans. The seriousness of the conduct and his inability to recognise that the conduct was of a sexual nature and/or sexually motivated 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;
- any sexual misconduct involving a child;

The panel found that Mr Millar-Evans had exchanged messages of an inappropriate nature with two individuals on separate occasions who had informed him that they were 13 years old and these messages were sexually motivated and/or of a sexual nature.

Whilst Mr Millar-Evans expressed limited insight and remorse, and acknowledged that reflection and [REDACTED] was required, the panel were not satisfied from the evidence that Mr Millar-Evans understood the full gravity of the conduct or that there would be no risk of repetition, particularly given he did not recognise that his behaviour was sexually motivated. The panel considered that he had engaged in conversations with two separate individuals who he believed were 13 years old, one being in July 2023 and the other taking place in August to September 2023, thereby already demonstrating repeated behaviours of concern.

The panel found that Mr Millar-Evans' remorse and level of insight were primarily directed at himself and the impact that his conduct had on his own life. The panel was not satisfied that any evidence had been adduced about Mr Millar-Evans' insight into the potential harm caused had the individuals been children, with whom he had been communicating. Mr Millar-Evans continued to maintain that his conduct was not sexually motivated and/or of a sexual nature, thereby demonstrating to the panel a lack of insight.

Furthermore, it was not clear from the evidence what steps had been taken by Mr Millar-Evans to fully understand the seriousness and impact of his conduct or the rehabilitative steps he had taken.

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 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 Dale Millar-Evans should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- 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 Millar-Evans, involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE) and/or involved breaches of Working Together to Safeguard Children.

The panel finds that the conduct of Mr Millar-Evans fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of sexual communication with a child.

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 Millar-Evans, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children/safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, "In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Millar-Evans, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils given the serious findings of exchanging messages of an inappropriate nature with Child A and Child B who had informed him that they were 13 years old and which were of a sexual nature." A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, "The panel also noted that Mr Millar-Evans referred to "self-reflection and [REDACTED] to learn from my mistakes", albeit again provided no evidence of any [REDACTED] undertaken or its efficacy." The panel has also commented "Mr Millar-Evans also previously admitted a number of the allegations and had referred to remorse, regret and embarrassment in a number of the statements and meeting notes and stated that he had lost his job/career, house, [REDACTED] and relationships with friends and family. He also positively engaged with the TRA throughout the process. Mr Millar-Evans did however dispute that the conduct was sexually motivated and/or of a sexual nature." I have therefore given this element 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 Millar-Evans were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession" I am particularly mindful of the finding of sexual communication with a child in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

I have had to consider that the public has a high expectation of professional standards of all teachers and that the public might regard a failure to impose a prohibition order as a

failure to uphold those high standards. In weighing these considerations, I have had to consider the matter from the point of view of an “ordinary intelligent and well-informed citizen.”

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of unacceptable professional conduct 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 Millar-Evans. The panel comment “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 Millar-Evans in the profession. Whilst there is evidence that Mr Millar-Evans had ability as an educator with Witness A describing him as an “excellent teacher”, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Millar-Evans in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and he sought to exploit his position of trust. The panel found that he had done this by informing both Child A and Child B that he was a teacher early on in his communications with them.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Millar-Evans from teaching. A prohibition order would also clearly deprive the public of his contribution to the profession for the period that it is in force.

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments concerning the lack of full insight or remorse. The panel has said, “The panel could not therefore be satisfied that Mr Millar-Evans was fully remorseful and/or had a sufficient level of insight into the seriousness of the conduct that he had committed. The regret he expressed related to the personal consequences of exposure of his actions rather than demonstrating that he understood the impact of online behaviours on children. The panel did note that Mr Millar-Evans had recognised the impact of his actions on the School.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding that “The panel noted that the allegations took place outside the education setting but were relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting because the allegations relate to communications of a sexual nature and/or sexually motivated with individuals which Mr Millar-Evans believed were children. In doing so, he disclosed that he was a teacher.”

In addition I have placed considerable weight on the following “The panel therefore noted that the conduct would have been likely to have had an impact on the safety and/or security of pupils. Had the individuals actually been a child of the age Mr Millar-Evans believed, those individuals would have been of school age.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Millar-Evans 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 found that Mr Millar-Evans' remorse and level of insight were primarily directed at himself and the impact that his conduct had on his own life. The panel was not satisfied that any evidence had been adduced about Mr Millar-Evans' insight into the potential harm caused had the individuals been children, with whom he had been communicating. Mr Millar-Evans continued to maintain that his conduct was not sexually motivated and/or of a sexual nature, thereby demonstrating to the panel a lack of insight." The panel has also said "Furthermore, it was not clear from the evidence what steps had been taken by Mr Millar-Evans to fully understand the seriousness and impact of his conduct or the rehabilitative steps he had taken."

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 Dale Millar-Evans 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 Millar-Evans 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.



Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey

Date: 17 July 2025

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