



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Alex Lloyd: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

October 2025

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	6
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	19
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	23

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

Teacher:	Mr Alex Lloyd
Teacher ref number:	56680
Teacher date of birth:	19 December 1973
TRA reference:	21724
Date of determination:	1 October 2025
Former employer:	The Bishop of Winchester Academy, Bournemouth (the “School”)

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 29 September 2025 to 1 October 2025 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Lloyd.

The panel members were Mr Paul Hawkins (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Karen Graham (teacher panellist) and Ms Wendy Shannon (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Elizabeth Gilbert of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mrs Charlotte Watts of Browne Jacobson LLP.

Mr Lloyd was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of hearing dated 24 June 2025.

It was alleged that Mr Lloyd was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst employed as the Teacher of Science and Head of Sixth Form at The Bishop of Winchester Academy;

1. On or around [REDACTED] 2022, he engaged in inappropriate and/or unprofessional behaviour during and/or after a lesson which focused on Honour Killings by;
 - a) Telling Pupil A that this was a serious matter which affected their culture specifically and that they should pay attention or using words to that effect;
 - b) Stating to Pupil B “imagine this was your mum being killed” or using words to that effect;
 - c) Looking at Pupil F and stating that female genital mutilation “happens exclusively in your culture” or using words to that effect;
 - d) Telling Pupil E that if she was living in Iran she would have been killed for what she was wearing or using words to that effect;
 - e) Referring to [REDACTED] as a “Religion of peace” in a sarcastic tone and/or with a thumbs up gesture;
 - f) Replying to Pupil I with “so you’re all not so bad after all” or using words to that effect;
 - g) Telling Pupil I “if I have offended you I am not sorry” or using words to that effect;
 - h) Telling the class that he would happily commit murder if anyone hurt his daughter/s or using words to that effect
2. His conduct as may be found proven at Allegations 1a-1g above demonstrated a lack of tolerance and/or respect for the rights and/or beliefs of others, contrary to Fundamental British Values.
3. On or around January 2023, he failed to follow the correct safeguarding procedure and/or ensure appropriate action was taken to safeguard Pupil X in that;
 - a) He did not seek advice from the Designated Safeguarding Lead before he discussed the disclosure with Pupil X;

- b) He contacted [REDACTED] and made a referral without seeking advice and/or permission from the Designated Safeguarding Lead;
- c) He did not log any of the concerns or actions on My Concern until he was asked to do so by the Designated Safeguarding Lead.

In a Statement of Agreed Facts dated 16 June 2024, Mr Lloyd admitted the allegations and that his admitted conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. As Mr Lloyd did not attend the hearing the allegations were treated as not admitted.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Anonymised pupil list – page 8

Section 2: Notice of hearing and response – pages 10 to 37

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts – pages 39 to 43

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 45 to 102

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 104 to 607

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 609 to 615

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the hearing.

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];
- Witness B – [REDACTED];
- Witness C – [REDACTED]; and

- Pupil H

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 Lloyd was employed as a science teacher and head of sixth form at the School from 1 April 2015 until 3 March 2023.

Mr Lloyd was referred to the TRA on 22 March 2023.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

- 1. On or around [REDACTED] 2022, you engaged in inappropriate and/or unprofessional behaviour during and/or after a lesson which focused on Honour Killings by;**
 - a) Telling Pupil A that this was a serious matter which affected their culture specifically and that they should pay attention or using words to that effect;**
 - b) Stating to Pupil B “imagine this was your mum being killed” or using words to that effect;**

In the Statement of Agreed Facts, dated 16 June 2024, Mr Lloyd admitted that he told Pupil A that the lesson on honour killings was a serious matter which affected their culture specifically and that they should pay attention, or words to that effect. In making this comment, Mr Lloyd admitted that he assumed that Pupil A was [REDACTED] and that in making this comment his behaviour was inappropriate and/or unprofessional.

Mr Lloyd further admitted in the Statement of Agreed Facts that whilst delivering a lesson about honour killings, he said to Pupil B “imagine this was your mum being killed” or words to that effect. Mr Lloyd also admitted that in making this comment his behaviour was inappropriate and/or unprofessional.

Pupil H stated in her written statement dated [REDACTED] 2022 that Mr Lloyd “brought up [Pupil B’s] mum” and said, “what if this was your mum that had been killed”. Pupil H further stated in her written statement dated [REDACTED] 2023 that Mr Lloyd “targeted

pupils during the lesson” and she could see other pupils were “visibly upset” because their religion had been “mocked”.

[REDACTED], the panel decided to admit documents provided by the presenting officer which contained hearsay evidence from several pupils and staff at the School. As the panel had the benefit of live evidence from four witnesses, including a pupil within the classroom and three staff members who were witness to the impact of the lesson on the pupils, the panel was satisfied that the reliability of the hearsay evidence could be tested against other evidence and the panel could determine what weight to be placed on it. The panel considered the following hearsay statements from pupils:

- In a statement dated [REDACTED] 2022, Pupil A stated that he and Pupil B walked into the honour killings lesson late, apologised and sat down. Pupil A outlined that Pupil B giggled during the lesson as his voice broke while reading and Mr Lloyd then said “this is a serious matter” referring to Pupil A’s culture specifically. Additionally, Pupil A stated that Mr Lloyd was “using racist stereotypes against a corner of us in the class” making them “feel insecure”. In the School’s meeting notes with Pupil A, it was noted that Pupil A said Mr Lloyd told him that it “was a serious matter and that it happens in our culture specifically”.
- In a statement dated [REDACTED] 2022, Pupil B stated that he and Pupil A walked into the honour killings lesson a few minutes late and Mr Lloyd referred to them as the “two cocky boys in the back”. Pupil B stated that when it was his turn to read from the board this resulted in giggling and Mr Lloyd thought they were laughing at the topic. Pupil B outlined that Mr Lloyd shouted at him and Pupil A as he thought they were mocking the topic and said that honour killings was “happening mainly because of [their] culture” when referring to him and Pupil A. [REDACTED]. Additionally, Pupil B stated that Mr Lloyd said “imagine this as your mum being killed” which Pupil B found really offensive.
- In a statement dated [REDACTED] 2022, Pupil C stated that Pupil A and Pupil B walked into the lesson late and Mr Lloyd commented that they were “cocky boys”. Pupil C also stated that Mr Lloyd told Pupil A and Pupil B that they needed to “pay attention because it’s mainly your culture” that commits honour crimes. Additionally, Pupil C stated that Mr Lloyd used Pupil A and Pupil B’s family members to “demonstrate what would happen if adultery was committed”. The panel noted that Pupil C’s position in the statement, which was obtained during the School’s investigation, was consistent with the position set out in a later statement dated [REDACTED] 2023 provided by Pupil C at the request of the TRA in connection with these proceedings.
- In a statement dated [REDACTED] 2022, Pupil D stated that Mr Lloyd “scolded” Pupil A and Pupil B, telling them that “this was real”, they should not be laughing and this was happening mostly in “their culture”.

- In a statement dated [REDACTED] 2022, Pupil E stated that Pupil A and Pupil B came late into the lesson and Mr Lloyd was “visibly annoyed by that”. Pupil E further stated that Mr Lloyd asked Pupil B to read and then Pupil B’s voice was “breaking up”. Mr Lloyd then “yelled” and said to Pupil B and Pupil A that it was “mainly in their culture” so they should pay attention. Additionally, Pupil E stated that Mr Lloyd told Pupil B to “imagine his mother getting stoned to death”.
- In a statement dated [REDACTED] 2022, Pupil F stated that Mr Lloyd “got mad” at Pupil A and Pupil B and said, “he’d getting fed up with them” and that “honour based violence happens in their culture and they should pay attention”. Pupil F further stated that he felt “uncomfortable and shocked” that he would make these statements [REDACTED].

The panel determined to place weight on the above hearsay evidence given the consistency in positions outlined by each of the pupils with each other, including Pupil H who gave oral evidence at the hearing.

The impact of Mr Lloyd’s conduct within the classroom was also corroborated by Witness A and Witness B’s written and oral evidence, as they both described the pupils as being negatively impacted by Mr Lloyd’s comments in his lesson on [REDACTED] 2022.

The panel was satisfied on the evidence that Mr Lloyd told Pupil A that the lesson was a serious matter which specifically impacted their culture and that they should pay attention or words to that effect. Similarly, the panel was satisfied that Mr Lloyd told Pupil B to imagine his mother being killed, or words to that effect.

The panel determined that the comments made by Mr Lloyd were inappropriate and unprofessional given the context of the lesson and [REDACTED]. The panel noted that Mr Lloyd’s comments were targeted and reinforced discriminatory stereotypes, which did not form part of the learning material, copies of which the panel considered as evidence. The panel considered that Mr Lloyd’s words were an unacceptable response to the pupils being disruptive, particularly given Mr Lloyd’s experience as a senior member of staff who should have an appreciation of the impact of his words on others.

The panel therefore found allegations 1(a) and 1(b) proven.

c) Looking at Pupil F and stating that female genital mutilation “happens exclusively in your culture” or using words to that effect;

In the Statement of Agreed Facts, Mr Lloyd admitted that he said female genital mutilation was a form of honour based violence and that he told Pupil F that female genital mutilation “happens exclusively in your culture” or words to that effect. Mr Lloyd further admitted that in making this comment his behaviour was inappropriate and/or unprofessional.

In her written statement dated [REDACTED] 2022, Pupil H stated that Mr Lloyd discussed female genital mutilation during the lesson and said that was a “[REDACTED]”. Pupil H also outlined in her written statement dated 3 November 2023 that Mr Lloyd referred to female genital mutilation and “linked this with [REDACTED]”.

The panel considered the following hearsay statements from pupils, which it decided to admit in a preliminary application:

- In a statement dated [REDACTED] 2022, Pupil C stated that Mr Lloyd was talking about female genital mutilation during the lesson and said that “it was predominantly in [REDACTED] culture”.
- In a statement dated [REDACTED] 2022, Pupil E stated that Mr Lloyd said that female genital mutilation was “an exclusively [REDACTED]” while looking at Pupil F. Pupil E further stated that she could “visibly see the shock on Pupil F’s face as that’s quite a sensitive topic”.
- In a statement dated [REDACTED] 2022, Pupil F stated that Mr Lloyd said in the lesson that female genital mutilation is a form of honour based violence, before looking at her and saying that female genital mutilation is an “exclusively [REDACTED]”. Pupil F further stated that Mr Lloyd’s comments made her feel “uncomfortable and shocked that he would boldly say that while making sure he was [REDACTED]”.

The panel determined to place weight on the above hearsay evidence given the consistency in positions outlined by each of the pupils with each other, including Pupil H who gave oral evidence at the hearing. The impact of Mr Lloyd’s conduct within the classroom was also corroborated by Witness A and Witness B’s written and oral evidence, as they both described the pupils as being negatively impacted by Mr Lloyd’s comments.

The panel was satisfied on the evidence that Mr Lloyd told Pupil F that female genital mutilation happens exclusively in her culture, or words to that effect. The panel considered that it was inappropriate and unprofessional for Mr Lloyd to comment on Pupil F’s culture in this way as it targeted her and reinforced discriminatory stereotypes. Additionally, Mr Lloyd placed Pupil F in a vulnerable position by directing the comment at her in relation to a particularly sensitive and sex specific topic, which was a significant departure from the standards expected of an experienced teacher and senior member of staff.

The panel therefore found allegation 1(c) proven.

d) Telling Pupil E that if she was living in Iran she would have been killed for what she was wearing or using words to that effect;

In the Statement of Agreed Facts, Mr Lloyd admitted that he told Pupil E that she would have been killed for what she was wearing or words to that effect, if she was living in Iran. Mr Lloyd further admitted that in making this comment his behaviour was inappropriate and unprofessional.

Pupil H stated in her written statement dated [REDACTED] 2023 that Mr Lloyd said Pupil C and Pupil E were not wearing [REDACTED] and therefore “would be killed or stoned to death in another country”. The panel noted this position was consistent with Pupil H’s earlier statement dated [REDACTED] 2022, which stated that Mr Lloyd said to two girls in the class that “if you were in Iran you would be kicked to or stoned to death” because of what they were wearing.

The panel considered the following hearsay statements from pupils, which it decided to admit in a preliminary application:

- In a statement dated [REDACTED] 2022, Pupil A stated that Mr Lloyd told Pupil E that she “would get stoned to death with what she was wearing” and that this would happen in Iran.
- In a statement dated [REDACTED] 2022, Pupil B stated that Mr Lloyd told Pupil E to “cover up if they go to Iran” otherwise they will be killed.
- In a statement dated [REDACTED] 2022, Pupil C stated that Mr Lloyd told her and Pupil E that they would “cause a form of offence” due to them [REDACTED].
- In a statement dated [REDACTED] 2022, Pupil D stated that Mr Lloyd told Pupil E she would be “killed for what she was wearing” if she was living in Iran.
- In a statement dated [REDACTED] 2022, Pupil E stated that Mr Lloyd told her during the lesson that she would “get killed” if she went to Iran dressed “like that”. Additionally, Pupil E said Mr Lloyd told Pupil C “you too”. Pupil E further stated that she was “shocked and felt attacked” and it “hurt because I felt that he was aiming hate to [REDACTED]”.
- In a statement dated [REDACTED] 2022, Pupil F stated that Mr Lloyd “started mentioning Iran and told [Pupil E] she would get arrested and beaten to death” because “she was dressed immodest [REDACTED]”. Pupil F also stated that Mr Lloyd “said the same” to Pupil C.

The panel determined to place weight on the above hearsay evidence given the consistency in positions outlined by each of the pupils with each other, including Pupil H who was present at the hearing. The impact of Mr Lloyd’s conduct within the classroom was also corroborated by Witness A and Witness B’s written and oral evidence, as they both described the pupils as being negatively impacted by Mr Lloyd’s comments.

The panel was satisfied on the evidence that Mr Lloyd told Pupil E she would be killed for what she was wearing in Iran, or words to that effect. The panel considered that it was inappropriate and unprofessional for Mr Lloyd to comment on what Pupil E was wearing and to express an extremely violent view of another culture which reinforced discriminatory stereotypes. The panel noted that Mr Lloyd's comments did not form part of the educational material and were a significant departure from the standards expected of an experienced teacher and senior member of staff.

The panel therefore found allegation 1(d) proven.

e) Referring to [REDACTED] as a “Religion of peace” in a sarcastic tone and/or with a thumbs up gesture;

In a Statement of Agreed Facts, Mr Lloyd admitted that he referred to [REDACTED] as a “Religion of peace” in a sarcastic tone and/or whilst putting his thumbs up sarcastically. Mr Lloyd further admitted that in making this comment and/or using that gesture, his behaviour was inappropriate and/or unprofessional.

In her written statement dated [REDACTED] 2023, Pupil H stated that Mr Lloyd was “mocking the [REDACTED] saying it was a peaceful religion but saying that they have honour based killings”. This position was consistent with Pupil H's earlier written statement dated [REDACTED] 2022, which outlined that Mr Lloyd “started mocking the [REDACTED] by saying that it was meant to be a peaceful religion”. Pupil H further stated that it made her “feel angry” and “upset” as Mr Lloyd “mocked [her] friends religion to their face”.

The panel considered the following hearsay statements from pupils, which it decided to admit in a preliminary application

- In a statement dated [REDACTED] 2022, Pupil B stated that Mr Lloyd read some quotes from the [REDACTED] and he said in a “sarcastic way that [REDACTED] is a religion of peace”.
- In a statement dated [REDACTED] 2022, Pupil C stated that Mr Lloyd said, “[REDACTED] was a peaceful religion” and that it was “sarcasm and offensive”.
- In a statement dated [REDACTED] 2022, Pupil E stated that Mr Lloyd said, “with a thumbs up [REDACTED] is such a religion of peace” and that this was said in a “sarcastic and offensive way”.
- In a statement dated [REDACTED] 2022, Pupil F stated that Mr Lloyd said “[REDACTED] is such a religion of peace” in a sarcastic tone and while looking at Pupil F, Pupil A, Pupil B and Pupil E, after reading quotes from the [REDACTED].

The panel decided to place weight on the above hearsay evidence given the consistency in positions outlined by each of the pupils with each other, including Pupil H who gave oral evidence at the hearing. The impact of Mr Lloyd's conduct within the classroom was also corroborated by Witness A and Witness B's written and oral evidence, as they both described the pupils as being negatively impacted by Mr Lloyd's comments.

The panel was satisfied on the evidence that Mr Lloyd referred to [REDACTED] as a religion of peace in a sarcastic tone, or words to that effect. However, the panel was not satisfied on the evidence that Mr Lloyd used a thumbs up gesture in saying this comment, as only Pupil E gave evidence in relation to this. The panel considered that it was inappropriate and unprofessional for Mr Lloyd to mock a religion, especially as the class contained pupils of that faith. The panel considered that Mr Lloyd's sarcastic comment reinforced a discriminatory stereotype which did not form part of the educational purpose of the lesson.

The panel therefore found allegation 1(e) proven.

h) Telling the class that you would happily commit murder if anyone hurt your daughter/s or using words to that effect

In the Statement of Agreed Facts, Mr Lloyd admitted that he told the class that he would happily commit murder if anyone hurt [REDACTED]. Mr Lloyd further admitted that in making this comment his behaviour was inappropriate and unprofessional.

In her written statement dated [REDACTED] 2022, Pupil H stated that Mr Lloyd said "if anyone hurt [REDACTED], I would commit murder to make sure no one hurt them" after watching a video on honour-based killings. Pupil H further stated that this comment was said in an "angry tone" and the class were "all shocked".

The panel was satisfied on the evidence that Mr Lloyd told the class he would commit murder if anyone hurt [REDACTED] or words to that effect. The panel considered this comment to be inappropriate and unprofessional within a classroom setting as it normalised criminal behaviour, particularly given the context of the honour killings session that he was teaching.

The panel therefore found allegation 1(h) proven.

2. Your conduct as may be found proven at Allegations 1a-1g above demonstrated a lack of tolerance and/or respect for the rights and/or beliefs of others, contrary to Fundamental British Values.

In the Statement of Agreed Facts, Mr Lloyd admitted that he was aware that the pupils in his class were from a variety of religions and/or backgrounds. Mr Lloyd further admitted that in making the comments as outlined at allegation 1, he demonstrated a lack of

tolerance and respect for the rights and beliefs of the pupils in his class and to others in general, contrary to fundamental British values.

The panel was satisfied that Mr Lloyd's conduct as found proven at allegations 1(a) to (e) demonstrated a lack of tolerance and respect for the beliefs of others, contrary to fundamental British values. Mr Lloyd would have been aware of the diverse profile of the pupils in his class as an experienced teacher and head of sixth form and should have delivered his lesson in a respectful way. However, the panel considered that Mr Lloyd instead chose to express his own negative view of the [REDACTED] by targeting comments at pupils to which he believed it directly related to. The panel found that Mr Lloyd's conduct demonstrated a lack of appreciation of diverse cultures and beliefs which reinforced discriminatory stereotypes and negatively impacted his pupils.

The panel therefore found allegation 2 proven.

3. On or around January 2023, you failed to follow the correct safeguarding procedure and/or ensure appropriate action was taken to safeguard Pupil X in that;

- a) you did not seek advice from the Designated Safeguarding Lead before you discussed the disclosure with Pupil X;**
- b) you contacted [REDACTED] and made a referral without seeking advice and/or permission from the Designated Safeguarding Lead;**
- c) you did not log any of the concerns or actions on My Concern until you were asked to do so by the Designated Safeguarding Lead.**

In the Statement of Agreed Facts, Mr Lloyd admitted that he did not seek advice from the designated safeguarding lead ("DSL") before discussing a [REDACTED] disclosure with Pupil X, nor did he log the concerns or actions on My Concern until he was asked to do so by the DSL.

Mr Lloyd also admitted in the Statement of Agreed Facts that he suggested to Pupil X a referral to [REDACTED] and made a call to [REDACTED] discussing a referral which he then made online.

Mr Lloyd further admitted in the Statement of Agreed Facts that he failed to follow the correct safeguarding procedure and to ensure appropriate action was taken to safeguard Pupil X. Mr Lloyd accepted that he was familiar with the correct procedures to be followed, including that once a concern is raised, it should be logged on My Concern and reported to the DSL so that they can manage the situation appropriately given they are the qualified person to do so.

The panel considered an email dated 1 June 2023 from Mr Lloyd to another staff member at the School which outlined in detail the steps he took after he became aware that Pupil X had made a disclosure of a [REDACTED]. Mr Lloyd's email explained:

- A member of staff informed Mr Lloyd of Pupil X's disclosure and informed Mr Lloyd that a My Concern entry had been completed;
- Later that day, Pupil X repeated the disclosure directly to Mr Lloyd. In response, Mr Lloyd suggested that Pupil X should tell her [REDACTED] and that organisations were available to help her;
- Pupil X said that she was aware of the organisation [REDACTED] and Mr Lloyd said that he could refer her if she wanted, and Pupil X asked him to do that. Mr Lloyd thereafter called [REDACTED] and filled in an online referral form;
- Following the referral, Mr Lloyd emailed the DSL to let her know about the conversation with Pupil X; and
- Mr Lloyd then logged his actions on My Concern following a request from the DSL to do so.

The above actions outlined in the email were consistent with the position set out by Witness A and Witness C in their written and oral evidence.

In her written statement dated [REDACTED] 2023, Witness A stated that the DSL came and spoke with her following an email from Mr Lloyd as this was the first time the DSL was aware of the disclosure. Witness A and the DSL then went to clarify the situation with Mr Lloyd, whereby they outlined to him the seriousness of not following the correct procedures following a disclosure of [REDACTED] and asked that he log his actions on My Concern "urgently".

In her written statement dated [REDACTED] 2023, Witness C stated that it was "not appropriate for Mr Lloyd to have a conversation with the student regarding the [REDACTED] as he doesn't have the appropriate level of safeguarding training for that" and he "should have spoken with the DSL". Additionally, Witness C stated that "it was not appropriate" for Mr Lloyd to make a referral to [REDACTED] as this "should have been a decision made by the DSL if they felt it was the correct course of action".

The panel was satisfied on the evidence that he did not seek advice from the DSL before he discussed a disclosure with Pupil X, he contacted [REDACTED] and made a referral without seeking advice from the DSL and he did not log any of the concerns or actions on My Concern until he was asked to do so by the DSL.

The panel considered the School's policy which outlined that all staff should identify emerging problems, liaise with the DSL and share information to support early

identification and assessment. The panel noted in particular, a flowchart contained in figure 1 of the policy, which illustrated the procedure to follow if someone had concerns about a child's welfare. The flowchart confirmed that the first step was to report the concern to the DSL and to complete a safeguarding concern report form. Thereafter, the DSL was to review the concern and action as appropriate. The policy further outlined that staff were required to record allegations on My Concern "and tell the DSL or deputy, but do not investigate it".

The School's policy also made clear that the statutory guidance set out in Part 5 of Keeping Children Safe in Education should be followed where there is an allegation of a [REDACTED].

Whilst the panel considered that Mr Lloyd was taking the safeguarding concern seriously by making an external referral, the panel noted that his actions were not in accordance with the procedure set out in the School's policy. The panel noted that the School's policy and training was robust and as an experienced teacher and senior member of staff, it was not acceptable for Mr Lloyd to deviate from procedure. This was particularly the case as a child's welfare was at the centre of the concern being dealt with.

The panel therefore found allegations 3(a), 3(b) and 3(c) proven.

The panel found the following particulars of the allegations against you not proved, for these reasons:

f) Replying to Pupil I with "so you're all not so bad after all" or using words to that effect;

In the Statement of Agreed Facts, Mr Lloyd admitted that he said, "so you're all not so bad after all" or words to that effect, following a comment from Pupil I who said, "we don't believe in killing anyone in the religion". Mr Lloyd further admitted that in making this comment his behaviour was inappropriate and/or unprofessional.

The panel considered the following hearsay statements from pupils, [REDACTED]:

- In a statement dated [REDACTED] 2024, Pupil E outlined that they heard Mr Lloyd say the words "you're all not that bad after all" in a conversation with Pupil I. Pupil E stated that these words were said by Mr Lloyd in response to Pupil I saying "we don't believe in killing in [REDACTED]".
- In a statement dated [REDACTED] 2022, Pupil E stated that Pupil I went to speak to Mr Lloyd following the lesson at 4pm, whereby Pupil I said, "we don't believe in killing anyone in the religion" and Mr Lloyd said "so you're all not so bad after all".

The panel noted that Pupil E's evidence was corroborated by Mr Lloyd's admission in the Statement of Agreed Facts. However, the panel were concerned that Pupil I, the

individual alleged to be part of the conversation with Mr Lloyd, had not corroborated this position. The notes of a meeting with Pupil I during the School investigation did not mention Mr Lloyd saying the words alleged.

The panel considered that none of the four witnesses gave evidence of Mr Lloyd saying the words alleged. Additionally, the hearsay evidence of Pupil E was undermined by the lack of supporting evidence from Pupil I, or any other pupils in the classroom. As such, the panel determined to place limited weight on Pupil E's evidence as it was not corroborated by other evidence. The panel was not satisfied on the evidence that Mr Lloyd said the words alleged to Pupil I.

The panel therefore found allegation 1(f) not proven.

g) Telling Pupil I “if I have offended you I am not sorry” or using words to that effect;

In the Statement of Agreed Facts, Mr Lloyd admitted that he said to Pupil I, who was not in the lesson but was informed of what had happened by other pupils, “if I have offended you I am not sorry” or words to that effect. Mr Lloyd further admitted that in making this comment his behaviour was inappropriate and/or unprofessional.

The panel considered Pupil H's witness statement dated [REDACTED] 2022 and [REDACTED] 2023. Pupil H stated in the earlier statement that Mr Lloyd “kept [Pupil B] back” and said to him “if I've offended you I'm not sorry”. Pupil H stated in the later statement, prepared for the TRA, that she heard a conversation between Pupil I and Mr Lloyd following the lesson whereby Mr Lloyd said he “wasn't going to apologise if he had offended him”.

The panel also considered Pupil C's witness statement dated [REDACTED] 2023, which was provided at the request of the TRA in connection with the proceedings. Pupil C stated that Pupil I relayed the conversation he had with Mr Lloyd, whereby Mr Lloyd told Pupil I that “he was not sorry for what he said” if he had caused any offence. The panel noted that Pupil C was not witness to the conversation, but heard about it from Pupil I after the event.

The panel considered the notes of the meeting with Pupil I, taken during the School's investigation. Pupil I stated that he went to speak with Mr Lloyd as he had become aware that Mr Lloyd had upset [REDACTED], Pupil K, during the honour killings lesson. Pupil I stated that he discussed the content of the honour killings lesson with Mr Lloyd following the lesson and their different interpretations of the [REDACTED]. Pupil I stated that he returned to speak with Mr Lloyd the next day and said he was unhappy that the pupils had not been given an apology. Pupil I further stated that, upon leaving the discussion, Mr Lloyd stated that he was “not going to apologise”. Pupil I outlined that he believed this was said as no further agreement would be possible.

The panel noted that there were inconsistencies in the evidence. Pupil H stated in her initial statement to the School that Mr Lloyd's words were said to Pupil B, whereas her later statement and that of Pupil C and Pupil I stated that the words were said to Pupil I. Additionally, the timing of the conversation between Pupil I and Mr Lloyd differed between Pupil H and Pupil I, as the former stated the conversation occurred straight after the lesson whereas the latter stated this occurred the following day.

The panel determined to place little weight on the evidence of Pupil C and Pupil I, as this was hearsay evidence which was not demonstrably reliable when considering other evidence before it, including the evidence of Pupil H. The panel was not satisfied on the evidence that Mr Lloyd said the words alleged to Pupil I.

The panel therefore found allegation 1(g) not proven.

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

Having found a number of the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to unacceptable professional conduct 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 Lloyd, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Lloyd 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
 - 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

- 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 Lloyd in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education (“KCSIE”).

The panel considered that Mr Lloyd was in breach of the following provisions:

- “If staff have a concern, they should follow their own organisation’s child protection policy and speak to the designated safeguarding lead (or deputy); and
- “Staff should not assume a colleague, or another professional will take action and share information that might be critical in keeping children safe”.

The panel also considered whether Mr Lloyd’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 did not find any of the offence types to be relevant to the conduct found proven at allegation 3. However, the panel found that the offence of intolerance on the grounds of race and religion was relevant to the conduct found proven at allegations 1(a) to (e), 1(h) and 2. The panel considered that Mr Lloyd’s comments were targeted at pupils of a particular background or belief which expressed stereotypical and discriminatory viewpoints.

Whilst Mr Lloyd’s proven conduct at allegations 1(a) to (e), 1(h) and 2 occurred within a short period of time, the panel considered Mr Lloyd’s conduct to be serious and more than a mere lapse of judgement. The panel noted that Mr Lloyd made several comments throughout the lesson to different pupils and sought to justify his beliefs as factual when questioned by the School.

The panel found that Mr Lloyd’s comments significantly impacted the pupils, causing them to be upset and distressed. The panel considered that the oral evidence from Witness A demonstrated the impact on the pupils as she stated that she had “never experienced anything like it before” and she was “quite taken aback by the emotions” of the pupils who were “distraught” and felt that Mr Lloyd had let them down.

In relation to allegation 3, the panel was also satisfied that Mr Lloyd’s conduct was serious. The panel noted that Mr Lloyd’s conduct was a clear breach of the School’s policy and the basic requirements of KCSIE, which delayed critical information being shared regarding a pupil’s welfare. As an experienced teacher and senior member of

staff, the panel determined that Mr Lloyd's conduct was a significant departure from the standards expected of him.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Lloyd as found proven at allegations 1(a) to (e), 1(h), 2 and 3 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 Lloyd was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Mr Lloyd'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 Lloyd'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 Lloyd was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found that the offence type of intolerance on the grounds of race and religion was relevant to the conduct found proven at allegations 1(a) to (e), 1(h) and 2. The panel did not find any of the offence types to be relevant to the conduct found proven at allegation 3.

The panel considered that Mr Lloyd's conduct as found proven at allegations 1(a) to (e), 1(h), 2 and 3 could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher. The panel was satisfied that the general public would view the comments made by Mr Lloyd to be inappropriate and unprofessional given the context of the learning material, the religious backgrounds of the pupils and the negative impact this had on the pupils thereafter. Additionally, the panel was satisfied that the general public would view Mr Lloyd's departure from safeguarding policy and procedure to be concerning, particularly given the potential impact on the pupil's welfare.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Lloyd'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 maintenance of public confidence in the profession;
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct; and
- the interest of retaining the teacher in the profession.

There was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of failing to following safeguarding procedure.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Lloyd 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 Lloyd 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 Lloyd in the profession. The panel decided that there was a public interest consideration in retaining the teacher in the profession, since no doubt had been cast upon his abilities as an educator and he is able to make a valuable contribution to the profession.

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 a high level of integrity and ethical standards at all times.

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 Lloyd.

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;
- 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;
- 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);
- actions or behaviours that undermine fundamental British values of democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty, and mutual respect and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs; and
- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour.

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

There was no evidence that Mr Lloyd's actions were not deliberate. There was also no evidence to suggest that Mr Lloyd was acting under extreme duress, such as a physical threat or significant intimidation.

The panel saw no evidence that Mr Lloyd demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or having contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel did not see any evidence that showed Mr Lloyd was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings or warnings.

Mr Lloyd did not provide any character references. However, the panel saw evidence of Mr Lloyd's good character and relied on the following statements in this regard:

- In her oral evidence, Pupil H stated that Mr Lloyd was "overall a good teacher". Pupil H also outlined in her written statement dated [REDACTED] 2023 that she thought Mr Lloyd was a "nice person";
- In her written statement dated [REDACTED] 2023, Pupil C stated that she "always had a positive opinion" of Mr Lloyd as he helped her to get her grades up and he "was a good teacher";
- In her written statement dated [REDACTED] 2023, Witness A stated that Mr Lloyd "had good interactions with pupils and staff"; and

- In her written statement dated [REDACTED] 2023, Witness C stated that Mr Lloyd was “liked by many students, particularly those who understood his sense of humour”.

The panel saw no evidence that Mr Lloyd was remorseful, or that he regretted his conduct. To the contrary, the panel noted that Mr Lloyd sought to justify the comments he made to pupils during his lesson by saying they were factual when questioned during the School’s investigation.

The panel noted that Mr Lloyd admitted all of the allegations in the Statement of Agreed Facts. However, the panel did not see any evidence that Mr Lloyd understood the nature and gravity of his misconduct or that he showed any empathy regarding the impact of his actions on others. Due to the lack of evidence regarding insight, the panel determined the risk of repetition to be significant.

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 Lloyd 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 Lloyd. The negative impact that Mr Lloyd’s comments had on his pupils, as well as the potential risk to Pupil X’s welfare, 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. None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel’s findings.

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. The panel considered that intolerance on the grounds of race and religion was engaged by its findings.

The panel noted that these lists are not intended to be exhaustive and that it should consider each case on its individual merits taking into account all the circumstances involved.

Whilst Mr Lloyd did not provide evidence of insight at this stage, the panel determined that there was scope for Mr Lloyd to reflect and learn from his behaviour in the future. This was on the basis that his proven conduct occurred within two isolated incidents. The panel considered that the views shared by Mr Lloyd during his lesson were firmly held, as they were repeated and justified by him. However, there was no evidence to show that he had made similar comments on other occasions. Neither had the panel seen evidence of Mr Lloyd failing to comply with safeguarding procedure on another occasion. There was also some evidence to support Mr Lloyd's general good character outside of these incidents. As such, the panel considered that it would be appropriate to provide Mr Lloyd with an opportunity for his prohibition order to be reviewed.

Notwithstanding the above, the serious nature of Mr Lloyd's conduct, the harm caused to his pupils, and the lack of any empathy at this stage, weighed in favour of a longer period before a review. The panel determined that this would provide Mr Lloyd with time to reflect and act on his misconduct.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provision for a 4 year 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. I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Alex Lloyd should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of four years.

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of intolerance on the grounds of race and religion and failing to follow correct safeguarding procedures.

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 Lloyd, 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, "There was a strong public interest

consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of failing to following safeguarding procedure.” 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 that Mr Lloyd admitted all of the allegations in the Statement of Agreed Facts. However, the panel did not see any evidence that Mr Lloyd understood the nature and gravity of his misconduct or that he showed any empathy regarding the impact of his actions on others. Due to the lack of evidence regarding insight, the panel determined the risk of repetition to be significant.” In my judgement, the lack of evidence 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 Lloyd were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of intolerance on ground of race or religion 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 Lloyd himself and the panel comment:

“The panel saw no evidence that Mr Lloyd demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or having contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel did not see any evidence that showed Mr Lloyd was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings or warnings.

Mr Lloyd did not provide any character references. However, the panel saw evidence of Mr Lloyd’s good character.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Lloyd 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 remorse. The panel has said, "The panel saw no evidence that Mr Lloyd was remorseful, or that he regretted his conduct. To the contrary, the panel noted that Mr Lloyd sought to justify the comments he made to pupils during his lesson by saying they were factual when questioned during the School's investigation."

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding that "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 Lloyd. The negative impact that Mr Lloyd's comments had on his pupils, as well as the potential risk to Pupil X's welfare, was a significant factor in forming that opinion."

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Lloyd 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 evidence of 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 a 4 year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments "Whilst Mr Lloyd did not provide evidence of insight at this stage, the panel determined that there was scope for Mr Lloyd to reflect and learn from his behaviour in the future. This was on the basis that his proven conduct occurred within two isolated incidents. The panel considered that the views shared by Mr Lloyd during his lesson were firmly held, as they were repeated and justified by him. However, there was no evidence to show that he had made similar comments on other occasions. Neither had the panel seen evidence of Mr Lloyd failing to comply with safeguarding procedure on another occasion. There was also some evidence to support Mr Lloyd's general good character outside of these incidents. As such, the panel considered that it would be appropriate to provide Mr Lloyd with an opportunity for his prohibition order to be reviewed."

The panel has also said that "Notwithstanding the above, the serious nature of Mr Lloyd's conduct, the harm caused to his pupils, and the lack of any empathy at this stage,

weighed in favour of a longer period before a review. The panel determined that this would provide Mr Lloyd with time to reflect and act on his misconduct.”

There is no doubt from the panel findings that the misconduct found proven was serious and had an impact on pupils, however in reaching my decision on review period I have also given significant weight to the following “The panel decided that there was a public interest consideration in retaining the teacher in the profession, since no doubt had been cast upon his abilities as an educator and he is able to make a valuable contribution to the profession.”

In this case, factors mean that allowing a two-year review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the serious nature of the findings and lack of evidence of full insight or remorse, which indicates a significant risk of repetition.

I consider therefore that a four review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

This means that Mr Alex Lloyd is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children’s home in England. He may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 08 October 2029, 4 years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If he does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Mr Lloyd remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr Alex Lloyd 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 stylized, cursive script.

Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey

Date: 2 October 2025

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