



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Mark Overland: Professional conduct panel hearing outcome

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

October 2025

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	18
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	22

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

Teacher:	Mr Mark Overland
Teacher ref number:	0319753
Teacher date of birth:	13 August 1975
TRA reference:	17297
Date of determination:	10 October 2025
Former employer:	King Harold Business and Enterprise Academy, Waltham Abbey

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 8 to 10 October 2025 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Mark Overland.

The panel members were Mr Aidan Jenkins (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Olayinka Oshoko (teacher panellist) and Ms Sarah Daniel (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Rebecca Hughes of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Miss Jessica Bass of Capsticks LLP solicitors.

Mr Overland was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public, save that portions of the hearing were heard in private, and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 11 July 2025.

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

1. On or after 15 April 2018, during a modelling photoshoot with Person A at the [REDACTED] Hotel, [REDACTED]:
 - a) Used language of a sexual nature towards Person A on one or more occasions;
 - b) Caused Person A to take off her clothing on one or more occasions;
 - c) Asked Person A to allow you to perform oral sex on her;
 - d) Pulled Person A's underwear to one side;
 - e) Took intimate photographs of Person A;
 - f) Touched Person A's breasts and/or pulled at Person A's nipples;
 - g) Touched and/or attempted to touch Person A's vagina;
 - h) Told Person A to stand in the shower and simulated sexual activity with Person A and/or over clothing whilst in the shower.
2. His conduct as set out at paragraph 1 was sexually motivated.

Mr Overland made no admission of fact in respect of allegations 1(a), 1(b), 1(c), 1(d), 1(e), 1(f), 1(g), 1(h) and 2 prior to the hearing.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology, anonymised individual list and list of key people – pages 3 to 5

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 6 to 29

Section 3: TRA witness statements – pages 30 to 40

Section 4: TRA documents – pages 41 to 125

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 126

The panel was also provided with a video of a text message exchange between Mr Overland and Person A.

In addition, the panel had agreed to accept the following:

- Service bundle index – pages 127 to 233
- Addendum service bundle – pages 234 to 247

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

Witnesses

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

Person A

Person B

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 Overland commenced employment at King Harold Business and Enterprise Academy ('the School') on 12 March 2018.

On 11 April 2018, Mr Overland booked a room at the [REDACTED] Hotel [REDACTED] ('the hotel').

In April 2018, Mr Overland contacted Person A to arrange a modelling photoshoot via Instagram stating he already had a hotel room booked and a model had cancelled. Person A agreed to the photoshoot because she wished to build up her Portfolio and had been involved in previous shoots.

On 15 April 2018, Mr Overland communicated with Person A via text message to discuss their arrival at the hotel. Mr Overland checked into the hotel during the morning. Person A was dropped off by [REDACTED], and Mr Overland took her to the hotel room.

Mr Overland allegedly took photographs of Person A in the hotel room whilst she was wearing lingerie. During the shoot, Mr Overland allegedly made comments of a sexual nature to Person A and caused her to take off her clothing.

Mr Overland allegedly took photographs of Person A in the shower, and allegedly thrust his groin onto her bottom, simulating sexual activity whilst he was clothed. He allegedly moved her underwear to the side during the shoot and touched her vagina, in addition to touching her nipples. At the end of the shoot, Person A got changed, and Mr Overland allegedly knelt by the bed in the hotel room and asked Person A to let him perform oral sex on her in exchange for his jumper.

On 21 June 2018, the matter was referred to the TRA.

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 after 15 April 2018, during a modelling photoshoot with Person A at the [REDACTED] Hotel, [REDACTED], you:**
 - a. Used language of a sexual nature towards Person A on one or more occasions;**

The panel considered the screenshots of Instagram messages between Mr Overland and Person A. The panel noted in particular that Mr Overland had responded to Person A asking what he would like to see and how to do her hair and makeup with *“What would you like to see. Something I’ll like. Also, the lingerie”*.

The panel considered the record of the police interview with Person A and the Summary of the Interview with Person A dated 19 April 2018. Person A set out that Mr Overland had made the following comments to her whilst they were in a hotel room for a photoshoot:

- *“Do you watch porn?”*
- *“10 out of 10 would fuck”*

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Person A.

Person A stated in her written statement that Mr Overland first made contact with her by sending her a message on Instagram in April 2018. She stated that they chatted generally about photography, and Mr Overland said that he was due to do a photoshoot

with a model, but that they had cancelled, and asked her to replace them. Person A stated that she agreed to do portrait lingerie shoots.

Person A stated that she sent Mr Overland two messages asking what he would like to see and how he wanted her to do her hair and makeup. She stated that Mr Overland replied with 2 messages stating, *“what would you like to see”* and *“something I’ll like. And also the lingerie”*.

Person A stated that [REDACTED] drove her to the hotel on the day of the photoshoot. She stated that Mr Overland took her to the hotel room and that Mr Overland did not attempt any casual conversation and right at the start was asking her lots of questions about sex. Person A stated that these included questions she referred to in her handwritten note to the police. She stated that she told Mr Overland that [REDACTED] to try and put him off, but she could see that Mr Overland was clearly erect through his trousers and was the whole time.

Person A stated that Mr Overland made comments constantly throughout the shoot, such as *“make it look like you want to be fucked”*, *“imagine that you’re trying to impress a sexy woman and that you want to fuck her”*, *“really sexy, 10 out of 10”*, *“When do you masturbate?”* and *“would fuck”*.

Person A stated in her written statement that [REDACTED] and she froze during the photo shoot as she did not *“know how to react”* to Mr Overland touching her or how to cope with the situation. She wrote that she did not know him and what he would do if he was upset. [REDACTED].

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Person B.

The panel considered the written statement of Person B who stated that Person A told her that she had a photoshoot. She stated that Person A had taken part in these before, and she thought that this was arranged as usual through PurplePort.

[REDACTED]

The panel considered the letter from Mr Overland to the TRA dated 19 July 2018, whereby he denied the allegations.

The panel considered the transcript of the police interview with Mr Overland. Mr Overland informed the police during the interview that the shoot took place in a hotel room that he had booked and was a fashion to lingerie shoot.

The panel was satisfied that the photoshoot with Person A had taken place at the hotel, having considered the evidence, in particular the written statement of the hotel employee who confirmed that Mr Overland had made a booking for 15 April 2018 and had checked

in. The panel also noted the video of text messages between Person A and Mr Overland regarding arrival at the hotel.

The panel considered Person A to be a credible witness.

The panel noted that Person A had attended to give evidence, had also provided information to the police, and had no apparent motive to be untruthful, particularly given that Mr Overland was not previously known to her and was not her teacher.

The panel also noted the nature of Mr Overland's decision to contact Person A directly via Instagram, rather than through the secure and monitored PurplePort.

The panel found allegation 1(a) proven, on the balance of probabilities.

b. Caused Person A to take off her clothing on one or more occasions;

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Person A.

Person A stated in her written statement that Mr Overland asked her to "*lose the bra*". She stated that she was wearing her own clothes at this stage, but Mr Overland had brought some clothes with him, including see-through sheer lacy tops and a black lingerie set, part of which was a black leopard print thong. Person A stated that Mr Overland brought these out very shortly after they had got into the room. She stated that she put on the clothes.

Person A stated that she called [REDACTED] to tell her that she was okay. She stated that Mr Overland told her to tell [REDACTED] that she was alright. Person A stated that whilst she was on the phone, Mr Overland took her top off without warning, and she froze.

The panel considered the transcript of the police interview with Person A, where she had stated that Mr Overland told her to "*lose the bra*" and that this was consistent with her written statement.

The panel considered the transcript of the police interview with Person A, where she had stated that Mr Overland said she should call [REDACTED] to tell them she was fine and that he then started to take her top off and that she did not have anything underneath.

[REDACTED]

The panel considered the letter from Mr Overland to the TRA dated 19 July 2018, whereby he denied the allegations.

The panel considered the transcript of the police interview with Mr Overland. Mr Overland stated that Person A wore black underwear during the lingerie shots and jeans and a jumper during other shots. The panel noted that Mr Overland denied taking her bra off.

The panel considered Person A to be a credible witness and preferred her evidence over that of Mr Overland.

The panel noted that Person A had attended to give evidence, had also provided information to the police, and had no apparent motive to be untruthful, particularly given that Mr Overland was not previously known to her and not her teacher.

As at allegation 1(a), having considered the written statement of the hotel employee confirming Mr Overland had checked into the hotel, and having considered the video of text messages between Mr Overland and Person A regarding arrival at the hotel, the panel was satisfied that the photoshoot with Person A had taken place at the hotel.

The panel found, on the balance of probabilities, that Mr Overland had caused Person A to take off her clothes on more than one occasion during the photoshoot.

The panel found allegation 1(b) proven, on the balance of probabilities.

c. Asked Person A to allow you to perform oral sex on her;

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Person A.

Person A stated in her written statement that following the shoot in the shower bath, they returned to the main room with the bed and sofa. She stated that she went onto the bed to change back into her clothes. Person A stated that Mr Overland had brought a jumper with him, and he knelt by the bed and said words to the effect of *"I'll make you a deal, you can have the jumper if I can eat you out"*.

[REDACTED]

The panel considered the summary of the police interview with Person A dated 19 April 2018, which states that Person A stated that she could have a jumper if he could *"eat [her] out"*.

The panel considered the messages between Mr Overland and Person A. The panel noted that Mr Overland had responded to Person A that he had a *"grey jumper that [he] wants to get rid of lol"* and that *"[she] should have taken it ha-ha"*.

The panel also reviewed the police interview with Mr Overland, in which he acknowledged a conversation regarding a jumper. The police summary records Mr Overland stating: *"I offered her the grey jumper in lieu of the money the £40, she said no obviously because I still have it and I joked with her you should have kept it and you should have took it with you and she joked along."*

The panel considered the letter from Mr Overland to the TRA dated 19 July 2018, where he denied the allegations.

The panel considered Person A to be a credible witness and preferred her evidence over that of Mr Overland.

The panel noted that Person A had attended to give evidence, had also provided information to the police, and had no apparent motive to be untruthful, particularly given that Mr Overland was not previously known to her and was not her teacher.

As at allegation 1(a), having considered the written statement of the hotel employee confirming Mr Overland had checked into the hotel, and having considered the video of text messages between Mr Overland and Person A regarding arrival at the hotel, the panel was satisfied that the photoshoot with Person A had taken place at the hotel.

The panel found allegation 1(c) proven, on the balance of probabilities.

d. Pulled Person A's underwear to one side;

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Person A.

Person A stated in her written statement that, in between taking photos during an '*implied nude topless*' series of shoots, Mr Overland was using his hands to adjust and pull her knickers to one side so that half of her vagina, and sometimes all of her vagina, could be seen.

The panel considered the summary of the police interview with Person A, which stated that Person A told the police that Mr Overland was adjusting and pulling at her knickers, so half of her vagina could be seen while saying things like "*don't worry it won't be in the photos and the photos it is in will be between you and me*".

The panel considered the letter from Mr Overland to the TRA dated 19 July 2018, whereby he denied the allegations. The panel noted that Mr Overland was consistent in his denial of the allegations.

The panel considered the transcript of the police interview with Mr Overland. Mr Overland stated that he never touched Person A, and when asked whether he had moved her underwear, he stated "*no*".

The panel considered Person A to be a credible witness and preferred her evidence over that of Mr Overland.

The panel noted that Person A had attended to give evidence, had also provided information to the police, and had no apparent motive to be untruthful, particularly given that Mr Overland was not previously known to her and was not her teacher.

As at allegation 1(a), having considered the written statement of the hotel employee confirming Mr Overland had checked into the hotel, and having considered the video of

text messages between Mr Overland and Person A regarding arrival at the hotel, the panel was satisfied that the photoshoot with Person A had taken place at the hotel.

The panel found allegation 1(d) proven, on the balance of probabilities.

e. Took intimate photographs of Person A;

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Person A.

Person A stated in her written statement that Mr Overland took portrait lingerie shots with his camera whilst she was on the sofa. She stated that he took a variety of shots, from lots of angles, including a mixture of full body images and close-ups. Person A submitted that she could constantly hear the 'click' of Mr Overland's camera.

Person A stated that Mr Overland took around 30 portrait pictures in total. She stated that she wore a mixture of black lingerie and the see-through sheer clothing that he had provided to her. Person A stated that at one stage she was wearing a black thong with a leopard print and a see-through vest top as he was taking photos, and she remembered him putting the camera close to her chest as she was wearing a pink see-through top, and he took some photos.

Person A stated that they did a new series of shoots called 'implied nude topless' where the topless nude photos would be later edited so that the nudity was implied. She stated that Mr Overland continued to take photos of her from various angles whilst she was on the sofa and there was constant clicking on his camera.

Person A stated that the photos taken of her involved her doing sexual poses, such as spreading her legs and holding her chest.

The panel considered the transcript of the police interview with Mr Overland. Mr Overland stated that he took photographs of Person A and that she wore black underwear in the lingerie shots. Mr Overland also stated that he uploaded some of the photos to his computer the ones he thought he could salvage, and he ran out of disk space, he then decided to "*get rid of all of them, purge everything*".

Mr Overland also stated that Person A wanted to shoot "*more revealing things so things like perhaps sheer things that sort of stuff which was not necessarily what we agreed on*" at which point he was getting uncomfortable at the idea of what she wanted to shoot. Mr Overland stated that he had to make a decision to either stop the shoot and then explain to Person A's [REDACTED] why he did this or continue with the expectation that he was going to delete the images. The panel considered this implausible.

The panel considered the letter from [REDACTED], from [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] at Capsticks dated 8 September 2022 which stated that "*the suspect's phone was seized and downloaded but there were no messages found between the suspect and victim. His*

computer was also downloaded with no messages or images of the victim found. However, there were over a million images supporting he is a photographer doing portraits.”

The panel also considered the crime report which stated that all devices had been downloaded and graded and that there are no indecent images found neither can Person A's photos be found on them and that there were approximately 1.3 million images in total.

The panel also noted that it had not seen any photographs taken by Mr Overland.

The panel considered the definition of “*intimate photographs*” and concluded that this would include images taken of a person in their underwear. Given that Mr Overland admitted to taking photographs of Person A while she was in her underwear, the panel found that he had taken intimate photographs of her.

As at allegation 1(a), having considered the written statement of the hotel employee confirming Mr Overland had checked into the hotel, and having considered the video of text messages between Mr Overland and Person A regarding arrival at the hotel, the panel was satisfied that the photoshoot with Person A had taken place at the hotel.

The panel found allegation 1(e) proven, on the balance of probabilities.

f. Touched Person A's breasts and/or pulled at Person A's nipples;

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Person A.

Person A stated in her written statement that she was stood in the shower bath Mr Overland was constantly pulling and tugging at her nipples under her clothing. She stated that she was wearing a see-through top, and Mr Overland was going underneath her clothing to try and get her nipples erect. Person A stated that Mr Overland did this multiple times while they were in the bathroom and that it was painful.

The panel considered the transcript of the police interview with Person A, which stated that she said, “*He was constantly feeling her breasts saying things like they're definitely not A's, maybe B's going onto C's and pulling at her breast trying to get them erect*”.

The panel considered the letter from Mr Overland to the TRA dated 19 July 2018, in which he denied the allegations.

The panel considered the transcript of the police interview with Mr Overland. Mr Overland stated that he did not touch Person A's breasts but did touch her hair to move it as part of the shoot.

The panel considered Person A to be a credible witness and preferred her evidence over that of Mr Overland.

The panel noted that Person A had attended to give evidence, had also provided information to the police, and had no apparent motive to be untruthful, particularly given that Mr Overland was not previously known to her and was not her teacher.

As at allegation 1(a), having considered the written statement of the hotel employee confirming Mr Overland had checked into the hotel, and having considered the video of text messages between Mr Overland and Person A regarding arrival at the hotel, the panel was satisfied that the photoshoot with Person A had taken place at the hotel.

The panel found allegation 1(f) proven, on the balance of probabilities.

g. Touched and/or attempted to touch Person A's vagina;

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Person A. Person A stated that in between taking photos Mr Overland was using his hands to adjust and pull her knickers, and that as he did this his hand made contact with her vagina. She stated that Mr Overland did not ask to touch her.

Person A stated that Mr Overland was taking pictures of her whilst she was stood in the shower bath as part of the shoot. She stated that as she was stood in the shower bath, Mr Overland touched her upper thigh with his open palm hand and grabbed it. She stated that she was just wearing underwear at this stage and Mr Overland's hand came into contact with her vagina, and he moved her knickers to the side, but his hand was mainly on her thigh.

The panel considered the notes from the police interview with Person A, in which she described Mr Overland touching the middle part of her intimate area, though not the outer lips. She stated, she was wearing a black lace thong and he "*kind of had*" his fingers hooked under the underwear.

The panel considered the letter from Mr Overland to the TRA dated 19 July 2018, in which he denied the allegations.

The panel considered the transcript of the police interview with Mr Overland. Mr Overland stated that he did not touch Person A's vagina.

The panel considered Person A to be a credible witness and preferred her evidence over that of Mr Overland.

The panel noted that Person A had attended to give evidence, had also provided information to the police, and had no apparent motive to be untruthful, particularly given that Mr Overland was not previously known to her and was not her teacher.

As at allegation 1(a), having considered the written statement of the hotel employee confirming Mr Overland had checked into the hotel, and having considered the video of

text messages between Mr Overland and Person A regarding arrival at the hotel, the panel was satisfied that the photoshoot with Person A had taken place at the hotel.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel found that Mr Overland had touched Person A's vagina.

The panel found allegation 1(g) proven, on the balance of probabilities.

h. Told Person A to stand in the shower and simulated sexual activity with Person A and/or over clothing whilst in the shower.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Person A.

Person A stated in her written statement that Mr Overland asked her to go into the shower bath and to stand facing the wall. She stated that neither the shower nor bath were running. Person A stated that Mr Overland grabbed her from behind without warning and began 'dry humping her'. She stated that he grabbed her from behind, thrust his hips forward a few times so that his groin came into contact with her bottom. He was fully clothed.

The panel considered the summary of the police interview with Person A, which states that Mr Overland was saying to Person A things like "*ah don't do that pose it make me wanna*" while "*dry humping*" her.

The panel considered the letter from Mr Overland to the TRA dated 19 July 2018, in which he denied the allegations.

The panel considered the transcript of the police interview with Mr Overland, in which he denied the allegation. He stated, "*I was not in the bathroom. So, there was the doorway, I was outside the doorway [inaudible] distance between the two [inaudible].*" He acknowledged that Person A went into the shower but maintained that he did not enter the shower.

When asked whether he had entered the bathroom at any point with her, Mr Overland responded, "*Not into the shower, no. If anything, a step closer there has to be a distance because lenses do not work like that.*" "*I did not enter into the shower with her or without her. I never went in there.*"

He further stated, "*I will say it again, the only physical contact that would have been made is asking permission to move hair or a piece of clothing, and at no time, to my understanding, did I go into the shower with this person.*"

The panel noted that Mr Overland's evidence did not always appear consistent in this respect.

The panel considered Person A to be a credible witness and preferred her evidence over that of Mr Overland.

The panel noted that Person A had attended to give evidence, had also provided information to the police, and had no apparent motive to be untruthful, particularly given that Mr Overland was not previously known to her and was not her teacher.

As at allegation 1(a), having considered the written statement of the hotel employee confirming Mr Overland had checked into the hotel, and having considered the video of text messages between Mr Overland and Person A regarding arrival at the hotel, the panel was satisfied that the photoshoot with Person A had taken place at the hotel.

The panel found allegation 1(h) proven, on the balance of probabilities.

2. Your conduct as set out at paragraph 1 was sexually motivated.

The panel's attention was drawn to section 78 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003 and to the cases of *Sait v The General Medical Council [2018]*, *Basson v General Medical Council [2018]* and *The General Medical Council v Haris [2021]* by the legal adviser.

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

The panel was also mindful of the Court of Appeal's conclusion in *Haris*. The Court found in that case that, "[i]n the absence of a plausible innocent explanation for what he did, the facts spoke for themselves. A sexual motive was plainly more likely than not; I would go so far as to say that that inference was overwhelming."

As set out above, Mr Overland had conducted a photoshoot of Person A at a hotel, during which he had made comments of a sexual nature, touched Person A inappropriately by touching her breasts and vagina, had simulated sexual activity with her in the shower and had asked her to perform oral sex on him.

The panel noted Mr Overland's decision to contact Person A directly via Instagram rather than through PurplePort. The panel noted that this appeared to be an attempt to avoid detection, as PurplePort could monitor messages between Person A and Mr Overland, whereas messages via Instagram would not be monitored in the same way.

The panel reviewed the text message exchanges between Person A and Mr Overland and noted that Mr Overland had instructed Person A not to disclose what had been discussed during the photoshoot. The panel considered that such an instruction may not have been given had Mr Overland's conduct not been sexually motivated.

The panel considered that engaging in such behaviour was sexually motivated. The panel concluded that there was no plausible innocent explanation for Mr Overland's

conduct, and that there were various sexual events that occurred during his time in the hotel room with Person A. The panel noted in particular that Mr Overland had continued to make sexual comments and act inappropriately repeatedly during the time he was with Person A, and by asking to perform oral sex on Person A he was acting in a way to achieve sexual gratification.

The panel found that Mr Overland's conduct as found proven at allegation 1, was sexually motivated.

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 Overland, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel noted that Person A was [REDACTED] years old at the time and therefore a child. Mr Overland was aware of her age and knew she was of school age, and likely a pupil in some educational setting.

In considering this, the panel referred to the definition of “*pupil*” as encompassing children of any age being taught by qualified teachers across various educational environments, including post-16 education.

The panel also noted that Mr Overland had breached the School Policy, which required him to adhere to the Teachers’ Standards.

The panel also considered whether Mr Overland’s conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice. The Advice indicates that where behaviours associated with such an offence exist, a panel is likely to conclude that an individual’s conduct would amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel found that the offence of sexual communication with a child, and any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or pseudo photograph or image of a child, or permitting any such activity, including one-off incidents, was relevant.

The panel considered the definition of unacceptable professional conduct to being, *“misconduct of a serious nature, falling significantly short of the standard of behaviour expected of a teacher. Misconduct outside of the education setting will amount to “unacceptable professional conduct” only if it affects the way the person fulfils their teaching role or if it may lead to pupils being exposed to or influenced by the behaviour in a harmful way.”*

The panel noted that although allegations 1(a), 1(b), 1(c), 1(d), 1(e), 1(f), 1(g) and 1(h) took place outside the education setting, they were relevant to Mr Overland’s position as a teacher in that he had conducted a photoshoot of Person A who was [REDACTED] years old at the time, during which he had touched and spoken to Person A inappropriately.

The panel considered that this type of misconduct could be harmful to pupils, potentially exposing them to inappropriate behaviour or influencing them in a detrimental way.

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

In relation to whether Mr Overland’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 into account 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.

The panel noted that the definition of conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute is *“conduct that could potentially damage the public’s perception of a teacher, therefore bringing the teaching profession into disrepute. Misconduct outside of the education setting will be considered relevant only if the conduct displayed is of a serious nature and would likely have a negative impact on the public’s perception of the individual as a teacher, therefore bringing the teaching profession into disrepute”*.

The panel considered the serious nature of the facts found proven, namely, sexual contact and communication with a child and conduct that was sexually motivated. It concluded that such behaviour would bring the teaching profession into disrepute.

In considering the issue of disrepute, the panel also considered whether Mr Overland’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 Overland was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that the offence of sexual communication with a child and any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or pseudo photograph or image of a child, or permitting any such activity, including one-off incidents 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.

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

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

Panel’s recommendation to the Secretary of State

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

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be made, the panel had to consider whether it would be an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it would be in the public interest to do so. Prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have a punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely: the safeguarding and well-being 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 Overland, which involved using language of a sexual nature towards Person A, causing her to take her clothes off, asking her to allow him to perform oral sex on her, pulling her underwear, taking intimate photographs of Person A, touching Person A's nipples and vagina and simulating sexual activity with Person A during a modelling shoot at a hotel, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils.

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of inappropriate conduct with a child.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Overland was 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 Overland 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 Overland in the profession. Mr Overland provided no evidence to attest to his ability as a teacher. The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Overland 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 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.

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 Overland.

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; and
- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing, or publishing any indecent photograph or image, or indecent pseudo photograph or image, of a child, or permitting such activity, including one-off incidents.

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 Overland's actions were not deliberate. The panel again noted Mr Overland's choice to contact Person A via Instagram rather than through PurplePort and that this appeared to be a calculated attempt to avoid detection. The panel concluded that this decision was likely deliberate, as communications on PurplePort could be monitored, whereas messages sent via Instagram would not be subject to the same oversight.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Overland was acting under extreme duress.

Mr Overland did not demonstrate exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or having contributed significantly to the education sector.

Mr Overland did not submit any mitigation evidence. However, the panel took into account his letter to the TRA dated 19 July 2018, in which he expressed that he believed his unblemished teaching record, dating back to 2002, and his commitment to creating life changing opportunities for students would carry weight. The panel considered that Mr Overland further outlined the negative consequences he had experienced since becoming aware of the allegations, including exclusion from professional bodies, [REDACTED]. The panel noted that in this letter he stated that the imposition of an interim prohibition order would result in the loss of his job, irreparable damage to his exemplary teaching career, immediate loss of income, and further breakdown of his [REDACTED]. He also raised concerns about the length of the investigation, describing it as "*problematic*". The panel noted that it was not presented with any evidence demonstrating how he had contributed to the teaching profession, nor was there any evidence showing the impact this had on him.

The panel noted that Mr Overland wrote in the letter that he posed no threat to public safety, "*a position supported by the police*" decision to release him without conditions.

However, the panel could not substantiate that Mr Overland was not a risk as they had been provided with no evidence of this.

[REDACTED].

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

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings would be sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Overland 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 Overland. The seriousness of the conduct involving sexual misconduct with a child 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; and
- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or indecent pseudo photograph or image of a child, including one off incidents.

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. None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel's findings.

The panel noted that Mr Overland did not attend the hearing or engage in the TRA process and, therefore, it had no direct evidence of the insight into and remorse Mr Overland had for his actions, and the impact his conduct had on Person A. The panel considered the summary of the police interview and Mr Overland's response to the TRA regarding the allegations and found no indication from Mr Overland that he had shown any insight or remorse. In light of the panel's finding that there was no evidence of insight or remorse, it concluded that Mr Overland had not evidenced any learning from the incident and there remained a risk of his future repetition of similar conduct.

The panel also considered that there was a complete absence of professionalism and the need to safeguard pupils and himself in Mr Overland's decision to enter a hotel room alone with a child.

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

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

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

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

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

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by

- treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
- having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of sexually motivated conduct 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 or 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 Overland, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children and safeguard pupils. The panel has observed:

“In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Overland, which involved using language of a sexual nature towards Person A, causing her to take her clothes off, asking her to allow him to perform oral sex on her, pulling her underwear, taking intimate photographs of Person A, touching Person A's nipples and vagina and simulating sexual activity with Person A during a modelling shoot at a hotel, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils.”

A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which the panel has set out as follows:

"The panel noted that Mr Overland did not attend the hearing or engage in the TRA process and, therefore, it had no direct evidence of the insight into and remorse Mr Overland had for his actions, and the impact his conduct had on Person A. The panel considered the summary of the police interview and Mr Overland's response to the TRA regarding the allegations and found no indication from Mr Overland that he had shown any insight or remorse. In light of the panel's finding that there was no evidence of insight or remorse, it concluded that Mr Overland had not evidenced any learning from the incident and there remained a risk of his future repetition of similar conduct."

In my judgement, the lack of evidence of insight and 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 has observed:

"The panel considered the serious nature of the facts found proven, namely, sexual contact and communication with a child and conduct that was sexually motivated. It concluded that such behaviour would bring the teaching profession into disrepute."

I am particularly mindful of the finding of sexually motivated conduct 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 or 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 Overland himself. The panel has commented:

“Mr Overland did not demonstrate exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or having contributed significantly to the education sector.”

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel's comments concerning the seriousness of Mr Overland's behaviour which involved sexual misconduct with a child, and that it had not been provided with evidence that Mr Overland was not a risk to public safety. I have also placed considerable weight on the panel's findings on the lack of evidence of insight or remorse on the part of Mr Overland.

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

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

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

The panel has noted that the Advice indicates that the public interest will weigh in favour of not offering a review period in cases involving serious sexual misconduct, any sexual misconduct involving a child and taking indecent photographs of a child.

I have considered the panel's comments:

“The panel also considered that there was a complete absence of professionalism and the need to safeguard pupils and himself in Mr Overland's decision to enter a hotel room alone with a child.”

I have considered whether not allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the serious nature of the misconduct found proven, the lack of evidence of either insight or remorse, and the risk of repetition.

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

This means that Mr Mark Overland 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 Overland shall not be entitled to apply for restoration of his eligibility to teach.

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

Mr Mark Overland has a right of appeal to the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this order.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D Oatley', with a large, sweeping loop at the end.

Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 14 October 2025

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