



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Miss Leanne Wilson: Professional conduct panel outcome**

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

**March 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	12
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	16

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

**Teacher:** Leanne Wilson

**TRA reference:** 23463

**Date of determination:** 14 March 2025

**Former employer:** Holbrook School for Autism

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 12 March 2025 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Leanne Wilson.

The panel members were Mr Peter Ward (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Lynn Seal (teacher panellist) and Ms Mona Sood (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Tania Dosoruth of Blake Morgan solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Matilda Heselton of Browne Jacobson solicitors.

Ms Wilson was present and was represented by Mr Nick Kennan Counsel instructed by the National Education Union.

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

## Allegations

The panel considered the allegation(s) set out in the notice of proceedings dated <date>.

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

1. She engaged in inappropriate and/or unprofessional behaviour, by;
  - a. Setting up an OnlyFans accounts under the alias Sophie Palmer and/or holding herself out as a teacher in which she advertised paid services including;
    - i. Providing sexually explicit photographs and/or videos of herself;
    - ii. Sexual interactions with subscribers via direct messages and/or chat functions;
    - iii. Rating subscribers penises;
    - iv. Sending underwear;
    - v. Having the ability to control her vibrator remotely;
  - b. Setting up an Instagram account under the alias Sophie Palmer which contained;
    - i. Sexually provocative images of herself wearing underwear;
    - ii. A link to the OnlyFans account at Allegation 1a. above.

Ms Wilson admitted the allegations and accepted that her conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

## Summary of evidence

### Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology – page 7

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 9 to 23

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 26 to 84

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 86 to 185

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 188 to 330

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 of Holbrook School for Autism Lane (“the School”); an

Witness B at the School

Ms Wilson also gave oral evidence and called the following witness

Witness C Ms Wilson’s former colleague and friend.

## **Decision and reasons**

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

Ms Wilson was employed at the School as a teacher from 20 April 2015. On 15 May 2023 a member of staff at the School reported to Witness A that they had found an Instagram account under the name of “Sophie Palmer” as a result of the “people you may know function” on Instagram. Screenshots of the account were taken by the School’s HR lead. Witness A recognised that it was Miss Wilson in the pictures and considered that the pictures were of an inappropriate nature.

The Instagram account contained a link to OnlyFans. When this link was opened by the School, the profile page for the account (which was also in the name of Sophie Palmer) included content which forms the basis of the allegations.

On 16 May 2023 Miss Wilson was suspended from her role and the Derbyshire County Council Local Authority Designated Officer (‘LADO’) was contacted. The School held an informal investigation meeting with Ms Wilson on 16 May 2023. Ms Wilson resigned on 26 May 2023 from the School. Despite the resignation a formal investigation meeting was held with Ms Wilson on 6 June 2023. The matter proceeded to a disciplinary hearing which took place on 11 July 2023. LADO did not take any further action in respect of Ms Wilson.

A referral was made to the TRA by the School on 25 March 2024.

## Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

The panel found the following particulars of the allegation(s) against you proved, for these reasons:

- 1. You engaged in inappropriate and/or unprofessional behaviour, by;**
  - a. Setting up an OnlyFans account under the alias Sophie Palmer and/or holding yourself out as a teacher in which you advertised paid services including;**
    - i. Providing sexually explicit photographs and/or videos of yourself;**

The allegation was admitted and was supported by evidence presented to the panel.

The panel heard evidence from Witness A and Witness B that Ms Wilson had admitted from the outset that the OnlyFans account belonged to her. Ms Wilson first admitted this during the informal investigation on 16 May 2023 and continued to admit that the account belonged to her at the formal investigation meeting and later during the disciplinary hearing in July 2023.

The panel was provided with screenshots of the OnlyFans profile page. The panel was not however provided with the content of the account.

Ms Wilson gave evidence to the panel that the “Sophie Palmer” OnlyFans page account belonged to her. Ms Wilson explained that she had set up the account in April 2022 at a time when she was extremely unwell. She explained that she had actively used it until around October 2022 after which time she became better and stopped her activity on it.

Ms Wilson stated that she had used content that was copied and pasted from another account for her profile page which meant that she had not actually intended to provide some of the services that were advertised on the profile page. Ms Wilson also clarified that she set up the OnlyFans account approximately two weeks after she set up the Instagram account.

Ms Wilson explained that she had interacted with only a small number of subscribers whilst she was actively using the OnlyFans account and that she had sent them images, but these had always been of her wearing underwear in a manner that did not show her face or make her immediately recognisable. Ms Wilson said that she had refused to send images or carry out any other activity which was of a more explicit nature and that this had resulted in her losing subscribers.

In considering the allegations, the panel noted that the stem of the allegation stated that Ms Wilson had held herself out to be teacher. The panel was satisfied that there was clear reference on the OnlyFans page to the profile belonging to a “Secondary School Teacher”.

The allegation was also worded so as to allege that Ms Wilson had advertised services as opposed to having provided them. In light of this the panel decided that it did not need to consider whether sexually explicit images and/or videos had actually been provided, only whether they were advertised.

The panel considered that there was a clear reference on the profile page to sexually explicit videos of a certain kind being available. In relation to the photographs, the panel was mindful that the photographs which were visible on the profile page, whilst provocative in nature, were not sexually explicit. However, the panel considered that the profile page as a whole offered sexually explicit services. Whilst there was no specific information as to the nature of the photographs offered, the services offered to subscribers included photographs via direct messaging. The panel considered as a result of the context of the page and the references to photographs being provided via direct messaging, that it was able to draw an inference that sexually explicit photographs were being advertised to potential subscribers.

The allegation was therefore found proved.

#### **ii. Sexual interactions with subscribers via direct messages and/or chat functions;**

The allegation was admitted and was supported by evidence presented to the panel. The panel noted that the screenshots of the profile page of the OnlyFans page made clear reference to subscribers being able to use direct messaging and/or 1:1 chats to contact Ms Wilson. Ms Wilson accepted that this service had been advertised as alleged.

The panel therefore found the allegation proved.

#### **iii. Rating subscribers penises;**

The allegation was admitted and was supported by evidence presented to the panel. The screenshots of the OnlyFans page contained reference to “ratings” with the picture of an aubergine emoji being offered. Witness B in his evidence to the panel confirmed that he had taken this to be a reference to “penises” as it was unlikely to have referred to anything else in this context.

Ms Wilson accepted that this was a reference to rating subscriber’s penises, and that it was well known that an aubergine emoji could be used to represent a penis. Ms Wilson also explained that she had advertised this service as a result of copying and pasting another profile page belonging to a different individual but said that she had not in fact ever carried out this service.

The panel decided that there was clear evidence that this service was being advertised on the profile page and the allegations were therefore found proved.

**iv. Sending underwear;**

The allegation was admitted and was supported by evidence presented to the panel. The screenshot of the OnlyFans page provided to the panel made references to selling with an underwear emoji.

Ms Wilson accepted that this was a reference to selling underwear on the profile page but stated that she had copied and pasted this content from another user's profile without any intention of actually acting on it.

The panel therefore found that this service was clearly advertised on the profile page and found this allegation proved.

**v. Having the ability to control her vibrator remotely;**

The allegation was admitted and was supported by evidence presented to the panel.

The screenshot of the OnlyFans profile page provided to the panel contained wording which offered subscribers the opportunity to control Ms Wilson's Bluetooth vibrator.

Ms Wilson admitted that this wording was on the profile page and that she had advertised this service but again explained that this content was in fact copied and pasted. Ms Wilson said that in reality she did not have such a device and therefore had no intention of actually acting on what was advertised on the profile page.

The panel decided that there was unambiguous wording on Ms Wilson's OnlyFans page which advertised this service. The panel therefore found this allegation proved.

**b. Setting up an Instagram account under the alias Sophie Palmer which contained**

**i. Sexually provocative images of yourself wearing underwear;**

The allegation was admitted and was supported by evidence presented to the panel.

Witness A gave evidence that he was able to identify that it was Ms Wilson from the screenshots of the Instagram page due to some of the pictures showing parts of her face. Witness A stated in his evidence that he considered the images on the Instagram account to be risky and potentially inappropriate.

Witness B also confirmed that Ms Wilson was identifiable from both her facial features and her tattoos, particularly those on her arms and fingers even though she had used a different name for the profile.



The panel were provided with screenshots of the Instagram account.

Ms Wilson gave evidence that she accepted that the Instagram account belonged to her. In her evidence Ms Wilson explained that she had set up the account two weeks before the OnlyFans page. She had done this at a time when she was very unwell and had thought “naively” that by using a different name and only posting pictures which showed some of her face that she would not have been recognisable.

The panel considered that it was not disputed that the “Sophie Palmer” account belonged to Ms Wilson. However, the panel noted that it was not clear that all of the pictures were of Ms Wilson. For example, some of the pictures showed only pictures of an individual’s cleavage in clothing, without any distinguishing features that would make the person identifiable. The panel also noted that a number of the pictures could not be said to be provocative. For example, the panel noted that some of the photographs just showed tattoos and in others fully clothed parts of the body which might be considered posed or artistic but not provocative.

However, two of the images showed part of Ms Wilson’s face which the panel accepted made her identifiable. The panel also noted Ms Wilson was wearing a bra in both of these images, and she was in a sexually provocative pose.

The panel therefore found this allegation proved on the basis of these two images.

## **ii. A link to the OnlyFans account at Allegation 1a. above.**

This allegation was admitted and found proved on the evidence presented.

The panel were provided with a screenshot of the “Sophie Palmer” Instagram account which contained a link to the Sophie Palmer OnlyFans account. Witness A also provided evidence that the member of staff who had first found the Instagram account had also reported that there was a link to an OnlyFans page on the account.

Ms Wilson admitted that the Instagram page belonged to her and that approximately two weeks later she had set up an OnlyFans account which had been linked to the Sophie Palmer Instagram account.

The panel considered that there was clear evidence of the link to the OnlyFans account on the Instagram account, and therefore the panel found this particular of the allegation proved.

Having found the factual particulars of the allegations proved the panel then considered whether the stem of the allegation, namely that Ms Wilson had engaged in inappropriate and/or unprofessional behaviour had been proved.

Ms Wilson accepted that her conduct had been inappropriate and unprofessional.

Ms Wilson's conduct in setting up the OnlyFans account which advertised paid services and the Instagram account which contained two sexually provocative images was in the panel's view clearly inappropriate and/or unprofessional. The panel was of the view that Ms Wilson's conduct was not appropriate or professional given her position as a teacher.

The panel accordingly found this part of the allegation proved.

### **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 Ms Wilson, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Ms Wilson 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
- 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.

The panel considered that Ms Wilson's conduct in posting two sexually provocative images on Instagram, as well as advertising paid services of a sexually explicit nature on the OnlyFans account was serious conduct which fell significantly short of the standard of behaviour expected of a teacher. The panel considered that Ms Wilson's actions fell significantly short of the requirement to maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour and that she acted without professional regard to the policies of the School.

The panel noted for example the School's Code of Conduct which stated that staff were responsible for their own actions and behaviour and that everyone expected high standards of behaviour from School staff. The Panel was of the view that the sexual nature of the content that was posted by Ms Wilson on Instagram as well as the advertised services offered on OnlyFans was not in keeping with the high standards of behaviour expected from teachers.

The panel was mindful of the fact that the allegations took place outside the education setting and that there was no evidence that Ms Wilson's conduct had affected the way in

which she had fulfilled her teaching role. The Panel had regard to the evidence from both Witness A and Witness B which confirmed that Ms Wilson was a good teacher who was able to positively influence the students including those that had more challenging needs. The panel also took into account the evidence that she had formed good relationships with parents and colleagues alike. The panel also considered the numerous detailed and positive testimonials from colleagues, parents and letters from pupils that attested to Ms Wilson being a well-regarded teacher.

The panel also considered that there was no evidence to suggest that any students or parents had seen the “Sophie Palmer” Instagram account or the OnlyFans account which would have also required a paid subscription to access the full content.

However, the panel balanced this against the fact that whilst it was not known how the Instagram account was found, it had been found by a member of staff who was able to identify Ms Wilson from the posts on the account. From that account, the OnlyFans page could be found using the link.

The panel noted that the Instagram account was not set up as a private account and could therefore be accessed by anybody. Although the content of the OnlyFans account could only be accessed by subscribers, the Panel noted that it had been possible to see the profile page in which Ms Wilson held herself out to be a secondary school teacher.

The Panel also noted that whilst Ms Wilson had now deleted both accounts, this had only occurred after some time once the School had become aware of the accounts. The panel could not therefore completely discount the possibility that some of the content from the accounts had been reproduced and remained in circulation despite Ms Wilson’s attempts to prevent this.

As a result of the above, the Panel considered that there was no evidence that any student or parent had seen either of the accounts. There was nonetheless a risk that the Instagram account which linked to the OnlyFans account could have been found by students. Given the sexually explicit content on the OnlyFans account and the sexually provocative posts on the Instagram account, the panel considered that this may have then led to students being exposed to, or influenced by, the behaviour in a harmful way.

For this reason, the panel was of the view that Ms Wilson’s actions amounted to serious misconduct and that despite the conduct taking place outside of the School setting, it also amounted to unacceptable professional conduct.

Having considered that Ms Wilson’s conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct, the panel went on to consider whether Ms Wilson’s ill health at the time was of such a nature that she could not be considered to have been responsible for her conduct and/or held morally culpable for the way in which she had acted.

[REDACTED].

As a result of the circumstances described above, the panel did not have sufficient evidence before it to conclude that Ms Wilson could not be held responsible or morally culpable at all for her actions due to her ill health. The panel accepted that Ms Wilson's health was likely to be a mitigating factor to her conduct, but it was unable to conclude on the evidence that her ill health exonerated her conduct entirely.

The panel therefore found that Ms Wilson's conduct amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Ms Wilson'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.

The panel considered that its 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 and could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher. This was due to the nature of the allegations found proved which involved posting images that were of sexually provocative nature on Instagram and advertising paid, sexually explicit content on OnlyFans account which referenced Ms Wilson being a secondary school teacher. The panel was of the view that such conduct could undermine the public's perception of a teacher where teachers were supposed to be considered role models and that it had the potential to undermine confidence in the teaching profession as a whole.

For these reasons, the panel found that Ms Wilson'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 that the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct were relevant in this case

The panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Wilson were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession. This was due to the nature of the allegations that had been found proved, which involved posting sexually provocative content on Instagram and set up an OnlyFans account which advertised sexually explicit services to subscribers.

The panel was also of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession given the nature of Ms Wilson's conduct.

In addition to the public interest considerations set out above, the panel went on to consider whether there was a public interest in retaining Ms Wilson in the profession.

The panel was mindful of the evidence before it which attested to Ms Wilson being a good teacher. This included evidence from Witness A, Witness B and Witness C. All of the witnesses had provided evidence that Ms Wilson was able to positively influence students with challenging needs to bring the best out of them in a special educational needs environment.

All of the witnesses also attested to Ms Wilson forming positive relationships with parents as well as students and that she worked well with her colleagues as part of team which in turn enabled positive outcomes for all concerned. This was despite her working in a challenging environment, and in spite of any challenges that Ms Wilson herself was facing as a result of her [REDACTED].

The panel decided that as a result of all of the above there was a strong public interest in retaining Ms Wilson as teacher which would need to be balanced against the other public interest considerations that the panel had identified.

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 Ms Wilson.

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, the panel decided that the only behaviours that were relevant in this case were:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;

- Online misconduct.

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 which could indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

As noted in its factual findings, Ms Wilson admitted that she had set up the Instagram and OnlyFans accounts. She had been open and honest about her conduct from the very outset, and at no stage had she attempted to minimise or detract from the severity of what she had done.

The panel was of the view that Ms Wilson had also demonstrated a high degree of insight into why her conduct was wrong and the impact that it could have on the reputation of the profession. In her evidence, Ms Wilson also expressed regret and remorse for what she had done which the panel found to be genuine.

Ms Wilson had suffered from a number of serious [REDACTED] conditions for a significant period of her life. The panel noted that Ms Wilson had disclosed her conditions to the School at the time that she applied for her position, and that at no time had she sought to conceal that she suffered from these conditions. The School had made accommodations to allow her to attend treatment sessions, and for a significant period of time, Ms Wilson's conditions were managed well and did not impact on her teaching ability. To the contrary, the evidence clearly showed that Ms Wilson was a good teacher.

The panel noted that there were a series of events which led to the allegations occurring which began with the assault by a student on Ms Wilson in September 2021. The panel accepted Ms Wilson's account that she was extremely unwell at this time [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. It was in this context that both the Instagram account and the OnlyFans account were set up. The panel considered that whilst Ms Wilson's [REDACTED] did not wholly exonerate her conduct, it was a significant factor which led to her doing what she did, and it is highly unlikely that she would have acted as she had if she had not been ill at the time.

Ms Wilson's conduct was not momentary or done on impulse, however the panel were nonetheless of the view that this was a one-off episode in Ms Wilson's life and that she had shown insight into what had led to this occurring. The panel noted that Ms Wilson had reflected on what had occurred and why. Going forward, she had also devised better coping strategies in the event that she were faced with a similar situation. These included her having more of a support network in place as well as the changes to her medication and treatment as outlined in the medical evidence presented to the panel. As a result, the panel considered that the risk of Ms Wilson repeating her conduct was low.

The panel also considered the evidence before it which attested to Ms Wilson's ability as a teacher. The panel took into account the evidence from Witness C who described Ms

Wilson's "natural" ability in teaching students with challenging needs and her ability to form positive relationships with students regardless of how challenging their needs were.

The panel also gave careful consideration to the positive testimonials that it had seen from parents, former colleagues and former students, all of which spoke highly of Ms Wilson's teaching abilities. For example, the panel noted the following comments from the testimonials received from the parents of former students which spoke of the impact that Ms Wilson had as a teacher:

*"For the year that she taught him, she developed a close therapeutic relationship with him, nurtured his self-confidence and was an integral part of his transition to adulthood.... she was one of the few people outside of our family that really understood and could bring out the best in [him]....to lose such an inspiring, motivational and passionate teacher would be a huge loss to the special needs community"*

*"Our son has Autism and ADHD, challenging behaviour, learning disabilities and diabetes and Leanne has always hit the ground running and taken everything in her stride. She is a confident, competent teacher who communicates well with students and parents, she is the kind of teacher who thinks outside of the box and is prepared to give her all for a positive outcome..."*

The panel also had regard to the testimonial received from a former pupil taught by Ms Wilson:

*"I am 25 years old, and have my own career as a dental nurse....I would like to state that it was my decision to contact Ms Wilson, as I wanted to thank her for the profound impact she made to my mental health and wellbeing during the most challenging periods of my adolescence.*

*In my opinion Ms Wilson's commitment to her students goes beyond academics. She is deeply invested in personal growth and well-being, building strong relationships founded on trust and respect.....It is rare to find an educator as dedicated and impactful as Ms Wilson..."*

The panel also had regard to the testimonials from former colleagues of Ms Wilson such as the following:

*"I was so inspired by the way Ms Wilson not only taught but de-escalated many volatile situations. As this was my first contract with EBD pupils I learned so much from Ms Wilson and felt such support from her. She has outstanding capacity to read people, and frequently it was her with such a powerful talent for communicating with her eyes that would guide me through restraint procedures, frequently putting herself at risk rather than me or the student in order to restore calm as swiftly and efficiently as possible without the need to always be talking"*

*“When I started, Lea was already known for working with some of the most difficult pupils at Holbrook; pupils that others had refused to work with because of the violence that they could show. During my time at Holbrook, myself, Lea and others had trips to the hospital due to incidents with pupils. However, Lea never gave up on these children, she never took the easy way out and gave into unhealthy demands that would further embed their behavioural challenges just to get a calmer or safer day. Lea always put their long-term interests first, above her own safety and needs. She would be the one to put herself in danger before others, when attempting to keep pupils and staff safe. Because of this, and the strong commitment she demonstrated to those pupils, pupils that would easily have spiralled into more troubled and challenged individuals instead became safer, healthier and happier. This translated not only into better lives for themselves but for the families who benefited from a much greater quality of time with their children”.*

In light of all of the above, 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, the recommendation of no prohibition order would be both a proportionate and an appropriate response.

Although the panel recognised the severity of Ms Wilson’s behaviour, the panel was of the view that this had to be balanced against the significant and compelling mitigation that was present in this case. Whilst Ms Wilson’s behaviour was serious, the panel considered that her actions were not of the kind which were incompatible with being a teacher.

The panel considered that the publication of the adverse findings it had made was sufficient to send an appropriate message to Ms Wilson as to the standards of behaviour that are not acceptable. The panel also considered that publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession whilst balancing the public interest in retaining Ms Wilson in the profession given the demonstrable and positive impact that she had had as a teacher.

## **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 sanction.

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 Miss Leanne Wilson should not be the subject of a prohibition order. The panel has recommended that the findings of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute should be published and that such an action is proportionate and in the public interest.

In particular, the panel has found that Miss Wilson 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
- 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.

The panel finds that the conduct of Miss Wilson fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

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 Miss Wilson, 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:

“...the Panel considered that there was no evidence that any student or parent had seen either of the accounts. There was nonetheless a risk that the Instagram account which linked to the OnlyFans account could have been found by students. Given the sexually explicit content on the OnlyFans account and the sexually provocative posts on the Instagram account, the panel considered that this may have then led to students being exposed to, or influenced by, the behaviour in a harmful way.”

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 was of the view that Ms Wilson had also demonstrated a high degree of insight into why her conduct was wrong and the impact that it could have on the reputation of the profession. In her evidence, Ms Wilson also expressed regret and remorse for what she had done which the panel found to be genuine.”

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 that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Wilson were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession. This was due to the nature of the allegations that had been found proved, which involved posting sexually provocative content on Instagram and set up an OnlyFans account which advertised sexually explicit services to subscribers.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding that Miss Wilson had posted two sexually provocative images on Instagram and advertised paid services of a sexually explicit nature on a OnlyFans account 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 Miss Wilson herself. The panel has commented:

“The panel was mindful of the evidence before it which attested to Ms Wilson being a good teacher. This included evidence from Witness A, Witness B and Witness C. All of the witnesses had provided evidence that Ms Wilson was able to positively influence students with challenging needs to bring the best out of them in a special educational needs environment.”

“All of the witnesses also attested to Ms Wilson forming positive relationships with parents as well as students and that she worked well with her colleagues as part of team which in turn enabled positive outcomes for all concerned. This was despite

her working in a challenging environment, and in spite of any challenges that Ms Wilson herself was facing as a result of her [REDACTED]”.

The panel also noted that it had considered a number of positive testimonials from parents, former colleagues and former students, all of which spoke highly of Ms Wilson’s teaching abilities.

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s findings concerning the high degree of insight that Miss Wilson had shown into her conduct and the low risk of repetition. The panel has said:

“Ms Wilson’s conduct was not momentary or done on impulse, however the panel were nonetheless were of the view that this was a one-off episode in Ms Wilson’s life and that she had shown insight into what had led to this occurring. The panel noted that Ms Wilson had reflected on what had occurred and why. Going forward, she had also devised better coping strategies in the event that she were faced with a similar situation. These included her having more of a support network in place as well as the changes to her medication and treatment as outlined in the medical evidence presented to the panel. As a result, the panel considered that the risk of Ms Wilson repeating her conduct was low.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the panel’s comment:

“Although the panel recognised the severity of Ms Wilson’s behaviour, the panel was of the view that this had to be balanced against the significant and compelling mitigation that was present in this case. Whilst Ms Wilson’s behaviour was serious, the panel considered that her actions were not of the kind which were incompatible with being a teacher.”

For these reasons, I have concluded that a prohibition order is not proportionate or in the public interest. I consider that the publication of the findings made would be sufficient to send an appropriate message to the teacher as to the standards of behaviour that were not acceptable and that the publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession.

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

**Decision maker: David Oatley**

**Date: 17 March 2025**

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