



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **James Wall: Professional conduct panel outcome**

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

**November 2025**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Witnesses	6
Decision and reasons	6
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	25
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	30

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

**Teacher:** Mr James Wall

**Teacher ref number:** 3557513

**Teacher date of birth:** 29 March 1990

**TRA reference:** 22348

**Date of determination:** 18 November 2025

**Former employer:** Lucton School, Herefordshire

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 13 to 15 August 2025 at Cheylesmore House, 5 Quinton Road, Coventry, CV1 2WT, and 18 August, 20 October and 18 November 2025 by way of virtual hearing to consider the case of Mr James Wall.

The panel members were Mr Paul Hawkins (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Christine McLintock (teacher panellist) and Mr Richard Young (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Lucy Bishop of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Alex Mullen of QEB Hollis Whiteman, instructed by Kingsley Napley LLP solicitors.

Mr James Wall was present and was represented by Mr Thomas Buxton of Crucible Law.

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 21 May 2025.

It was alleged that Mr James Wall was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst working as Director of Music at Lucton School:

1. Between July 2022 – August 2022, Mr Wall:
  - a. asked Pupil A if he could follow her on Instagram;
  - b. exchanged private messages with Pupil A;
  - c. exchanged messages of a personal and/or sexual nature with Pupil A;
  - d. asked Pupil A to send him a photograph of herself;
  - e. Used a nickname for Pupil A so [REDACTED] did not find out that he was messaging her;
  - f. asked Pupil A to delete all of the messages exchanged and/or arranged for messages with Pupil A to be deleted; and/or
  - g. bought and/or gave Pupil A a present and/or birthday card.
2. Between around 2018 and August 2022, Mr Wall:
  - a. Shared information about his personal life and/or personal details with Pupil A;
  - b. Asked Pupil A about her relationships;
  - c. Told Pupil A about a friend who had a sexual relationship with their teacher, and said it was ok as the student was [REDACTED] at the time; and/or
  - d. Looked closely at Pupil A's outfits.
3. Between around 2018 and August 2022, Mr Wall touched Pupil A inappropriately, in that he:
  - a. Grabbed her waist with both hands;
  - b. Put his arm around her; and/or
  - c. Took insufficient care not to touch her breasts.
4. In or around 2018, Mr Wall:

- a. shared information about his personal life and/or personal details with Pupil B, a recent school-leaver;
  - b. added Pupil B on Facebook; and/or
  - c. exchanged messages of a personal and/or sexual nature with Pupil B.
5. Mr Wall's conduct at paragraphs 1a) – g) and/or 2a) – 2d) and/or 3a)-c) and/or 4a)-c) was sexually motivated.
6. Mr Wall's conduct at paragraphs 1b-1d) and/or 2a-d) and/or 3a)-c) and/or 4c) was of a sexual nature
7. Mr Wall's conduct at paragraph 1e) and/or 1f):
- a. Was dishonest; and/or
  - b. lacked integrity.

Mr Wall accepted that he carried out the acts as set out in allegations 1(a) to (d), (f) and (g), allegation 2(a) and 2(b), and allegation 4(b).

Mr Wall denied the allegations at 2(c) and (d) albeit he accepted that they could have taken place.

Mr Wall denied the allegations at 3(a)-(c) albeit he accepted that they could have taken place.

Mr Wall denied the allegations at 1(e), 4(a) and (c).

Mr Wall denied allegations 5, 6 and 7.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section 1: Chronology and anonymised pupil list – pages 5 to 7

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 8 to 17

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 18 to 34

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 35 to 499

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 500 to 598

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

In the consideration of this case, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession 2020, (the “Procedures”).

## **Witnesses**

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

Pupil A, Former-Pupil of Lucton School (“the School”);

Pupil B, Former-Pupil of the School; and

Witness C – [REDACTED]

Mr Wall also gave oral evidence.

## **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 Wall had been employed at the School since 1 September 2013 as a teacher.

On 27 August 2022, the School was contacted by the parents of Pupil A regarding alleged inappropriate text messages sent by Mr Wall to Pupil A.

On 31 August 2022, an investigation meeting was held between Mr Wall and the School. Mr Wall resigned from his position at the School.

On 12 September 2022, the disciplinary investigation was concluded.

The matter was referred to the TRA on 24 July 2023.

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

The panel was mindful that the burden of proof was upon the TRA to prove that it was more probable than not that the alleged incidents had occurred.

The panel confined its deliberations to the allegations in question.

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

**1. Between July 2022 and August 2022, you:**

**a. Asked Pupil A if you could follow her on Instagram**

The panel heard from Pupil A that Mr Wall sent the “request” to follow her on Instagram on the last day of term. Pupil A’s witness statement also noted that she recalled driving out of School on 7 July 2022, on the last day of term, when she received a friend request from Mr Wall on Instagram.

The note of the meeting between Mr Wall and the [REDACTED] stated:

*“[REDACTED]: You asked to follow [Pupil A] on Instagram*

*JW: Yes.”*

In Mr Wall’s statement, he stated at paragraph 23:

*“...I accept that I did request to follow her on Instagram”.*

The panel noted that it had not been provided with any message from Mr Wall specifically asking Pupil A if he could follow her on Instagram.

Mr Wall admitted allegation 1(a).

On the balance of probabilities, the panel found that this allegation had been proven.

**b. exchanged private messages with Pupil A**

In respect of this allegation, the panel noted that Mr Wall had admitted allegation 1(b).

The panel heard from Pupil A and Mr Wall that they had exchanged messages.

The panel had sight of some of the messages exchanged between Mr Wall and Pupil A. The panel considered the screenshot showing messages exchanged between Mr Wall and Pupil A at 11:02pm. While the screenshot was not dated, the panel noted that there was no dispute between the parties that the message was sent on 16 August 2022.

The panel appreciated that the screenshot did not represent the extent of the messages exchanged between Mr Wall and Pupil A but were satisfied that it demonstrated that Mr Wall had exchanged private messages with Pupil A given the screenshot was of a chat between just the two of them, rather than a chat with other individuals. The panel also considered the School’s interview notes between the [REDACTED] of the School and Mr Wall dated 31 August 2022 during which Mr Wall was asked whether he messaged Pupil A privately. Mr Wall’s response was recorded as:

*“Yes I thought that as she had left that it was ok and it was banter. It is a grey area.”*

The panel exercised caution when considering the interview notes given that it was not clear how the interview was recorded given that only Mr Wall and the [REDACTED] were present. It was therefore unclear whether the [REDACTED] recorded the minutes at the time of the interview or did so after the event, and if so, how much time passed. The panel was also not able to test the accuracy of the interview notes during cross-examination [REDACTED]. Nevertheless, the panel noted that Mr Wall’s position at that time is consistent with him having admitted this allegation.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel found that this allegation had been proven.

### **c. Exchanged messages of a personal and/or sexual nature with Pupil A**

The panel noted that Mr Wall had admitted allegation 1(c).

The panel considered the School’s interview notes between the [REDACTED] and Mr Wall dated 31 August 2022. The notes read:

*“[REDACTED]: Now, there were other texts that refer to you and [REDACTED], are these [sic] true*

*JW: Nods*

*[REDACTED]: The bit about fulfilment*

*JW: Nods*

*[REDACTED]: The bit about gratification*

*JW: Nods*

*[REDACTED]: The bit about [REDACTED] sex*

*JW: Nods [breaks down cries hits own head]”*

The panel also heard evidence from Pupil A about the nature and content of the messages sent by Mr Wall in relation to considering [REDACTED], which the panel considered to be of a personal and sexual nature. While Mr Wall disputed sending the message as a proposition to Pupil A, Mr Wall did confirm during his oral evidence that he did send a message in relation to [REDACTED] to Pupil A.

The panel noted, therefore, that it had documentary evidence of actual messages of a personal and sexual nature. The panel also had evidence which described the messages as being personal and sexual in nature.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel found that this allegation had been proven.



**d. asked Pupil A to send you a photograph of herself;**

The panel noted that Mr Wall had admitted allegation 1(d).

The panel heard evidence from Pupil A that Mr Wall was quite adamant that he wanted a picture of her wearing a pair of earrings that he had given to Pupil A as a present for her [REDACTED] birthday. While Mr Wall did not accept that he was 'adamant' when requesting a photograph, he did admit during the hearing that he asked for a photograph of Pupil A.

The bundle did not include the photograph of Pupil A and neither Pupil A nor Mr Wall could remember if a photograph was sent. However, the panel found that Mr Wall had made the request of Pupil A.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel found that this allegation had been proven.

**f. asked Pupil A to delete all of the messages exchanged and/or arranged for messages with Pupil A to be deleted**

The panel noted that Mr Wall had admitted allegation 1(f).

The panel noted that in Pupil A's police interview she stated:

*"The following morning I replied saying 'it's ok', and he messaged asking me to delete all the messages, so I did. I felt shocked and horrified by what had happened."*

In Pupil A's statement prepared for the TRA, and during oral evidence, Pupil A stated that she could have been the one to suggest deleting the messages. In her witness statement, Pupil A stated:

*"I cannot be completely sure either way who suggested to delete the messages as it was two years ago and something I have tried to forget, but it is more likely that I suggested the messages were deleted as it made me feel like I had done something wrong and I would get in trouble for it."*

The panel heard from Mr Wall that he asked Pupil A to delete all of the messages exchanged. The panel also heard from Mr Wall that he was embarrassed by the content of the messages so deleted them on his device.

The panel also noted that during the meeting with the [REDACTED], it is recorded that Mr Wall had said that he asked Pupil A to delete all of the messages, which is consistent with the evidence Mr Wall gave to the panel.

The panel noted that the messages between Mr Wall and Pupil A were deleted.

The panel also heard from Mr Wall that he changed the chat settings on his phone so the messages were set to delete after 24 hours. Mr Wall stated that he remembered changing the settings when he “panicked” but could not remember how he did so and did not mean to do it.

Based on the evidence available, the panel found that it was more probable than not that Mr Wall asked Pupil A to delete the messages and, given his changing of the chat settings, also arranged for the messages with Pupil A to be deleted.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel found that this allegation had been proven.

**a. bought and/or gave Pupil A a present and/or birthday card**

The panel noted that Mr Wall had admitted allegation 1(g).

The panel heard evidence from Pupil A, Witness C and Mr Wall that earrings and a card were given to Pupil A by Mr Wall.

While there appears to have been some confusion initially, with Pupil A’s [REDACTED] referring to the present as a necklace rather than a pair of earrings, the panel considered that it was more probable than not that the present was a pair of earrings.

The note of the interview with the [REDACTED] contains the following:

“[REDACTED]: *What about the earrings?*”

*JW: Well they [REDACTED] have bought [REDACTED] loads of things and I felt guilty [Why?] Well guilty is the wrong word. I wanted to say thank you.*

[REDACTED]: *Did [REDACTED] know? I understand that they cost around £120*

*JW: Well not quite more like £80*

[REDACTED]: *Quite a lot. I understand that [REDACTED] told you to send them back but you bought them anyway and got [REDACTED] to pick them up?*

*JW: Yes”*

The panel considered Mr Wall’s evidence that the present was given to Pupil A for her [REDACTED] birthday, but also as a result of [REDACTED].

The panel also heard from Mr Wall that [REDACTED], upon becoming aware of the value of the present, told Mr Wall to send the present back as it was too expensive. Mr Wall advised that he did send the present back but then re-ordered it and arranged for it to be delivered to the School. Mr Wall did not tell [REDACTED] during this conversation that the present was not for her.

Mr Wall also confirmed during his oral evidence that he asked Pupil A's [REDACTED] for permission to give her the present, after it had been purchased.

The panel heard evidence from Pupil A that upon receiving the present she looked up the value of it, and that she often looked at the value of presents. Pupil A stated in her witness statement that the present cost approximately £122. During her oral evidence, Pupil A stated while [REDACTED] did give Mr Wall's [REDACTED] presents, the value of the earrings surpassed the value of any present Pupil A's [REDACTED] had given.

The panel noted that Mr Wall did disagree with the value of the present, stating in his statement that the cost was in the region of £90-£100.

Therefore, while the panel heard contradicting evidence as to the value of the present, there was no dispute that Mr Wall bought and gave Pupil A a present.

The panel was presented with very little evidence as to whether Mr Wall bought and/or gave Pupil A a birthday card. During her oral evidence, Pupil A stated that she may have received a birthday card but could not remember.

However, given the "and/or" wording contained in the allegation, the panel found that this allegation had been proven in that it was satisfied that Mr Wall had given Pupil A a present.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel found that this allegation had been proven.

## **2. Between around 2018 and August 2022, you:**

### **a. Shared information about your personal life and/or personal details with Pupil A**

The panel noted that Mr Wall had admitted allegation 2(a).

The panel heard from Pupil A that the content of her conversations with Mr Wall were personal in nature. Pupil A stated orally and in her statement that Mr Wall had told her that he had never received [REDACTED].

[REDACTED]

The panel also considered the interview notes from the meeting with the [REDACTED] during which Mr Wall confirmed that he had exchanged texts with Pupil A relating to [REDACTED].

On the balance of probabilities, the panel found that this allegation had been proven.

### **b. Asked Pupil A about her relationships**

The panel noted that Mr Wall had admitted allegation 2(b).

The panel heard evidence from Pupil A and Mr Wall as to conversations during which Pupil A's relationships were discussed. Pupil A confirmed during her oral evidence that Mr Wall asked for details about her past relationships and boyfriends.

The panel considered Mr Wall's witness statement, in which Mr Wall stated:

*"I deny that I was always the person to seek such information [about her relationships] from Pupil A; she would often openly instigate a conversation and seek guidance from me.*

*I deny ever "grilling" Pupil A about her relationships. I would have shown interest but only insofar as there was an established bond of [REDACTED] friendship between us."*

The panel noted that regardless of Mr Wall's relationship with Pupil A, his evidence did support the allegation that he discussed Pupil A's relationships with her.

The panel also considered the notes of the meeting between Mr Wall and the [REDACTED] in which it is recorded that Mr Wall stated, at the outset:

*"[REDACTED] [James' REDACTED] told me that I am overfamiliar and that I treat them [pupils] like friends and am overly chatty."*

Mr Wall also confirmed during that interview:

*"because we are [REDACTED] friends she came to confide in me?"*

*[REDACTED]: What do you mean?*

*JW: Well boyfriends and so on..."*

The panel noted that regardless of whether Mr Wall instigated these conversations each time, the allegation only requires that Mr Wall asked about Pupil A's relationships. Given that both Pupil A and Mr Wall gave evidence that Pupil A's relationships had been discussed between them, the panel considered it more likely than not that Mr Wall would have asked questions of her as part of those conversations.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel found that this allegation had been proven.

#### **d. Looked closely at Pupil A's outfits**

The panel noted that Mr Wall had admitted that allegation 2(d) could have taken place as [REDACTED].

During his oral evidence, Mr Wall provided examples in which he would look closely at pupils' uniforms or outfits, i.e. if the pupil invited him to do so by saying "look at my new jumper" or "look at my new shoes".

The panel also heard that Mr Wall may have looked closely at Pupil A's outfit to see a badge on Pupil A's uniform.

The panel appreciated that the way in which Mr Wall would look at pupil's outfits would be different to other teachers, [REDACTED].

The panel also heard from Pupil A that she did not think it was appropriate for a teacher to be looking at a female student's clothing, their skirts and dresses.

The panel noted that Pupil A's police interview did not refer to instances of Mr Wall having looked closely at Pupil A's outfits.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel found that this allegation had been proven.

**3. Between around 2018 and August 2022, you touched Pupil A inappropriately, in that you:**

**a. Grabbed her waist with both hands**

**b. Put your arm around her**

The panel considered allegations 3a. and 3b. together.

The panel considered Pupil A's police statement which stated:

*"On occasions I would physically touch him and [REDACTED] around to assist him especially as I was [REDACTED] at school."*

The panel noted that Pupil A did not report the incident of Mr Wall grabbing her by the waist with both hands during this interview, despite referring to incidents where she would touch Mr Wall.

Pupil A does refer to the incident within her witness statement prepared as part of the TRA's case. She stated:

*"James Wall also physically touched me. He had issues with his [REDACTED]. Usually it would be on my arm but sometimes it was fully grabbing my waist with both hands or with one arm around me."*

The panel heard evidence from Mr Wall that during the early stages of his [REDACTED]. Mr Wall stated that there was a delay from the School in organising [REDACTED].

The panel heard evidence as to [REDACTED]. Mr Wall accepted that it was inappropriate for a student to [REDACTED]. Mr Wall stated during oral evidence that it was not just Pupil A, [REDACTED].

Mr Wall stated in his witness statement that he could not recall whether the factual allegations as set out in Allegations 3(a)-(c) took place.

At the hearing, Mr Wall accepted that he did grab Pupil A by her waist with both hands, noting that this was not while Pupil A was [REDACTED]. During his oral evidence, Mr Wall told the panel that the incident occurred when he slipped on a bag and fell over causing him to fall into her. Mr Wall stated that he apologised and that he was embarrassed.

Mr Wall confirmed during his oral evidence that he gave Pupil A a hug [REDACTED]. Mr Wall confirmed that this would not have been in the context of being [REDACTED].

Given that Mr Wall had admitted in his oral evidence that he had grabbed Pupil A by her waist with both hands and that he had put his arm around her, the panel then considered whether this touching was inappropriate.

The panel considered the School's Staff Code of Conduct:

*"Avoid putting yourself at risk of allegations of abuse or unprofessional conduct. Be very careful in making physical contact with a child, either for instruction or physical management."*

The panel considered Mr Wall's evidence and noted that a teacher touching a pupil on their waist as well as putting their arm around them are examples of inappropriate touching.

The panel also noted that Mr Wall did not report the incidents of the touching of Pupil A to the School. The panel considered this to be inappropriate. It was also considered to be contrary to the School's Code of Conduct:

*"If you have any concern make a written record of any such contact and let your senior member of staff have a copy."*

On the balance of probabilities, the panel found that this allegation had been proven.

### **c. Took insufficient care not to touch her breasts**

Pupil A stated in her witness statement:

*"Sometimes he would also brush past my breasts and claim it was an accident, making a giggly remark about boobs, yet again I thought this was being brotherly."*

Mr Wall stated in his witness statement that he could not recall whether the factual allegations as set out in Allegation 3(c) took place. He stated in his witness statement:

*“Any touching of Pupil A’s breasts (Allegation 3(c)) would have been unintentional and would have caused me to be awkwardly apologetic. However, any such action was a direct consequence of my [REDACTED] and not evidence of insufficient care.”*

During his oral evidence, Mr Wall stated that the incident did happen but it was accidental. Mr Wall stated that he likely said in an embarrassed tone words to the effect of “oops boobies”.

Mr Wall confirmed that, despite this incident, he continued to seek assistance from Pupil A in being [REDACTED]. He also did not report this incident to the School.

The panel considered the incident to be in breach of the provision in the School’s Code of Conduct which read:

*“There are occasions when it is entirely appropriate and proper for staff to have physical contact with pupils, but it is crucial that they only do so in ways appropriate to their professional role.”*

Mr Wall accepted, when questioned by the presenting officer, that the incidents of touching were not appropriate to his professional role.

The panel also found that in not reporting the incident, Mr Wall again had acted contrary to the School’s Code of Conduct.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel found that this allegation had been proven.

#### **4. In or around 2018, you**

##### **b. added Pupil B on Facebook**

The panel noted that Mr Wall admitted this allegation.

At paragraph 6 of Pupil B’s witness statement she states:

*“After I left School and somewhere between first and second year of University in or around 2018, James Wall added me as a friend on Facebook”.*

At paragraph 85 of Mr Wall’s statement he confirmed that he added Pupil B on Facebook. He stated:

*“It is accepted that I did friend request Pupil B on facebook [sic] and started chatting via facebook messenger, but only after she had left the school.”*

Mr Wall confirmed that he had sent Pupil B a friend request and that this was ‘significantly after she left school’.

The panel also heard evidence from Pupil B as to messages exchanged between her and Mr Wall on Facebook.

The panel heard evidence from Mr Wall that he had messaged Pupil B on Facebook seeking information as to how she was getting on at university and about her involvement [REDACTED] that Mr Wall managed.

While the panel did not have screenshots to show that Mr Wall and Pupil B were or had been connected on Facebook, the panel found that in light of Mr Wall and Pupil B's evidence it was more likely than not that Mr Wall added Pupil B on Facebook.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel found that this allegation had been proven.

**5. Your conduct at paragraphs 1a) – g) and/or 2a) – 2d) and/or 3a)-c) was sexually motivated.**

The panel considered whether Mr Wall's conduct in respect of the allegations found proven (allegations 1a) – d), f) g) and 2a), b), d) and 3a)-c)), was sexually motivated.

The panel heard evidence from Mr Wall that Pupil A was no longer a pupil of the School so he thought that it was ok to message her. The panel noted that it was provided with contradicting evidence as to whether Pupil A was still a pupil at the time Mr Wall started messaging her. However, the panel determined that regardless of her status as a pupil, Pupil A was still a child, given her birth date, while Mr Wall was messaging her.

The panel also considered the School's Code of Conduct:

*"Do not use Social Media such as Facebook, Instagram and Twitter for inappropriate contact/direct messaging with children, and liking their pages etc. is not permitted. In short professional staff should not use any form of social media for private contact with children."*

The panel noted that in using WhatsApp to message Pupil A, Mr Wall was acting contrary to the School's Code of Conduct.

The panel considered Mr Wall's repeated denials that any of his behaviour was sexually motivated. Mr Wall described a close relationship between himself and Pupil A but stated that it was more of an older brother friendship. He refers to Pupil A as being a "friend" throughout his witness statement. For example, in his witness statement Mr Wall stated:

*"I was blinded by what I thought was a genuine and platonic friendship between myself and Pupil A. I had known her for years, and became [REDACTED] and watched her grow into a young woman."*

Pupil A also referred to initially seeing their relationship as being akin to one of siblings in her witness statement:



*“James Wall was a man who I viewed as an older brother which [REDACTED] I desperately wanted.”*

The panel determined that to describe the relationship as one of siblings or close friends was inappropriate and demonstrated a blurring of professional boundaries.

While the panel accepted that Mr Wall had a closer relationship with Pupil A, particularly due to the closeness of the [REDACTED], Mr Wall appears to have taken advantage of that closeness to steer the conversations to being of a sexual nature.

The panel considered the wording of the messages sent by Mr Wall to Pupil A:

*“Mr Wall: She says we both go quite gooey round the other!”*

*Pupil A: Ofc we do. That’s what 9 years does!*

*Mr Wall: Well yes. But! Yes, but what we have is different!*

*Pupil A: V true*

*Mr Wall: But nothing happened. You are now not a pupil of mine, so it’s fine, apart from I’m married, and I am feeling naughty on that front.”*

The reference to being “gooey” around each other was as a result of a comment made by a former teacher at the School who referred to Mr Wall and Pupil A going “gooey” around each other.

The panel considered the content of this message to be inappropriate, particularly in relation to Mr Wall feeling “naughty” on the marriage “front”. The panel also found that the reference to Pupil A “now not being a pupil” of his demonstrated sexual motivation.

The panel did not accept Mr Wall’s explanation that his messages were an attempt to shut the conversation with Pupil A down.

The panel also noted that Mr Wall had a means of communication with Pupil A already, via a group chat between Mr Wall, Pupil A and her [REDACTED]. The group chat was set up in order to exchange pictures as the three of them regularly attended events outside of school together. In her evidence, Pupil A stated that Mr Wall had previously asked her [REDACTED] if he could WhatsApp Pupil A, but her [REDACTED] had said that this was not appropriate and that she wanted to be included in the chat.

The panel considered the nature of the messages sent to Pupil A in the private chat, particularly those in relation to wanting to get drunk with Pupil A and regarding [REDACTED]. The timing of the request to follow Pupil A on Instagram was also notable. The panel could not see any other reason as to why Mr Wall would have waited until after

he believed that Pupil A was no longer a pupil of the School in order to follow her on Instagram.

The panel also heard from Pupil A and Mr Wall that he had sent Pupil A a message expressing his disappointment that he was no longer able to attend Pupil A's [REDACTED]. Mr Wall accepted that he sent a message to Pupil A that he was "looking forward to getting drunk with you". Mr Wall explained during his evidence that his intention in using "you" was to include Pupil A's [REDACTED].

The panel also considered that Mr Wall had requested or had arranged for the messages to be deleted by Pupil A. The panel noted that if this was an acceptable relationship, then the messages would not have needed to be deleted.

The panel heard from Mr Wall that he could have bought Pupil A a more practical present, given that she was about to go to university. The panel considered Mr Wall's attempt to conceal the present from [REDACTED] to further demonstrate sexual motivation.

The panel also considered that Mr Wall did not consider reporting any concerns or the incidents of touching to the School.

Based on the above and when taking Mr Wall's conduct as a whole for the allegations found proven, the panel considered that on the balance of probabilities Mr Wall's conduct was either in pursuit of sexual gratification or a future sexual relationship and was therefore sexually motivated.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel found that this allegation had been proven.

**6. Your conduct at paragraphs 1b-1d) and/or 2a-d) and/or 3a)-c) and/or 4c) was of a sexual nature**

The panel considered whether Mr Wall's conduct in respect of the allegations found proven (allegations 1a) – d) and 2a), b), d) and 3a)-c)), was of a sexual nature.

The panel noted that there was considerable overlap in the evidence, with that referred to in respect of allegation 5 above.

The panel considered the content of the messages namely the conversations in relation to [REDACTED], oral sex and wanting to get drunk with Pupil A. The panel also considered the value and nature of the present given to Pupil A and requesting a photograph from Pupil A of her wearing the earrings.

Taking Mr Wall's conduct as a whole for the allegations found proven, the panel considered that on the balance of probabilities Mr Wall's conduct was of a sexual nature.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel found that this allegation had been proven.

## **7. Your conduct at paragraph 1e) and/or 1f):**

### **a. Was dishonest; and/or**

### **b. lacked integrity**

Given that the panel did not find allegation 1e) proven, the panel only considered whether Mr Wall's conduct at allegation 1f) was dishonest and/or lacked integrity.

The panel found Mr Wall's conduct, in requesting that Pupil A delete the messages to be dishonest. In terms of Mr Wall's actual state of knowledge, the panel considered that Mr Wall knew the content and nature of the messages were wrong and that he should not have been having those types of conversations with Pupil A, so asked for them to be deleted. In Mr Wall's witness statement he stated:

*"Indeed, immediately after the conversation had ended, I felt uncomfortable about the direction the conversation had gone and I reflected on the fact that I had just opened up about matters of a personal nature to Pupil A as a friend but then realised how foolish I had been to do that, given her age."*

Mr Wall also stated:

*"I do acknowledge that I was foolish in relaying this information to Pupil A.*

*I deeply regretted doing this immediately and contacted Pupil A to ask her to delete the messages. I recognised that I should not have engaged in any discussion with Pupil A about the sexual experiences of either of us.*

*I contacted her again and asked her to delete the thread as I felt embarrassed by what we had discussed."*

Based on the above and Mr Wall's oral evidence, the panel found that Mr Wall knew that his request to Pupil A to delete the messages would be dishonest.

The panel determined that an ordinary decent person would also consider his behaviour in asking that the messages were deleted to be dishonest.

The panel also considered that in asking Pupil A to delete the messages, Mr Wall lacked integrity. The panel noted that Mr Wall had not adhered to the ethical standards of the teaching profession by concealing messages he had exchanged with Pupil A and also asking that she cover that up.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel found that this allegation had been proven.

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

## **1. Between July 2022 and August 2022, you:**

### **e. Used a nickname for Pupil A so your [REDACTED] did not find out that you were messaging her**

The evidence in relation to Pupil A's nickname was unclear to the panel.

The panel heard from Pupil A that her family nickname [REDACTED] was not widely used and noted that she appeared adamant about this.

The panel also noted that there was some confusion as to whether this allegation related to the nickname [REDACTED] – which was said to have been the name of the group chat between Mr Wall, Pupil A and her [REDACTED] or [REDACTED].

The panel considered the note of the meeting between Mr Wall and the [REDACTED]:

*“[REDACTED]: Did you ask her “What shall I call you?” as you didn’t want [REDACTED] to find out?”*

*JW: Yes”*

The panel approached these notes with caution due to not being provided with information as to how the contents were produced. However, the panel did appreciate that Mr Wall did not take any issue with the way in which the notes were recorded.

Mr Wall also stated during his oral evidence that he did not remember his answer to this question and that he was not in a great frame of mind during the interview. Mr Wall concluded that his answer was wrong as [REDACTED] knew what Pupil A's nickname was as they'd previously spoken about it.

The panel also heard from Mr Wall that he would use Pupil A's nickname as he had picked it up from her [REDACTED] and only used it outside of school.

Ultimately, given that the lack of evidence to prove this allegation one way or the other, the panel considered that it could not rely on the notes as being determinative, due to being unable to test the evidence at the hearing.

The panel determined that the TRA had not discharged its burden of proof in respect of this allegation.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel found that this allegation had not been proven.

## **2. Between around 2018 and August 2022, you:**

### **c. Told Pupil A about a friend who had a sexual relationship with their teacher, and said it was ok as the student was REDACTED at the time**

During her oral evidence, Pupil A stated that Mr Wall told her twice about his friend who had a sexual relationship with their teacher, once where he made a passing reference and once when she was in [REDACTED] when he was “explicit”. When asked what she meant by “explicit”, Pupil A said that the incident involved 2 males, and that was “explicit enough” for her. Pupil A could not recall her reaction but noted that she probably laughed.

The panel noted that Mr Wall admitted telling Pupil A about the incident. However, he denied saying that it was “ok as the student was [REDACTED] at the time”.

The panel heard evidence from Mr Wall that he told a number of people about the incident but that he would never have told Pupil A that it was “ok” as it was something that deeply troubled him. Mr Wall stated that his [REDACTED] was involved in the police investigation at the time and described the incident as traumatising to him.

Mr Wall stated that he did not remember talking about the incident with another pupil, only Pupil A. Mr Wall said that in telling Pupil A he was passing on some information of a situation which he had learnt from and that there was no malicious intent.

The presenting officer suggested that there was a similarity between Mr Wall saying that “it was ok” because the student was [REDACTED] at the time and the message in which Mr Wall stated:

*“You are now not a pupil of mine, so it’s fine”*

Mr Wall agreed that the comments were similar, but the context was different. Mr Wall reiterated that he did not say that it was ok as it had had a lasting impact on him.

The panel considered Mr Wall’s explanation in his statement:

*“As a result of the incident involving not only my friend but [REDACTED], it is an incident which has deeply affected me and is something which I have mentioned as an unfortunate life experience to numerous people.*

*Whenever I have spoken of this event, I have never condoned the behaviour of those involved and so I deny stating to Pupil A, in the event that I did inform her about it, that the teacher’s conduct with my friend was OK as the friend was [REDACTED] years old.”*

While the panel was satisfied that Mr Wall had discussed this incident with Pupil A, it determined that the TRA had not proven, on the balance of probabilities, that Mr Wall had said “it was ok as the student was [REDACTED]”.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel found that this allegation had not been proven.

#### **4. In or around 2018, you**

**a. shared information about your personal life and/or personal details with Pupil B, a recent school leaver**

Mr Wall denied this allegation.

In relation to this allegation, the panel noted that it was not presented with sufficient evidence to demonstrate that Mr Wall had shared information about his personal life and/or personal details with Pupil B.

The panel heard evidence from Pupil B as to Mr Wall messaging her on Facebook. However, Pupil B did not provide sufficient detail or any examples to the panel as to the content of the messages.

Given the lack of evidence provided to the panel, on the balance of probabilities, the panel found that this allegation had not been proven.

**c. Exchanged messages of a personal and/or sexual nature with Pupil B**

Mr Wall denied this allegation.

In relation to this allegation, the panel noted that it was not presented with sufficient evidence to demonstrate that Mr Wall had exchanged messages of a personal and/or sexual nature with Pupil B.

The panel heard evidence from Pupil B that the messages from Mr Wall had “sexual connotations” however she could not provide any further detail beyond this, nor could she provide examples. This was contrary to the evidence of Mr Wall who said that the messages exchanged with Pupil B related to how she was getting on at university and about her involvement [REDACTED] Mr Wall managed.

The panel heard evidence from Pupil B that Mr Wall had sent a message about a dream he had about Pupil B. Pupil B stated the message relating to the dream were untoward but could not provide any further information. Mr Wall accepted that he sent that message, however, stated that the message was not sent with any sexual motivation and was not of a sexual nature.

The panel considered that the message in relation to the dream did cause Pupil B to tell her [REDACTED] about it, something which she did not do regularly. However, the panel considered that it did not have sufficient evidence to find this allegation proven.

The panel also noted that the timing of the messages was also unclear. The panel heard evidence from Pupil B that the messages could have been exchanged in the summer of first or second year of university, meaning either 2018 or 2019. The panel therefore was not presented with evidence as to the timing of the messages.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel found that this allegation had not been proven.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Wall, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education 2018 (“KCSIE”).

- The panel considered that Mr Wall was in breach of the following provisions:
- Safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children is everyone’s responsibility. Everyone who comes into contact with children and their families and carers has a role to play in safeguarding children. In order to fulfil this responsibility effectively, all professionals should make sure their approach is child-centred. This means that they should consider, at all times, what is in the best interests of the child.
- Safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children is defined for the purposes of this guidance as: ensuring that children grow up in circumstances consistent with the provision of safe and effective care.

- All staff have a responsibility to provide a safe environment in which children can learn.
- All staff members should be aware of systems within their school or college which support safeguarding and these should be explained to them as part of staff induction. This should include:
  - The child protection policy;
  - The staff behaviour policy (sometimes called a code of conduct)

The panel also considered whether Mr Wall conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

The Advice indicates that where behaviours associated with such an offence exist, a panel is likely to conclude that an individual's conduct would amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel found that the offence of sexual communication with a child was relevant.

The panel had also found that Mr Wall had engaged in conduct that was sexually motivated.

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

### Disrepute

In relation to whether Mr Wall's actions amounted to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, the panel took into account the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. It considered the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel also took account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils' lives and the fact that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way that they behave.

In considering the issue of disrepute, the panel also considered whether Mr Wall'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 Wall was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found that the offence of sexual communication with a child was relevant. The panel had also found that Mr Wall had engaged in conduct that was sexually motivated.



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

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Wall'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 wellbeing of pupils, the protection of other members of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Wall, which involved exchanging private messages with Pupil A, asking Pupil A to delete all of the messages exchanged, touching Pupil A inappropriately, engaging in conduct which was sexually motivated, of a sexual nature and which was dishonest and lacked integrity, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of an inappropriate relationship 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 Wall were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Mr Wall 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 Wall in the profession. Whilst there is evidence that Mr Wall had significant ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Wall 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 a high level of integrity and ethical standards at all times. The panel noted that a teacher's behaviour that seeks to exploit their position of trust should be viewed very seriously in terms of its potential influence on pupils and be seen as a possible threat to the public interest.

In view of the clear public interest considerations that were present, the panel considered carefully whether or not it would be proportionate to impose a prohibition order, taking into account the effect that this would have on Mr Wall.

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;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- an abuse of any trust, knowledge, or influence gained through their professional position in order to advance a romantic or sexual relationship with a pupil or former pupil;
- sexual misconduct, e.g. involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature and/or that use or exploit the trust, knowledge or influence derived from the individual's professional position;
- failure in their duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk or failing to promote the safety and welfare of the children (as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE);
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions or purposeful destruction of evidence, especially where these behaviours have been repeated or had serious consequences, or involved the coercion of another person to act in a way contrary to their own interests;

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.

The panel also noted that some of the misconduct took place online.

In light of the panel's findings there was evidence that Mr Wall's actions were deliberate.

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

Mr Wall did have a previously good history, having made a significant contribution to the education sector.

The panel was presented with a number of statements in respect of Mr Wall's character which were prepared as part of representations Mr Wall made to the [REDACTED] but all of whom had consented to their references being provided to the TRA.

The panel considered a statement from a retired headteacher which described Mr Wall as a "warm, generous person who relates well to people and has a strong commitment to the community (long term involvement with the Scouts and [REDACTED])." He also stated that Mr Wall is "patient and good with children and able to bring out the best in others through musical performance. He has enormous challenges with deteriorating vision but bears this with remarkable fortitude."

A [REDACTED], and now friend, of Mr Wall also stated that Mr Wall is "passionate about music and worked tirelessly for its development across the whole school." He described the time that he worked with Mr Wall and how he was committed to the raising of standards, accessibility and the profile of music at Lucton School and in the wider community too." The statement goes on to explain how Mr Wall was "instrumental in growing the peripatetic provision at Lucton School, developed free instrumental lessons for Year 5 and 6 pupils and launched [REDACTED] and much more."

The panel did note that the allegations made as part of the [REDACTED] could have differed from those which it was considering as part of the TRA's process. The panel noted that in the case of some of the character witnesses they only made reference to allegations of dishonesty, breaching professional boundaries and inappropriate communications. It was not clear to the panel whether the allegations in respect of the TRA proceedings were provided to the character witnesses.

The panel also considered the reference forms contained in the bundle dating back to 2013.

One reference from [REDACTED] stated that Mr Wall was a "thoroughly professional and devoted individual who has a genuine passion for teaching music." The reference also

noted that Mr Wall “is an outstanding music teacher with a genuine interest in his subject and students alike.”

The panel also considered Mr Wall’s engagement with extra-curricular activities, such as the Scouts, Duke of Edinburgh Award scheme and musical activities.

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 Wall 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 Wall. The findings that Mr Wall’s conduct was sexual in nature and sexually motivated were significant factors in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate for it to decide to recommend a review period of the order. The panel was mindful that the Advice states that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances, in any given case, that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 2 years.

The Advice indicates that there are certain types of case where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period.

These include:

- serious sexual misconduct e.g. where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons, particularly where the individual has used their professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons;
- any sexual misconduct involving a child;

The panel considered the risk of repetition was low. In particular, the panel noted Mr Wall’s engagement with training courses as part of steps taken in remediation. The panel considered the certificate he obtained for completing the course entitled “Professional

Boundaries – working with young people” to demonstrate some level of insight into his behaviour.

However, the panel determined that Mr Wall’s level of insight in respect of the impact on Pupil A was low. The panel took into account statements contained within his witness statement:

*“I am extremely regretful that Pupil A was emotionally affected by my comments. She was a friend and I would never have intended to harm her; I thought I was offering her comfort by illustrating that it is common for people to have anxieties about sex. I never intended to shock her or make her feel uncomfortable.”*

He also stated:

*“I am deeply regretful of my actions and have acknowledged how my actions, however innocent in intent, can be perceived. I am extremely mindful of the emotional stress and anxiety which my actions have caused to others, with particular concern to Pupil A.”*

The panel considered that Mr Wall was not demonstrating a level of insight into the over familiar relationship he had developed with Pupil A. When questioned by the panel he demonstrated limited learning in relation to the issues addressed in the training concerning professional boundaries.

The panel was provided with a reflections statement from Mr Wall dated 17 November 2025. The panel noted that this did not refer to Mr Wall having reflected on the impact of his conduct on Pupil A, as such demonstrating a limited level of insight.

The panel also considered Mr Wall’s difficult personal circumstances as outlined in his reflections statement, in respect of his [REDACTED]. Mr Wall’s representative also told the panel that he did not realise how vulnerable he was, that he was emotionally unstable and had poor judgement. The representative also drew the panel’s attention to the fact that Mr Wall’s emotional wellbeing has improved. The panel acknowledged the difficulties Mr Wall had experienced at this time but considered that these in no way excused sexual misconduct towards a child.

The panel was mindful that Mr Wall had engaged fully with the process. The panel also noted that Mr Wall made early admissions and had expressed regret in his initial interview with the [REDACTED].

However, the panel considered this in light of the findings that Mr Wall’s conduct was sexually motivated in respect of allegations 1a) – d), f) g) and 2a), b), d) and 3a)-c). It also considered the findings that Mr Wall’s conduct was of a sexual nature allegations 1a) – d) and 2a), b), d) and 3a)-c).

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 some of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. In this case, the panel has found some of the allegations not proven. I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

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

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

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

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Wall involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE).

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding which involved exchanging private messages with Pupil A, asking Pupil A to delete messages, touching Pupil A inappropriately, engaging in conduct which was sexually motivated, of a sexual nature and which was dishonest and lacked integrity.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself, whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Mr Wall and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children/safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, "In light of the panel's findings against Mr Wall, which involved exchanging private messages with Pupil A, asking Pupil A to delete all of the messages exchanged, touching Pupil A inappropriately, engaging in conduct which was sexually motivated, of a sexual nature and which was dishonest and lacked integrity, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of an inappropriate relationship with a child." A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, "The panel was provided with a reflections statement from Mr Wall dated 17 November 2025. The panel noted that this did not refer to Mr Wall having reflected on the impact of his conduct on Pupil A, as such demonstrating a limited level of insight." The panel has also commented that "The panel was mindful that Mr Wall had engaged fully with the process. The panel also noted that Mr Wall made early admissions and had expressed regret in his initial interview with the [REDACTED]."

In my judgement, the lack of full insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, "the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Wall were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession." I am particularly mindful of the finding of sexual misconduct

towards 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 Wall himself and the panel comment “Mr Wall did have a previously good history, having made a significant contribution to the education sector.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Wall 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 “The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Wall. The findings that Mr Wall’s conduct was sexual in nature and sexually motivated were significant factors in forming that opinion.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that “Whilst there is evidence that Mr Wall had significant ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Wall 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.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Wall has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, that is not backed up by full insight, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

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

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



I have considered the panel's comments:

"the panel determined that Mr Wall's level of insight in respect of the impact on Pupil A was low. The panel took into account statements contained within his witness statement:

*"I am extremely regretful that Pupil A was emotionally affected by my comments. She was a friend and I would never have intended to harm her; I thought I was offering her comfort by illustrating that it is common for people to have anxieties about sex. I never intended to shock her or make her feel uncomfortable."*

"The panel considered that Mr Wall was not demonstrating a level of insight into the over familiar relationship he had developed with Pupil A. When questioned by the panel he demonstrated limited learning in relation to the issues addressed in the training concerning professional boundaries".

"The panel was provided with a reflections statement from Mr Wall dated 17 November 2025. The panel noted that this did not refer to Mr Wall having reflected on the impact of his conduct on Pupil A, as such demonstrating a limited level of insight."

"The panel also considered Mr Wall's difficult personal circumstances as outlined in his reflections statement, in respect of his [REDACTED]. Mr Wall's representative also told the panel that he did not realise how vulnerable he was, that he was emotionally unstable and had poor judgement. The representative also drew the panel's attention to the fact that Mr Wall's emotional wellbeing has improved. The panel acknowledged the difficulties Mr Wall had experienced at this time but considered that these in no way excused sexual misconduct towards a child."

In this case, factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the seriousness of the findings and the limited level of insight.

Despite the mitigating and difficult personal circumstances outlined by Mr Wall, 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 James Wall 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 Wall 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 Wall has a right of appeal to the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this order.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'SABuxcey'.

**Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey**

**Date: 26 November 2025**

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