



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Stephen Metcalfe- Taylor: Professional conduct panel hearing outcome

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

December 2025

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Witnesses	4
Decision and reasons	4
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	8
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	14

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

Teacher: Mr Stephen Metcalfe-Taylor

TRA reference: 24257

Date of determination: 5 December 2025

Former employer: EBN1 Academy, Birmingham

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 5 December 2025 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Stephen Metcalfe-Taylor.

The panel members were Mr Peter Ward (lay panellist – in the chair), Ms Rachel Kruger (teacher panellist) and Ms Sofia McGreavy (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mrs Shanie Glen of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Cher Lyne Peh of Brown Jacobson LLP solicitors.

Mr Metcalfe-Taylor was present and was represented by Mr Silas Lee of Thompsons Solicitors.

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 set out in the notice of proceedings dated 19 September 2025.

It was alleged that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:

1. On 26 June 2024, he was convicted at Aberystwyth Magistrates' Court for the following offence:
 - a. Driving motor vehicle when alcohol level above limit

The allegations were admitted by Mr Metcalfe-Taylor. Mr Metcalfe-Taylor also admitted to the conviction of a relevant offence.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Notice of hearing and response – pages 5 to 20

Section 2: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 22 to 96

Section 3: Teacher documents – pages 98 to 156

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 Mr Metcalfe-Taylor at the third stage of the hearing.

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 Metcalfe-Taylor commenced employment at EBN1 Academy (the “School”) in 2015. In 2018, Mr Metcalfe-Taylor became Deputy Headteacher at the School. Mr Metcalfe-Taylor had also been appointed as Headteacher at the School, effective from September 2024.

On 8 June 2024, Mr Metcalfe-Taylor contacted the Headteacher of the School to advise that he had been arrested during the early hours of that morning. On 10 June 2024, Mr Metcalfe-Taylor informed the Executive Headteacher of the School of the incident.

On 14 June 2024, the School instigated a formal disciplinary investigation.

On 18 June 2024, Mr Metcalfe-Taylor attended an investigatory interview.

Mr Metcalfe-Taylor was dismissed from the School.

Mr Metcalfe-Taylor was subsequently referred to the TRA.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

- 1. On 26 June 2024, you were convicted at Aberystwyth Magistrates’ Court for the following offence:**

- a. Driving motor vehicle when alcohol level above limit**

The panel had sight of Mr Metcalfe-Taylor’s response to the notice of referral, which he signed and dated 5 January 2025. Within the response, Mr Metcalfe-Taylor confirmed that this allegation was admitted. Further, Mr Metcalfe-Taylor also confirmed to the panel that the allegation was admitted at the substantive hearing.

The panel had sight of the disciplinary investigation report dated 28 June 2024, which was commissioned by the School and undertaken by [REDACTED] Consultancy Ltd. The investigation report stated the following: Mr Metcalfe-Taylor was stopped by police in the early hours of Saturday 8 June 2024, breathalysed and arrested on suspicion of driving under the influence of excess alcohol. Mr Metcalfe-Taylor was taken to Aberystwyth Police Station where he was tested twice more and subsequently charged. Mr Metcalfe-Taylor contacted the Headteacher of the School at 9:10 on 8 June 2024 to report the incident. On 10 June 2024, Mr Metcalfe-Taylor attended a face-to-face meeting with the Executive Headteacher of the School and informed him of the incident.

The panel also had sight of an undated written statement provided and signed by Mr Metcalfe-Taylor. Within the statement, Mr Metcalfe-Taylor stated the following: on Friday 7 June 2024, he left work and travelled to Aberystwyth where he was due to meet friends

for a reunion twenty years on from leaving University. He attempted to contact 3 different taxi companies all of which were unable to pick him up and travel the 15-minute drive into Aberystwyth town centre. At approximately 6:40pm, having failed to secure a taxi, he elected to drive his vehicle into the town and leave it there overnight. He went out for drinks with his former University colleagues and “drank from 7pm until 11pm and did not eat a substantial evening meal”. At 11:15pm, he went to a live music venue where he “drank water and danced until the close at 1am” on Saturday 8 June. After this, he walked to his vehicle and drove towards where he was staying, when an unmarked police officer stopped his vehicle as a result of him believing that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor’s vehicle had crossed over the central white line. He was asked if he had been drinking, to which he responded that he had, and he then failed a roadside breathalyser test. As a result, he was arrested and charged with driving under the influence of alcohol.

The panel had sight of the certificate of conviction which confirmed that on 26 June 2024, Mr Metcalfe-Taylor was convicted at Aberystwyth Magistrates’ Court, having entered a guilty plea, of the following offence: “drive motor vehicle when above alcohol level limit”. It also stated that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor had consumed 72 microgrammes of alcohol in 100 millimetres of breath, in excess of the prescribed limit.

The certificate of conviction also confirmed that, on 26 June 2024, Mr Metcalfe-Taylor was sentenced at Aberystwyth Magistrates’ Court where he was disqualified from holding or obtaining a driving licence for 18 months, to be reduced by 18 weeks if by 21 June 2025 he satisfactorily completed a course approved by the Secretary of State. Mr Metcalfe-Taylor was also ordered to pay a fine.

The panel accepted the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction.

The panel found this allegation proven.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

Having found the sole allegation proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of the proved allegation amounted to the conviction of a relevant offence.

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

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

- not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law ...
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach ...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel noted that the individual's actions were not relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting. In particular, the panel noted that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor's conviction related to actions that were taken on the weekend, outside of school, and did not impact upon pupils.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety and/or security of members of the public. The panel noted that no one was harmed as a result of Mr Metcalfe-Taylor's actions, but he did put members of the public at risk having driven under the influence of alcohol and at least double over the prescribed legal limit.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor's behaviour in committing the offence could affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community.

The panel noted that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor's behaviour did not lead to a sentence of imprisonment, which was indicative that the offence was at the less serious end of the possible spectrum.

The panel also considered the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice. This was a case concerning an offence involving serious driving offences, particularly those involving alcohol or drugs, which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel found this to be a serious offence as a result of a conscious act by Mr Metcalfe-Taylor. In particular, the panel noted Mr Metcalfe-Taylor's own admission that he had consumed between 6 to 8 pints of alcohol that evening, before he decided to drive home. The panel also noted that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor was aware that he would have difficulties getting home, having already had difficulties ordering a taxi earlier that evening, and that he made a conscious choice to drive under the influence of alcohol which led to his arrest.

The panel took into account evidence of mitigating circumstances, such as the written evidence that was adduced attesting to Mr Metcalfe-Taylor's exemplary record as a teacher, with no previous disciplinary matters and a clear prior criminal record. The panel noted that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor immediately admitted the offence to the police, entered a

guilty plea at the earliest opportunity and has fully cooperated and engaged with the TRA proceedings. The panel noted that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor also immediately contacted senior staff members at the School after his arrest to report the incident and cooperated with the School's own investigation. The panel also noted that no one was injured as a result of Mr Metcalfe-Taylor's actions.

Although the panel found that the evidence of Mr Metcalfe-Taylor's teaching proficiency was of note and took into account the above circumstances, the panel also found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Metcalfe-Taylor's ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding that this conviction was for a relevant offence was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of a conviction of a relevant offence, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

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

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely, the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession, and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

There was a public interest consideration in respect of the protection of other members of the public, given the panel's findings that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor had been convicted of a relevant offence (namely, driving under the influence of excess alcohol) which did potentially place members of the public at risk of harm, albeit they were not harmed on this occasion.

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

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the behaviour, noting that the Advice states that the expectation of both the public and pupils, is that members of the teaching profession maintain an exemplary level of integrity and ethical standards at all times. The panel considered that the offence was on the lower end of the spectrum and noted that it was a one-off incident set against an unblemished professional career and a clear criminal record.

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 Metcalfe-Taylor.

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; and
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of the Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures.

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.

Mr Metcalfe-Taylor's actions were deliberate. There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation.

Mr Metcalfe-Taylor did have a previously good history, having demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both his personal and professional conduct and having contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel accepted that the incident was out of character. In particular, the panel noted that there was no evidence to suggest that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor was a regular or heavy drinker and, that this was his first and only criminal conviction.

The panel had sight of various evidence in the bundle which attested to Mr Metcalfe-Taylor's exemplary 19-year career. In particular, the panel had sight of Mr Metcalfe-Taylor's written statement to the TRA dated 5 November 2025, in which he stated that, during his previous school before joining the School, the school saw a rise from 38% to 64% in C+ grades under his leadership as Head of English.

The panel also heard from Mr Metcalfe-Taylor that the School (where he worked at the time of his conviction and prior to his referral to the TRA) was set up as a free school to avoid permanent exclusion from mainstream education for young people in the area. The panel also heard that, as a result, there was disengagement from young people who had very complex needs. The panel noted that working within this environment, and in alternative provision generally, was very challenging. The panel found it commendable that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor appeared to excel within this role, as it noted that he was promoted at the School every two years before he was eventually promoted to Headteacher prior to his dismissal.

The panel also heard evidence from Mr Metcalfe-Taylor surrounding his dismissal from the School. In particular, the panel noted that upon informing the School of the incident, Mr Metcalfe-Taylor was not instantly dismissed and instead the School looked for a way to retain him at the School until a later decision was made to dismiss him. The panel considered this to demonstrate Mr Metcalfe-Taylor's value to the School. The panel also noted that following an appeal, Mr Metcalfe-Taylor's dismissal was downgraded to a 12-month written warning which had since expired.

The panel also had sight of various character references for Mr Metcalfe-Taylor in the bundle. In particular, the panel had sight of a reference from a former colleague of Mr Metcalfe-Taylor. The reference confirmed that the former colleague was aware of the allegations against Mr Metcalfe-Taylor and these proceedings. The reference states that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor has "always been both an excellent teacher and leader", and that he "has effortlessly brought value to the two schools" in which they had worked together. It also states that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor gave "freely of his own time to ventures such as school productions, often working in excess of fifty hours a week to ensure school plays and musicals ran smoothly" and that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor eventually became a Designated Safeguarding Leader which "speaks volumes of the intrinsic value he has brought to his work". The reference also states that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor is "reliable" and "trustworthy".

The panel also had sight of a reference from a different former colleague of Mr Metcalfe-Taylor. The reference states that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor "takes his role seriously and is always motivated and enthusiastic about driving standards and improving the school, the environment and the opportunities for pupils", and that he is a "person of remarkable character, possessing unwavering integrity, compassion, and responsibility".

The panel also had sight of a reference from a close friend of Mr Metcalfe-Taylor, who also knew him in a professional capacity. The reference, provided on official letterhead,

confirms that the referee is aware of the allegations against him. It also states that he has always been impressed by Mr Metcalfe-Taylor's "knowledge, empathy and understanding of his learners". The reference also states that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor's "direct intervention and decision making has, in many cases, led to positive outcomes for individuals that would otherwise have dropped out of education".

The panel also had sight of further references from former colleagues of Mr Metcalfe-Taylor which describe Mr Metcalfe-Taylor as "a consummate professional, an excellent problem solver and an empathetic leader". They also state that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor "brings a warmth and a presence to the teaching environment that is so desperately needed in today's educational settings", and that he is "effective, trustworthy, highly talented, in demand and admired by so many people". They also state that he is "in the top percentages of the profession, without a doubt". They state that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor "tirelessly gives back [to the community] and is a much loved and respected person locally and wider afield". They also state that "he has improved and touched so many young lives" and that "he is absolutely essential to the teaching profession" and that "he is essential to helping so many become the best versions of themselves".

The panel had sight of a reference from the Headteacher of the School, who was Headteacher during the incident that took place and the School's investigation, and is aware of the allegation against him. The reference dated 30 October 2024 stated that the School educates "some of the most hard to reach, underprivileged and disaffected children in Birmingham", that these children "need a high level of support, guidance and people with excellent teaching ability in order to help them move forward positively in their lives", and that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor "has these skills in abundance." The reference also states that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor was "instrumental in the success of [the School]" and that the School "would not have been a success without him". It also states that this incident "was completely out of character" for Mr Metcalfe-Taylor.

The panel noted that following his dismissal from the School and the referral to the TRA, Mr Metcalfe-Taylor has continued to work within the education profession. In particular, the panel noted that in late 2024, Mr Metcalfe-Taylor worked at a college where he taught students who needed to re-sit and pass their GCSE English language. Mr Metcalfe-Taylor stated to the panel that as part of his interview process for this role, he voluntarily provided the college with the School's investigation and all of the necessary paperwork to understand the full circumstances surrounding his conviction, as his conviction did not show on his [REDACTED] check at the time. He also attended numerous interviews where he was open and honest about his conviction.

The panel noted that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor was since working at a different school where he was also making a significant contribution. In particular, the panel had sight of a character reference from the Headteacher at the school which currently employs Mr Metcalfe-Taylor (and has done since February 2025). The reference dated 11 October 2025, which was provided on the school's letterhead paper, confirms that Mr Metcalfe-

Taylor is employed as a teacher of English and has more recently been promoted to the role of extended leadership. The reference also states that the Headteacher is “fully aware of the circumstances” that led to these proceedings. The reference goes on to describe Mr Metcalfe-Taylor as an “excellent teacher” and “a real contributor to the school”. It also states that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor has “been honest and humble about the mistake he made and shown incredible resilience to be nothing but professional for the prolonged period that this matter has hung over him.” In addition, it states that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor has “exceptional teaching ability and can connect with young people like no other”, and that he has “so much to offer” to the teaching profession. The reference also states that “Education needs more Stephen’s”.

The panel acknowledged that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor would have gone through a rigorous process in order to obtain both of these positions in light of his criminal record, and found that the decisions to hire him in both instances, despite his conviction, demonstrate that they had full confidence in his skills and teaching ability.

The panel also had sight of multiple emails in the bundle from parents of children who were taught by Mr Metcalfe-Taylor. The panel noted that all of these emails speak positively of Mr Metcalfe-Taylor including an email which states: “[Pupil] has told me how [they are] enjoying [their] lessons and how much support you have given [them], which I’m most grateful for.” Overall, the panel found there was a significant amount of evidence to show that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor continues to make an exceptional contribution to the education profession.

The panel also had heard evidence from Mr Metcalfe-Taylor about his personal circumstances at the time of his arrest and conviction. [REDACTED]. However, Mr Metcalfe-Taylor also stated to the panel that he knew this was not a justification for his actions and that his conduct was unacceptable.

The panel went on to consider Mr Metcalfe-Taylor’s level of insight and remorse. The panel found Mr Metcalfe-Taylor to be very remorseful about his actions. The panel had sight of Mr Metcalfe-Taylor’s written statement in which he stated: “I hold shame and remorse without prospect of recovery as it stands”, “I know that I have let down the students, families and communities that already face enough hardship and challenge”, and “my reflection on my conviction involves an all-consuming feeling of guilt, remorse, shame and I became hollow as a result of my error in judgement”. The panel found this level of remorse to be clear during Mr Metcalfe-Taylor’s oral evidence at the hearing.

The panel also found that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor demonstrated clear insight into his behaviour at every possible stage. Firstly, the panel noted that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor admitted his offence to the police at the earliest opportunity, he also entered a guilty plea as soon as possible at Aberystwyth Magistrates’ Court and complied fully with the TRA proceedings. Further, the panel noted that immediately after his release from the police station following his arrest, Mr Metcalfe-Taylor contacted the Headteacher of the School

to report the incident and cooperated fully with the School's own investigation. The panel found that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor did not attempt to make excuses for his actions and that he had been continuously open and honest with both the School and his future employers about his conviction.

Further, the panel noted that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor appeared to fully understand the impact of his actions on the School, his current school, parents and pupils. He also understood the potential impact his actions may have had on the public and that he placed them at risk of harm (albeit no harm was caused). Further, he acknowledged that his actions had damaged his reputation but that he would always be willing to openly speak with parents, pupils and his employer about his conviction should they raise any concerns, and how he has since learned from it. The panel considered Mr Metcalfe-Taylor to have properly reflected upon his actions.

During the hearing, the panel heard from Mr Metcalfe-Taylor about the steps he had taken since his conviction to address his problems. In particular, Mr Metcalfe-Taylor stated that he had since started to open up to others and talk to them about his stresses and/or problems, including [REDACTED], friends and a colleague at the school where he is currently employed. Mr Metcalfe-Taylor stated that he has started to manage his stress better by communicating with others and also taking part in activities such as bike rides with [REDACTED]. Mr Metcalfe-Taylor acknowledged that this was a serious one-off mistake that he would never make again.

Overall, the panel found Mr Metcalfe-Taylor to have demonstrated a significant amount of insight and remorse into his behaviour and found that he was actively taking steps to ensure that it would not occur again. The panel considered this to be a one-off incident, for which Mr Metcalfe-Taylor had already been severely punished by way of a criminal record and damage to his reputation, and for which he had taken full responsibility. As a result, the panel found there was no risk of repeating similar behaviours in the future. The panel found that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor was clearly a significant asset to the teaching profession and that to lose a teacher of his ability would be a sad loss.

The panel 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. Given that the nature and severity of the behaviour were at the less serious end of the possible spectrum and, having considered the significant mitigating factors that were present, the panel determined that a recommendation for a prohibition order would not be appropriate in this case. The panel considered that the publication of the adverse findings it had made was sufficient to send an appropriate message to the teacher as to the standards of behaviour that are not acceptable, and the

publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession.

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 the allegation proven and found that those proven facts amount a relevant conviction.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Stephen Metcalfe-Taylor should not be the subject of a prohibition order. The panel has recommended that the findings of a relevant conviction should be published and that such an action is proportionate and in the public interest.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor 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
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law ...
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach ...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel finds that the conduct of Mr Metcalfe-Taylor 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 a relevant conviction, 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 Metcalfe-Taylor, 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:

“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 and the protection of other members of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession, and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.”

“There was a public interest consideration in respect of the protection of other members of the public, given the panel’s findings that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor had been convicted of a relevant offence (namely, driving under the influence of excess alcohol) which did potentially place members of the public at risk of harm, albeit they were not harmed on this occasion.”

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 found Mr Metcalfe-Taylor to be very remorseful about his actions. The panel had sight of Mr Metcalfe-Taylor’s written statement in which he stated: “I hold shame and remorse without prospect of recovery as it stands”, “I know that I have let down the students, families and communities that already face enough hardship and challenge”, and “my reflection on my conviction involves an all-consuming feeling of guilt, remorse, shame and I became hollow as a result of my error in judgement”. The panel found this level of remorse to be clear during Mr Metcalfe-Taylor’s oral evidence at the hearing.”

The panel has also commented that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor demonstrated clear insight into his behaviour at every possible stage. 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 also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor’s behaviour in committing the offence could affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of a conviction for driving under the influence of excess alcohol 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 a relevant conviction, 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 Metcalfe-Taylor himself and the panel comment “Mr Metcalfe-Taylor did have a previously good history, having demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both his personal and professional conduct and having contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel accepted that the incident was out of character. In particular, the panel noted that there was no evidence to suggest that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor was a regular or heavy drinker and, that this was his first and only criminal conviction.” I have also noted the following “The panel had sight of various evidence in the bundle which attested to Mr Metcalfe-Taylor’s exemplary 19-year career.”

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments concerning the level of insight and remorse demonstrated. The panel has said:

“Overall, the panel found Mr Metcalfe-Taylor to have demonstrated a significant amount of insight and remorse into his behaviour and found that he was actively taking steps to ensure that it would not occur again. The panel considered this to be a one-off incident, for which Mr Metcalfe-Taylor had already been severely punished by way of a criminal record and damage to his reputation, and for which he had taken full responsibility. As a result, the panel found there was no risk of repeating similar behaviours in the future. The panel found that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor was clearly a significant asset to the teaching profession and that to lose a teacher of his ability would be a sad loss.”

“The panel noted that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor appeared to fully understand the impact of his actions on the School, his current school, parents and pupils. He also understood the potential impact his actions may have had on the public and that he placed them at risk of harm (albeit no harm was caused). Further, he acknowledged that his actions had damaged his reputation but that he would always be willing to openly speak with parents, pupils and his employer about his conviction should they raise any concerns, and how he has since learned from it. The panel considered Mr Metcalfe-Taylor to have properly reflected upon his actions.”

In reaching my decision I have also given weight to the following “The panel noted that the individual’s actions were not relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting. In particular, the panel noted that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor’s conviction related to actions that were taken on the weekend, outside of school, and did not impact upon pupils.”

I have given weight in my consideration of sanction to the contribution that Mr Metcalfe-Taylor has and could continue to make to the profession.

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 'SABuxcey', with a stylized, cursive script.

Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey

Date: 10 December 2025

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