



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Kevin Davies: Professional conduct panel meeting 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
Statement of Agreed Facts	4
Decision and reasons	4
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	7
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	11

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

Teacher: Mr Kevin Davies

Teacher ref number: 8775097

Teacher date of birth: 11 June 1965

TRA reference: 19803

Date of determination: 17 December 2025

Former employer: Harry Carlton School, Leicestershire (the “School”) and Concord College, Shrewsbury (the “College”)

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 17 December 2025 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Davies

The panel members were Mr Paul Hawkins (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Bernie Whittle (teacher panellist) and Mr Scott Evans (lay panellist).

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

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mrs Natasha Savovic of Kingsley Napley LLP solicitors.

Mr Davies was not present and was not represented.

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Davies that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Davies provided a signed Statement of Agreed Facts and admitted he was convicted of a relevant offence. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, Mr Davies or his representative.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegation set out in the Notice of Meeting dated 4 December 2025.

It was alleged that Mr Davies was convicted of a relevant offence in that:

1. On or around 31 March 2022, he was convicted of two counts of indecent assault on a female under 16 years old.

In the Statement of Agreed Facts dated 8 September 2025, Mr Davies admitted the allegation and that his admitted conduct constituted a conviction of a relevant offence.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology and anonymised pupil list – pages 3 to 5

Section 2: Notice of referral and response – pages 6 to 15

Section 3: Statement of Agreed Facts – pages 16 to 18

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 19 to 98

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 99 to 101

Section 6: Notice of meeting – pages 102 to 103

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

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

Statement of Agreed Facts

The panel considered a Statement of Agreed Facts which was signed by Mr Davies on 8 September 2025.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

In advance of the meeting, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Davies for the allegations to be considered without a hearing. The panel had the ability to direct that the case be considered at a hearing if required in the interests of justice or in the public interest. The panel did not determine that such a direction was necessary or appropriate in this case.

Mr Davies was employed as a teacher at the School between 1 September 1993 and 31 August 2001.

Mr Davies was employed as a physics teacher at the College from 1 September 2015 to 31 October 2020.

Mr Davies was referred to the TRA on 5 February 2021.

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:

It was alleged that you were convicted of a relevant offence in that:

1. On or around 31 March 2022, you were convicted of two counts of indecent assault on a female under 16 years old.

In the Statement of Agreed Facts, Mr Davies admitted that he was convicted on 31 March 2022 at Nottingham Crown Court of two counts of indecent assault on a female under 16 years old. Mr Davies further admitted that he was sentenced on 15 November 2024 at Nottingham Crown Court.

In the Statement of Agreed Facts, Mr Davies further admitted the following:

- Pupil X is a former pupil of the School;
- In or around [REDACTED] and kissed Pupil X [REDACTED];
- Pupil X performed oral sex on Mr Davies [REDACTED]; and
- Mr Davies continued to have sexual encounters with Pupil X until 2002.

In a written statement dated 9 April 2025, Mr Davies stated “I accept my offence”.

The panel was presented with a certificate of conviction from Nottingham Crown Court, confirming that Mr Davies was convicted on 31 March 2022 of the offences particularised in this allegation.

Mr Davies was sentenced on 15 November 2024 to 18 months imprisonment and issued a 10-year notification requirement under the Sex Offenders Register.

The panel was presented with the transcript of the sentencing remarks dated 15 November 2024, summarising the offences and the reason for the sentence imposed.

The panel noted that there was no evidence showing that there were any exceptional circumstances to call into question the facts necessarily implied by the conviction. The panel therefore accepted the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of the commission of these offences by Mr Davies.

The panel therefore found the allegation proven.

Findings as to a conviction of a relevant offence

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

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Davies 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; and
 - not undermining 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 offences were committed by Mr Davies prior to the coming into force of the Teachers Standards. Therefore, the panel had regard to its knowledge and experience of teaching standards at that time and considered that the teacher and pupil boundary had been an important one, and Mr Davies had breached this in his conduct.

The panel noted that Mr Davies' actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting, as Mr Davies' conviction relates to assault on a child during a school trip.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offences could have had an impact on the safety and security of pupils and members of the public given the harm caused in assaulting a child.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Davies' behaviour in committing the offences 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 Davies' behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed.

The panel also considered the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice. This was a case concerning offences involving sexual activity, which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel considered Mr Davies' conduct to be very serious, as he was convicted of indecent assault on a child during a school trip. The panel noted that Mr Davies was in a position of power over a child and breached his position of trust.

The Judge stated in the sentencing remarks dated 15 November 2024 that Mr Davies was "in a position of trust" and "as abuses of trust go, it is an extreme example". As such, the Judge stated that he "would be completely failing" in his public duty if he did not impose an immediate custodial sentence.

In the sentencing remarks dated 15 November 2024, the Judge also stated that Mr Davies had "never offended previously" and had "not offended since". Additionally, the Judge stated that Mr Davies was an "excellent school teacher" and that he "did a very great deal to enrich the lives of so many children". However, the panel noted that it had no direct evidence which could attest to Mr Davies' record as a teacher.

Whilst the panel noted the sentencing remarks in relation to Mr Davies' previous ability as a teacher, the panel found the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Davies' fitness to be a teacher. The panel considered a finding that this conviction was a relevant offence was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession. As such, the panel determined that the allegation amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

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 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 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.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Davies, which involved indecent assault on a female under 16, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils as the offences occurred in respect of a pupil during a school trip.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Davies was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Mr Davies 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 Davies in the profession. Whilst there was some evidence that Mr Davies had ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Davies 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 Davies.

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;
- 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;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- 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;
- violation of the rights of pupils; and
- actions or behaviours that undermine the rule of law.

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

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

Whilst the Judge in the sentencing remarks dated 15 November 2025 made reference to Mr Davies being an excellent teacher, the panel saw no other evidence that Mr Davies demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both his personal and professional conduct and having contributed significantly to the education sector. Similarly, the panel saw no evidence that showed Mr Davies was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings/warnings.

The panel was not provided with any character references regarding Mr Davies. As such, the panel did not accept that the incident was out of character.

The panel considered the following statements made by the Judge in the sentencing remarks dated 15 November 2024:

- [REDACTED];
- Mr Davies was “in a position of trust” and “as abuses of trust go, it is an extreme example”;
- “As breaches of trust go, this is about as serious as it gets”;
- Mr Davies has “never offended previously and you have not offended since”;
- The Judge was “satisfied” that Mr Davies was “genuinely remorseful” for what he did and he “always certainly” in the Judge’s presence “recognised this”;
- The Judge had “no doubt” that Mr Davies was “an excellent school teacher who really enjoyed doing his job” and “did a very great deal to enrich the lives of so many children”; and
- Mr Davies admitted what he had done “at an early stage”.

The panel acknowledged that Mr Davies admitted his conduct, and entered a guilty plea in respect of the criminal proceedings.

The panel further acknowledged that the Judge believed that Mr Davies was “genuinely remorseful” for his actions. To that end, the panel noted that Mr Davies stated the following in his written statement, “I honestly and sincerely apologise for my behaviour/actions” and “I am very sorry for the hurt, pain and devastation that I caused”.

The panel further noted that Mr Davies had been in contact with the Lucy Faithfull Foundation for “support” in respect of how he may take his place in society after his sentence is completed.

The panel considered that Mr Davies had shown some accountability and insight into his conduct in light of the above factors. As such, the panel considered that the risk of Mr Davies repeating his behaviour was on the lower end of the possible scale, particularly as the offences took place many years ago and Mr Davies had not committed any offences since. However, the panel was not satisfied that the risk of repetition was eliminated by Mr Davies’ accountability and insight, given the seriousness of the offences and the fact that Mr Davies’ behaviour was a serious breach of his position of truth.

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 or 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 Davies 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 Davies. The seriousness of the offending behaviour against a child was a significant factor in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

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

The Advice indicates that there are certain types of cases 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 and any sexual misconduct involving a child which relate to Mr Davies' offending behaviour.

The panel acknowledged that Mr Davies had shown some insight into his actions. However, the panel considered that Mr Davies' conduct was so serious that public confidence in the profession could be seriously damaged if Mr Davies was provided any opportunity to return to teaching. Similarly, the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils would be at risk given the harm suffered by a pupil as a result of Mr Davies' behaviour. The panel considered that any contribution that Mr Davies could make to the teaching profession in the future was outweighed by the seriousness of his conduct.

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

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Davies 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; and
 - not undermining 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 Davies fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a conviction of indecent assault on a child during a school trip. The panel noted that Mr Davies was in a position of power over a child and breached his position of trust.

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 Davies, 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 the light of the panel’s findings against Mr Davies, which involved indecent assault on a female under 16, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils as the offences occurred in respect of a pupil during a school trip.” 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 Judge was “satisfied” that Mr Davies was “genuinely remorseful” for what he did and he “always certainly” in the Judge’s presence “recognised this.”

The panel has also commented that “Mr Davies had shown some accountability and insight into his conduct in light of the above factors. As such, the panel considered that the risk of Mr Davies repeating his behaviour was on the lower end of the possible scale, particularly as the offences took place many years ago and Mr Davies had not committed any offences since. However, the panel was not satisfied that the risk of repetition was eliminated by Mr Davies’ accountability and insight, given the seriousness of the offences and the fact that Mr Davies’ behaviour was a serious breach of his position of truth.” In my judgement 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 Davies was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of indecent assault 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 Davies himself and the panel comment “Whilst the Judge in the sentencing remarks dated 15 November 2025 made reference to Mr Davies being an excellent teacher, the panel saw no other evidence that Mr Davies demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both his personal

and professional conduct and having contributed significantly to the education sector. Similarly, the panel saw no evidence that showed Mr Davies was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings/warnings."

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Davies 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 Advice, where a prohibition order may be appropriate and the panel said:

"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;
- 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;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- 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;
- violation of the rights of pupils; and
- actions or behaviours that undermine the rule of law."

I have also placed considerable weight on the following "The Judge stated in the sentencing remarks dated 15 November 2024 that Mr Davies was "in a position of trust" and "as abuses of trust go, it is an extreme example". As such, the Judge stated that he "would be completely failing" in his public duty if he did not impose an immediate custodial sentence."

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding that "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 Davies in the profession. Whilst there was some evidence

that Mr Davies had ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Davies 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 Davies 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, 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 Advice indicates that there are certain types of cases 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 and any sexual misconduct involving a child which relate to Mr Davies' offending behaviour."

The panel has also said that "The panel acknowledged that Mr Davies had shown some insight into his actions. However, the panel considered that Mr Davies' conduct was so serious that public confidence in the profession could be seriously damaged if Mr Davies was provided any opportunity to return to teaching. Similarly, the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils would be at risk given the harm suffered by a pupil as a result of Mr Davies' behaviour. The panel considered that any contribution that Mr Davies could make to the teaching profession in the future was outweighed by the seriousness of his conduct."

I have considered whether not allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the seriousness of the findings and the risk of repetition.

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

This means that Mr Kevin Davies 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 Davies 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 Kevin Davies 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 "Sarah Buxcey".

Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey

Date: 22 December 2025

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