



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Steven Battye: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

December 2025

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Witnesses	6
Decision and reasons	6
Findings of fact	7
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	20
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	24

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

Teacher: Mr Steven Battye

Teacher ref number: 9546630

Teacher date of birth: 11 March 1966

TRA reference: 20186

Date of determination: 3 December 2025

Former employer: The Romsey School, Romsey

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 1 to 3 December 2025 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Steven Battye.

The panel members were Mrs Christine McLintock (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Rebecca Beaty (lay panellist) and Mrs Jill Wells (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Nicholas West of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Mark Millin, instructed by Kingsley Napley LLP solicitors.

Mr Battye was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of hearing dated 15 September 2025.

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

1. Between around 07 January 2019 and 24 May 2019, whilst employed as a teacher at Brighton Hill School, he:
 - a) Made inappropriate and/or unprofessional and/or sexual comments to and/or regarding one or more pupils as outlined within Schedule 1;
 - b) He swore on one or more occasions at and/or in front of one or more pupils;
 - c) He invaded Pupil H's personal space by getting close to her face.
2. Between around September 2019 and 31 July 2021, whilst employed as a teacher at The Romsey School, he:
 - a) Made inappropriate and/or unprofessional and/or sexual comments to and/or regarding one or more pupils as outlined within Schedule 2;
 - b) Made inappropriate and/or unprofessional gestures to and/or regarding one or more pupils as outlined within Schedule 3.

Schedule 1

1. Between around 07 January 2019 and 24 May 2019, on one or more occasions he called Pupil H "my angel", or words to that effect;
2. Between around 07 January 2019 and 24 May 2019, talked to one or more pupils about different names for vaginas and/or walked around the room saying "minge;"
3. Between around 07 January 2019 and 24 May 2019, when Pupil H asked him a question, he replied "yes minge" or words to that effect;
4. Between around 07 January 2019 and 24 May 2019, he asked one or more pupils "who needs lubrication then" or words to that effect;
5. Between around 07 January 2019 and 24 May 2019, when asked for a match to light the Bunsen burner by Pupil H, he replied "you can't have a match but you know what is a match, my ass and your face, oh I mean your ass and my face" or words to that effect.

Schedule 2

1. On or around 07 November 2020, commented to Pupil B that "[Pupil B] why haven't you shrunk, penises shrink in the cold so I wonder why you haven't shrunk yet", or used words to that effect;
2. On an unknown date between September 2019 and 31 July 2021, he sent Pupil B out of class and once he was outside he commented that Pupil B was "a little dick" or words to that effect;
3. On an unknown date or dates between September 2019 and 31 July 2021, he called Pupil B, "twat" and/or "knob", or used words to that effect;
4. On one or more occasion on unknown dates between September 2019 and 31 July 2021, he commented to Pupil B that he had a "small dick" and/or "small todger" or used words to that effect;
5. On or around 20 November 2020, he commented to Pupil C and/or Pupil D "blow on it harder...no not like that, you've got a dirty mind..." and/or "Pupil D knows how to blow it" or used words to that effect;
6. On an unknown date between September 2020 and 31 July 2021, he commented to Pupil D about [REDACTED] saying he "would've given her a grade 9 if she had been nicer to him" or used words to that effect.

Schedule 3

1. On or around 13 November 2020, he used his fingers to swear by holding up his index finger and middle finger together and/or holding up his middle finger alone while explaining about atoms and compounds;
2. When discussing Pupil B and commenting on his genitals he held up and/or waved his little finger.

Mr Battye made no formal admission of fact prior to the hearing.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology, anonymised pupil list and list of key people – pages 7 to 10

Section 2: Notice of hearing and response – pages 11 to 27

Section 3: TRA witness statements – pages 28 to 65

Section 4: TRA documents – pages 66 to 441

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 442 to 443

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

The TRA's hearsay application and appendices totalling 107 pages; and

Mr Battye's written response to the TRA's hearsay application dated 30 November 2025 totalling three pages.

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

In the consideration of this case, the panel had regard to the 2020 Procedures.

Witnesses

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

Pupil H

Witness A - [REDACTED]

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 Battye worked at Brighton Hill Community School from 7 January 2019 to 24 May 2019.

In June 2019, a disclosure was made by Pupil H regarding Mr Battye's conduct. Various pupils provided statements attesting to the fact Mr Battye had allegedly made inappropriate comments to pupils.

On 1 September 2019, Mr Battye commenced employment at The Romsey School.

On 30 November 2020, it was reported by a member of staff that Mr Battye had made an inappropriate comment to a student via a post it-note.

On 7 December 2020, Pupil N reported that Mr Battye had made inappropriate comments in class, specifically towards Pupil B.

Mr Battye was also alleged to have made inappropriate gestures towards pupils whilst teaching.

Mr Battye was suspended from The Romsey School on 10 December 2020.

On 28 July 2021, the matter was referred to the TRA.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

1. Between around 07 January 2019 and 24 May 2019, whilst employed as a teacher at Brighton Hill School, you:

a) Made inappropriate and/or unprofessional and/or sexual comments to and/or regarding one or more pupils as outlined within Schedule 1;

Schedule 1

1. Between around 07 January 2019 and 24 May 2019, on one or more occasions you called Pupil H "my angel", or words to that effect

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statements of Pupil H, who stated that when Mr Battye approached her, *"he would call me his "angel"*. Pupil H's contemporaneous handwritten statement dated 19 June 2019 was consistent with this, stating that Mr Battye was *"always approaching me calling me "his angel"*. The panel asked Witness A about Pupil H, and he confirmed in his oral evidence that she was a *"top set student and went on to be a prefect – as model student as you could imagine"*.

The panel considered the handwritten statement of Pupil EEE which stated, Mr Battye would *"always call her things like "my angel"*. The panel was mindful that the evidence of Pupil EEE was hearsay, and it had not had an opportunity to test this evidence. The panel was able to ask Witness A about Pupil EEE generally, and he confirmed that he had *"no reason to disagree"* with anything they had said, and he would deem them to be *"a trustworthy witness"*. Witness A could not recall where or how Pupil EEE's statement was obtained but the panel noted that the statement was written in the first person and was handwritten. The panel was comfortable that there was no ulterior motive in respect of Pupil EEE's evidence as it had been provided to Brighton Hill Community School after Mr Battye's engagement had been terminated. The panel therefore considered that appropriate weight could be provided to Pupil EEE's statement, and this evidence corroborated Pupil H's written and oral evidence.

The panel found on the balance of probabilities that Mr Battye had called Pupil H *"my angel"* on one or more occasions and this amounted to an inappropriate and unprofessional comment.

Schedule 1

2. Between around 07 January 2019 and 24 May 2019, talked to one or more pupils about different names for vaginas and/or walked around the room saying "minge"

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statements of Pupil H, who stated that, on one occasion, she remembered Mr Battye was talking to other boys in the class about different names for vaginas like *"minge"*, and, after finishing the conversation with the boys, he wandered around the room on his own muttering the word *"minge"*. Pupil H's handwritten statement dated 19 June 2019 was consistent with this, stating that Mr Battye *"was talking to some boys about like different names for vaginas and stuff like 'c***' and 'minge' and things like that, even him himself was just waling [sic] round the room saying 'minge'"*.

The panel considered the handwritten statement of Pupil GGG which stated, *"he was telling us different names for a 'vagina' like 'cunt' and 'minge'"*. The panel was mindful that the evidence of Pupil GGG was hearsay, and it had not had an opportunity to test this evidence. The panel was able to ask Witness A about Pupil GGG generally and he confirmed that they were *"reliable"* and there was *"absolutely nothing to suggest any form of fabrication at all"*. Witness A stated in his written statement that he asked Pupil GGG to provide a statement on 25 June 2019. The panel noted that Pupil GGG's statement was written in the first person, and it was handwritten. The panel was again comfortable that there was no ulterior motive in respect of Pupil GGG's evidence as it had been provided to Brighton Hill Community School after Mr Battye's engagement had been terminated. The panel therefore considered that appropriate weight could be provided to Pupil GGG's statement which corroborated Pupil H's written and oral evidence.

The panel found, on the balance of probabilities, that Mr Battye had talked to pupils about different names for vaginas and walked around the room saying *"minge"* and this amounted to inappropriate, unprofessional and sexual comments. The panel accepted Witness A's oral evidence that there was *"absolutely no reason for staff to share different names for a vagina"* and the comments Mr Battye made to children included *"some of the most offensive words in our language"*.

Schedule 1

3. Between around 07 January 2019 and 24 May 2019, when Pupil H asked you a question, you replied "yes minge" or words to that effect

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statements of Pupil H, who stated that she asked a question and Mr Battye replied, *"yes minge"*. Pupil H's contemporaneous handwritten statement dated 19 June 2019 was consistent with this,

stating *"I then ask him a question about what we were revising and he answers "yes minge"*".

The panel found on the balance of probabilities that Mr Battye had replied to Pupil H asking him a question *"yes minge"* and this amounted to an inappropriate, unprofessional and sexual comment.

Schedule 1

4. Between around 07 January 2019 and 24 May 2019, you asked one or more pupils "who needs lubrication then" or words to that effect

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statements of Pupil H, who stated Mr Battye came back into the classroom and shouted, *"who needs lubrication then"*. Pupil H's contemporaneous handwritten statement dated 19 June 2019 was consistent with this, stating *"he came in from the other room and heard this he just shouts 'who needs lubrication then'"*.

The panel considered the handwritten statement of Pupil EEE which stated, *"one of the boys was playing a maths game where the birds would make a noise if you clicked on the correct answer so when it was clicked just as he had walked in the room he said "who needs lubrication then?"*". The panel further considered the handwritten statement of Pupil GGG which stated, *"someone in the room was playing a game on the computer and it was making a bird sound then he walked into the class and said 'who needs lube then?"*". The panel was mindful that the statements of Pupils EEE and GGG were hearsay evidence, but for the reasons previously stated above, the panel considered appropriate weight could be provided to both statements which corroborated Pupil H's oral and written evidence.

The panel found, on the balance of probabilities, that Mr Battye had asked one or more pupils *"who needs lubrication then"* or words to that effect and this amounted to an inappropriate, unprofessional and sexual comment. The panel considered that Mr Battye's choice of words was deliberate and had sexual connotations.

Schedule 1

5. Between around 07 January 2019 and 24 May 2019, when asked for a match to light the Bunsen burner by Pupil H, you replied "you can't have a match but you know what is a match, my ass and your face, oh I mean your ass and my face" or words to that effect

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statements of Pupil H, who explained that there was one incident in particular that really concerned her. Pupil H explained that during a lesson where they were transitioning into a science experiment, she went up to Mr Battye's desk at the front of the classroom and asked for matches to light the Bunsen

burner, to which he responded *“no you can’t have a match, but you know what is a match my ass and your face oh I mean your ass and my face”*. Pupil H’s handwritten statement dated 19 June 2019 was consistent with this stating, *“I asked for a match and he goes ‘no you cant have a match, but you know what is a match my ass and your face oh I mean your ass and my face”*”.

The panel considered the handwritten statement of Pupil EEE which was provided to Brighton Hill Community School on 25 June 2019. In that statement Pupil EEE stated that Mr Battye had said to Pupil H *“do you know what is a match? Your face and my arse no I mean your arse and my face”*. Despite Pupil EEE’s evidence being hearsay, the panel considered appropriate weight could be given for the reasons identified above.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Witness A, who stated that on 14 June 2019 he received an email from Individual B. This set out that she had heard some students talking about Mr Battye and that she had told them to stop speaking about staff members in that way. He stated that Individual B said that the students had told her Mr Battye says very inappropriate things, and that when she asked what inappropriate things he had said, Pupil H informed her that when she approached Mr Battye’s desk to ask for a match to light a Bunsen burner, he said *“that’s not a match, what’s a match is your arse on my face.”*

The panel found, on the balance of probabilities, that Mr Battye had replied to Pupil H *“you can’t have a match but you know what is a match, my ass and your face, oh I mean your ass and my face”* or words to that effect and this amounted to an inappropriate and unprofessional comment. The panel accepted Pupil H’s recollection of this comment - *“you can’t have a match but you know what is a match, my ass and your face, oh I mean your ass and my face”* - as it was slightly different to that reported by Witness A which referred to *“your arse on my face”*. The panel preferred the evidence of Pupil H as she heard the comment directly and Witness A’s recollection included multiple hearsay. The panel did not consider the comment it had found proven to be sexual.

The panel noted that Mr Battye had not specifically addressed the allegations set out in Schedule 1 in his written submissions, but he had admitted to making an error at the end of his career when he was responding to the TRA on 22 October 2024. Mr Battye also stated *“I have made my sincere apologies known to all involved along with my huge disappointment during that time of my behaviour”* in an email to the TRA dated 20 May 2025.

Having found that Mr Battye made inappropriate, unprofessional and sexual comments to pupils as outlined in Schedule 1, the panel found allegation 1(a) proven.

b) You swore on one or more occasions at and/or in front of one or more pupils;

The panel's findings against Mr Battye at allegation 1(a) included inappropriate and unprofessional language which amounted to swearing. Pupil H provided specific examples of Mr Battye saying "*cunt*" and "*minge*" in class and the panel accepted this evidence.

Pupil GGG's handwritten statement referred to Mr Battye using other swear words such as "*saying he's in a 'shit' mood and he would sometimes say he's 'fucked off' and 'pissed off'*". The panel was mindful that the statement of Pupil GGG was hearsay but for the reasons previously stated the panel considered appropriate weight could be provided to this statement.

The panel found Mr Battye did swear in front of pupils and therefore found allegation 1(b) proven.

c) You invaded Pupil H's personal space by getting close to her face.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Pupil H who stated that Mr Battye came over to her during class and got close to her face when checking her work or answering her questions. She stated that as a result, she stopped making eye contact with Mr Battye when he asked her a question as she knew that it would lead to him coming over and getting close to her face.

Pupil H explained in her oral evidence that Mr Battye would drag a stool over to where she was sitting on the end of the table and sit diagonally across from her. Pupil H stated it "*felt like he would be overly close to me*" and he "*would come forwards*" leaning towards her face.

The panel considered Pupil H to be a credible and reliable witness and accepted her oral evidence that Mr Battye's conduct made her feel "*uncomfortable*" as he was "*overly close*".

The panel concluded on the balance of probabilities that Mr Battye's conduct in getting close to Pupil H's face did invade her personal space and therefore found allegation 1(c) proven.

2. Between around September 2019 and 31 July 2021, whilst employed as a teacher at the Romsey School, you:

a) Made inappropriate and/or unprofessional and/or sexual comments to and/or regarding one or more pupils as outlined within Schedule 2;

When considering allegation 2, the panel was conscious that the only evidence available was hearsay as Individual A was unable to attend the hearing. The panel accepted the presenting officer's submissions that the passage of time had unfortunately meant that witnesses who were previously willing to assist the TRA had now disengaged or were

unavailable. The panel considered that it wasn't reasonable or practicable for the TRA to continue to pursue any of the witnesses to give oral evidence due to the passage of time since the incidents occurred. Notwithstanding this, the panel noted that there were a number of contemporaneous documentary accounts from pupils which did not include multiple hearsay. The pupils provided written accounts of their personal knowledge as direct observers of Mr Battye's conduct.

The panel noted Individual A's witness statement which provided information about how the pupils' statements were taken and what questions she had asked in order to obtain the information from the pupils during interviews. The panel was unable to test whether there was any motive from the pupils to conceal or misrepresent matters, however, it did note Pupil B's evidence that he liked Mr Battye. This was supported by statements from other pupils, including Pupil C who said *"Pupil B would just laugh at these comments, him and his friends saw it as a joke and would usually make a comment back at Mr Battye"*. The panel further noted a record of Individual A's conversation with Pupil B's parents on 11 December 2020 which noted, *"Pupil B said he didn't feel uncomfortable and thought it was a joke"*. The panel therefore considered this evidence supported a finding that there was no malicious motivation in the pupils raising allegations against him.

Based on all of these factors, the panel considered that appropriate weight could be given to the written statements of Individual A and Pupils B, C, D, N and V.

Schedule 2

- 1. On or around 07 November 2020, commented to Pupil B that "[Pupil B] why haven't you shrunk, penises shrink in the cold so I wonder why you haven't shrunk yet", or used words to that effect**
- 2. On an unknown date between September 2019 and 31 July 2021, you sent Pupil B out of class and once he was outside you commented that Pupil B was "a little dick" or words to that effect**
- 3. On an unknown date or dates between September 2019 and 31 July 2021, you called Pupil B, "twat" and/or "knob", or used words to that effect;**
- 4. On one or more occasion on unknown dates between September 2019 and 31 July 2021, you commented to Pupil B that he had a "small dick" and/or "small todger" or used words to that effect**

The panel considered the written statement of Pupil C who stated that Mr Battye would often say to Pupil B that he *"had a small dick"*, and he said this in almost every lesson.

Pupil C stated that in a lesson on 7 November 2020, Mr Battye said to Pupil B *"why haven't you shrunk, penises shrink in the cold so I wonder why you haven't shrunk yet"*.

The panel considered the handwritten statement of Pupil B who stated that Mr Battye had walked past him on one occasion and said *“you’ve got less than a 6 inch”*.

The panel considered the written statement of Individual A, who stated that on 7 December 2020 she obtained a witness statement from Pupil N, who stated that Mr Battye told Pupil B *“you know penises shrink in the cold? How come you haven’t shrunk yet”*.

Individual A stated that on 11 December 2020 she spoke to Pupil B’s parents over the phone, she stated that they reported that they spoke to Pupil B, who told them that several weeks before 11 December 2020, Mr Battye gave Pupil B a 30cm ruler and said *“I think you need a smaller one”* referring to his size.

Individual A stated that on 16 December 2020 she interviewed Pupil C who told her that Mr Battye had said that Pupil B had a *“small dick”* quite often. She stated that she also obtained a statement from Pupil D, who stated that Mr Battye called Pupil B names such as *“twat”* and *“knob”*.

Pupil D stated that Mr Battye would often call Pupil B names like *“twat”* and *“knob”* in class, and he would say that Pupil B had *“a little dick”* and *“small todger”*.

The panel considered the statements produced on behalf of Pupil C and Pupil D following their interviews with Individual A and noted that they attested to the same.

The panel noted Mr Battye’s responses to these allegations in Individual A’s investigation report dated 25 May 2021. Mr Battye specifically denied saying *“you know penises shrink in the cold? How come you haven’t shrunk yet?”* stating, *“No, I did not say it”*. In response to the allegation that Mr Battye has said to Pupil B, *“you’re acting like a penis”*, he stated *“I remember saying the comment ‘I could call you something inappropriate right now’ but I did not say anything about a ‘penises. However, Pupil B would make regular comments (aloud) in class about his ‘6 inch’. I would normally say ‘Pupil B’ indicating that is not appropriate and if I did not respond to his comment then he would keep saying it until I did”*. Mr Battye denied saying that Pupil B was *“acting like a dick”*, calling him names such as *“twat”* and *“knob”* or saying, *“he has a small dick”*.

Based on the available hearsay evidence which the panel considered could be given appropriate weight, the panel concluded that on the balance of probabilities, Mr Battye did comment to Pupil B *“why haven’t you shrunk, penises shrink in the cold so I wonder why you haven’t shrunk yet”*, or words to that effect and made other comments to Pupil B including that he was *“a little dick”*, *“twat”*, *“knob”* and that he had a *“small dick”* and a *“small todger”*. The panel considered that all of these comments were highly inappropriate, unprofessional and sexual as they were all linked to Pupil B’s genitalia.

Schedule 2

5. On or around 20 November 2020, you commented to Pupil C and/or Pupil D "blow on it harder...no not like that, you've got a dirty mind..." and/or "Pupil D knows how to blow it" or used words to that effect

The panel considered the written statement of Pupil D, who stated that they were working with Pupil C and called over Mr Battye to ask him about the next part of the experiment with the Bunsen burners, as they were unsure of how they were supposed to blow on the metal. Pupil D stated that Mr Battye told them to "blow on it", and he "looked smug" and as she looked said "no not like that, you have a dirty mind."

The panel considered the contemporaneous handwritten statement of Pupil C dated 16 December 2020 who stated:

"when me and Pupil D were doing and experiment we had to blow into the metal pot over the bunsen burner and I was confused about what to do so I asked him how to do it and he said just blow and I blew gently but he said no harder and laughed a bit then Pupil D came over to help me and she blew quite a lot harder than me and sir said that Pupil D knows how to blow it obviously implying a blowjob".

The panel further considered Individual A's contemporaneous notes from her interview with Pupil C which recorded that Mr Battye "said to blow harder implying a blow job during an experiment. Pupil C was working with Pupil D. Think it was 20/11".

Pupil C's written statement dated 31 July 2023 was consistent with Pupil D's statement, stating "On one occasion the class was doing an experiment and we had to blow into a metal pot over a Bunsen burner. I remember being confused on how to do it and asked Mr Battye who told me to "just blow it". I blew it gently but then he said "no harder" and laughed a bit. Then Pupil D came over to help me and she blew quite a lot harder than me. I do not remember the exact words but Mr Battye said something along the lines of "[Pupil D] knows how to do it", obviously implying a blowjob".

The panel noted Mr Battye's responses from Individual A's investigation report dated 25 May 2021. When questioned about this alleged incident, Mr Battye stated:

"No, I did not say this. I do recall the practical and I would have been anxious that the students had not completed many experiments (being a top set) and often having split lessons. This was the lesson I had to carry buckets of cold water along the bottom corridor to my room to cover health and safety rules so the practical could happen. I remember it because Individual C made a sarcastic comment and thought it was funny - something I didn't appreciate when I was trying to make the teaching the best it could be for the students and the situation".

The panel found, on the balance of probabilities, that Mr Battye did comment to Pupil C and Pupil D *“blow on it harder...no not like that, you've got a dirty mind...”* and *“Pupil D knows how to blow it”* or words to that effect. The panel considered these comments were inappropriate, unprofessional and Mr Battye’s reference to the pupils having a “dirty mind” made the comments sexual.

Schedule 2

6. On an unknown date between September 2020 and 31 July 2021, you commented to Pupil D about [REDACTED] saying you "would've given her a grade 9 if she had been nicer to him" or used words to that effect

Pupil D stated that Mr Battye talked about [REDACTED] when talking about GCSE results stating, *“he would have given her a grade 9 had she been nicer to him”*. Individual A stated that on 16 December 2020, she interviewed Pupil D who stated that Mr Battye said to her in a conversation about her sister that he *“would’ve given her a grade 9 if she had been nicer to him”*.

The panel noted Mr Battye’s responses from Individual A’s investigation report dated 25 May 2021. Mr Battye stated, *“No, I did not say it I have asked - how [REDACTED] was, and I would have mentioned how pleased I was with the grade she had achieved after a difficult year.”*

The panel was satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that Mr Battye had commented to Pupil D about [REDACTED] that he would have given her a grade 9 if she had been nicer to him. The panel considered this comment was inappropriate and unprofessional, but it did not have sufficient context regarding the comment to determine whether or not it could have been perceived or intended as sexual.

When considering allegation 2(a) in general, the panel noted the written representations of Mr Battye dated 19 September 2025, when he stated *“the subject content mentioned like sexual reproduction and words associated with certain parts is an important point of reference. Street’ language is important to understand where you are starting from when teaching new aspects in the science curriculum to young people and to diminish [sic] their understanding of reality”*. The panel was unable to test this evidence but concluded that the comments found proven were inappropriate, unprofessional and sexual.

Having found that Mr Battye made inappropriate, unprofessional and sexual comments to pupils as outlined in Schedule 2, the panel found allegation 2(a) proven.

b) Made inappropriate and/or unprofessional gestures to and/or regarding one or more pupils as outlined within Schedule 3.

Schedule 3

1. On or around 13 November 2020, you used your fingers to swear by holding up your index finger and middle finger together and/or holding up your middle finger alone while explaining about atoms and compounds

The panel considered the written statement of Pupil D, who stated that on one occasion Mr Battye was explaining content related to atoms and compounds and to demonstrate his explanation of how they work, he held up his index and middle finger and then put down his index finger, so he was just holding up his middle finger.

The panel noted Mr Battye's written representations dated 19 September 2025 regarding this specific allegation, and he stated, with *"regards to teaching to atoms and atoms compounds and as a science teacher I have always used my hands and fingers to teach certain aspects - in this case single and double bonds between atoms or molecule to reinforce the learning of atoms/molecules joining together"*. Mr Battye's response to this allegation was consistent with his more contemporaneous response in Individual A's investigation report dated 25 May 2021. Mr Battye said, *"I do try to use 'props' available to me to try and explain some difficult concepts in science. There has been the odd occasion when using my hands and fingers, where something may fall off my hand or fingers and students would say something like 'sir, that's rude'. It would then click with me that it was the middle finger, but I would always apologise to the students"*.

The panel considered on the balance of probabilities it was possible that Mr Battye's explanation was correct. The panel was mindful that it only had hearsay evidence regarding this allegation, and it was hard to interpret a physical gesture from a written account when this could not be explored and tested through oral testimony.

The panel therefore considered that there was insufficient evidence to find this allegation proven.

2. When discussing Pupil B and commenting on his genitals you held up and/or waved your little finger

The panel considered the contemporaneous handwritten statement of Pupil C dated 16 December 2020 who stated that Mr Battye used *"his small finger towards Pupil B as if he has a small penis"* and *"Mr Battye would often use his small finger (pinky) and wave it at Pupil B implying he has a small penis"*.

The panel noted that Individual A's written statement provided factual evidence about how Pupil C's statement was taken and the questions that she had asked in the interview in order to elicit this information. The panel was therefore comfortable that sufficient weight could be given to Pupil C's statement, despite it being hearsay.

Pupil C's written statement dated 31 July 2023 was consistent with his contemporaneous account, stating *"Mr Battye would also often use his little (pinky) finger and wave it at Pupil B. Pupil B did not really take offence to it and would just laugh. The gesture was*

related to Mr Battye saying to Pupil B that he had a small dick. We knew that it meant this because Mr Battye would stand at the front of the class and say it to Pupil B to make the rest of the class laugh, and he had made comments about Pupil B having a small dick in the past. It felt like it was Mr Battye's way of getting back at Pupil B for him being disruptive during lessons. I think I found it funny at first but when it was all of the time the class got bored of it and thought it was weird. Mr Battye would make this gesture to Pupil B in almost every lesson."

The panel noted that Mr Battye had not provided any specific written representations regarding this allegation.

The panel considered that Pupil C's description of Mr Battye's physical gesture was convincing and found allegation 2(b) proven insofar as Mr Battye had made inappropriate and/or unprofessional gestures to and/or regarding Pupil B.

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

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Battye 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; and
 - 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.

In relation to breaches of the policies and procedures of the schools in which Mr Battye taught, the panel specifically noted the Code of Conduct of The Romsey School which was stated to have been formally agreed on 19 November 2015 and would have therefore been in force during Mr Battye's engagement. This Code of Conduct stated, *"Staff are expected to demonstrate the highest possible standards of personal and professional conduct and behaviour and consistently act with honesty and integrity. The school expects staff to treat each other, pupils, parents and the wider school community with dignity and respect at all times"*. The panel found that Mr Battye's conduct as found proven fell short of the expected professional standards.

The panel also considered the Staff Code of Conduct of Brighton Hill Community School but the version available to the panel was last reviewed and ratified in December 2021, after Mr Battye's employment had terminated. The panel therefore did not take this document into consideration.

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

The panel considered that Mr Battye was in breach of the following provisions: Part one, paragraph 13:

All staff 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;*
- *behaviour policy;*
- *staff behaviour policy (sometimes called a code of conduct);*
- *safeguarding response to children who go missing from education; and*
- *role of the designated safeguarding lead (including the identity of the designated safeguarding lead and any deputies).*

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

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

The panel found that none of these offence types were relevant.

The panel noted that Mr Battye had been found to have made highly inappropriate, unprofessional and sexual comments to a number of pupils, which had made them feel uncomfortable and humiliated. Some of the comments included what Witness A referred to in his oral evidence as *"some of the most offensive words in our language"*. Mr Battye's

unprofessional conduct was not a one-off occurrence and there was a repetitive pattern of behaviour by Mr Battye, particularly towards Pupil H and Pupil B, which the panel found concerning.

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

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

The panel considered that Mr Battye's conduct as found proven would be very likely to bring the profession into disrepute and the public would be shocked and appalled to know that a teacher had behaved in this way, making highly inappropriate, unprofessional and sexual comments to pupils. The panel was concerned that Mr Battye had failed to model behaviours expected of pupils and this ultimately led to pupils reporting Mr Battye for his unprofessional behaviour.

In considering the issue of disrepute, the panel also considered whether Mr Battye's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offence types in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice.

As set out above in the panel's findings as to whether Mr Battye was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found that none of these offences were relevant.

The findings of misconduct are serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on Mr Battye's status as a teacher.

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

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Battye'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 and protection of other members of the public; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct within the teaching profession.

The panel's findings against Mr Battye involved making inappropriate, unprofessional and sexual comments to pupils, swearing at pupils, invading Pupil H's personal space and making inappropriate and unprofessional gestures. There was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Battye 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 Battye 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 Battye in the profession. There was oral evidence from Witness A that he was impressed with Mr Battye's "secure subject knowledge", he presented as "a safe pair of hands" and he was "popular with students".

Pupil C noted in their written statement dated 31 July 2023, "*Mr Battye did not make me feel uncomfortable very often and I thought he seemed nice*". Pupil A's contemporaneous statement dated 2 December 2020 stated, "*he is a great teacher and it's nice to have a strict teacher with a sense of humour*". Pupil B's contemporaneous statement dated 7 December 2020 stated, "*Mr Battye was obviously joking and I like him quite a bit as he's a good teacher*". Pupil X's contemporaneous statement dated 10 December 2020 stated,

“Pupil B and Mr Battye don’t get along because Pupil B annoys him a lot, Mr Battye is just lovely”.

The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Battye in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.

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 noted that Mr Battye’s inappropriate, unprofessional and sexual comments to children should be viewed very seriously in terms of its potential influence on pupils and be seen as a possible threat to the public interest. Especially given the repetitive nature of the findings in respect of Mr Battye’s conduct.

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 Battye.

The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours of a teacher have been proved. In the list of such behaviours, those that were relevant in this case were:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers’ Standards;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- 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);
- ...or other deliberate behaviour that undermines pupils, the profession, the school or colleagues; and
- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour.

The panel considered that the allegations did not amount to sexual misconduct as the conduct was not sexually motivated or of a sexual nature. However, the findings of fact that Mr Battye made sexual comments to children was akin to the factors set out in the Advice which are incompatible with being a teacher. The panel was also concerned that Mr Battye’s behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher at two different schools over a period of time. This suggested that his behaviour

was of an attitudinal nature and was deep-seated leading the panel to believe that there was a real risk of repetition.

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 may not be appropriate or proportionate.

There was no evidence that Mr Battye's actions were not deliberate.

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

The panel was not presented with any evidence that Mr Battye demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or contributed significantly to the education sector. Mr Battye submitted no evidence to attest to his ability as an educator, but the panel noted from the documentary evidence available that Mr Battye's application to The Romsey School declared having held previous senior leadership roles including a promotion to Headship.

The panel noted the mitigation provided by Mr Battye in Individual A's investigation report dated 25 May 2021. Mr Battye explained:

"[REDACTED]. I want to sincerely apologise for any upset I may have caused to the students".

Mr Battye's written submissions dated 30 November 2025 explained:

"Covid happened and I have made comments during that period of what happened [REDACTED] and returning to the UK". Mr Battye further stated, "I have admitted to my unprofessional comments several times before and given reasons why and apologised for my actions, which I apologise for again. It was never my intention to bring the teaching profession into disrepute nor upset any students in my charge – it is truly the best career anyone could undertake and one that I would like to continue subject to your conclusions".

Despite references to Mr Battye apologising for his actions and admitting to unspecified "unprofessional comments", the panel considered that there was very limited evidence that he had shown insight or remorse for his actions. The panel considered Mr Battye had failed to fully recognise the impact of his actions on pupils. Pupil B was repeatedly publicly humiliated with sexual comments. The panel also noted Pupil H's oral evidence that his comments had made her "curl up inside and uncomfortable" and despite describing herself as not being a very sensitive person, the repetitive pattern of behaviour built up, and she described how she could still recall how it made her feel when Mr Battye got close to her face.

Mr Battye's written representations focused on the impact that the proceedings have had on him, suggesting that Individual A was "*acting in a bullying and harassing*" way to discredit him and suggesting that pupils were "*coming for him*".

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 Battye 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 Battye. The panel identified aggravating features which added to the seriousness of Mr Battye's conduct as it affected a significant number of students over a period of time. The targeting and humiliation of Pupil B and Pupil H in a public forum in front of their peers was a significant factor in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

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

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

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

The Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate.

None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel's findings. However, the panel considered its findings that Mr Battye repeatedly made sexual comments to children, including words that were considered by Witness A to be "*some of the most offensive words in our language*", and this weighed in favour of offering a longer review period.

The panel noted that, although limited, Mr Battye had shown some insight and remorse into his actions and indicated that he would “*like to continue*” his teaching career. Taking account of the mitigation provided, the panel considered that Mr Battye may be able to demonstrate a consistent change in behaviour that could mitigate the risk of repetition and as such it would be appropriate and proportionate to allow for a review period, albeit with a longer period of review.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a review period of 5 years.

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 Steven Battye should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of five years.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Battye 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; and
 - 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 Battye, 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 Battye fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of making inappropriate, unprofessional and sexual comments to pupils, swearing at pupils, invading a pupil's personal space, and making inappropriate and unprofessional gestures.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself, whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct or conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Mr Battye, 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's findings against Mr Battye involved making inappropriate, unprofessional and sexual comments to pupils, swearing at pupils, invading Pupil H's personal space and making inappropriate and unprofessional gestures. There was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public." 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, "Despite references to Mr Battye apologising for his actions and admitting to unspecified *"unprofessional comments"*, the panel considered that there was very limited evidence that he had shown insight or remorse for his actions. The panel considered Mr Battye had failed to fully recognise the impact of his actions on pupils. Pupil B was repeatedly publicly humiliated with sexual comments. The panel also noted Pupil H's oral evidence that his comments had made her *"curl up inside and uncomfortable"* and despite describing herself as not being a very sensitive person, the repetitive pattern of behaviour built up, and she described how she could still recall how it made her feel when Mr Battye got close to her face." In my judgement, the lack of evidence of full insight or remorse means that there is some risk of the repetition of this

behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, “the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Battye was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of inappropriate behaviour with pupils 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 Battye himself and the panel comment “The panel was not presented with any evidence that Mr Battye demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or contributed significantly to the education sector. Mr Battye submitted no evidence to attest to his ability as an educator, but the panel noted from the documentary evidence available that Mr Battye’s application to The Romsey School declared having held previous senior leadership roles including a promotion to Headship.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Battye 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 lack of full insight or remorse. The panel has said, “Mr Battye’s written representations focused on the impact that the proceedings have had on him, suggesting that Individual A was “*acting in a bullying and harassing*” way to discredit him and suggesting that pupils were “*coming for him*”.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding that “The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Battye. The panel identified aggravating features which added to the seriousness of Mr Battye’s conduct as it affected a significant number of students over a period of time. The targeting and humiliation of

Pupil B and Pupil H in a public forum in front of their peers was a significant factor in forming that opinion.”

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

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended a 5 year review period.

I have considered the panel’s comments “The panel considered its findings that Mr Battye repeatedly made sexual comments to children, including words that were considered by Witness A to be “*some of the most offensive words in our language*”, and this weighed in favour of offering a longer review period.”

The panel has also said “The panel noted that, although limited, Mr Battye had shown some insight and remorse into his actions and indicated that he would “*like to continue*” his teaching career. Taking account of the mitigation provided, the panel considered that Mr Battye may be able to demonstrate a consistent change in behaviour that could mitigate the risk of repetition and as such it would be appropriate and proportionate to allow for a review period, albeit with a longer period of review.”

In this case, factors mean that allowing a two-year review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the lack of evidence of full insight or remorse, and the risk of repetition

I consider therefore that a five year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

This means that Mr Steven Battye is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children’s home in England. He may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 2030, 5 years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If he does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Mr Battye remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr Battye 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', with a horizontal line extending from the start of the signature.

Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey

Date: 8 December 2025

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