



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Ms Lyndi Corston: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome**

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

**January 2026**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	8
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	12

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

**Teacher:** Ms Lyndi Corston

**Teacher ref number:** 8663700

**Teacher date of birth:** 21 February 1964

**TRA reference:** 25119

**Date of determination:** 14 January 2026

**Former employer:** Engage Education/Workwell Limited, London

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 14 January 2026 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Ms Lyndi Corston.

The panel members were Mrs Michelle Chappell (teacher panellist – in the chair), Dr Martin Coles (former teacher panellist) and Dr Sheila Cunningham (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Delme Griffiths of Blake Morgan LLP, Solicitors.

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Ms Corston that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Ms Corston provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, Ms Corston or a representative.

The meeting took place in private.

## **Allegations**

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 5 January 2026.

It was alleged that Ms Corston was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into, in that whilst working as a supply teacher at Rye Primary School:

1. She appeared in explicit content available to the general public and/or behind a paywall, including:
  - a. on an unknown date in 2024, she created and/or appeared on an OnlyFans account, which included nudity;
  - b. between January 2023 and January 2025, she engaged in making a sexually explicit video or videos, which appeared on the internet;
  - c. she appeared on pornographic websites under the description “granny schoolteacher”.

Ms Corston admitted the facts of the allegations and that her conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section 1: Chronology, anonymised pupil list and list of key people – pages 4 to 5

Section 2: Notice of referral and response – pages 6 to 21

Section 3: Statement of Agreed Facts – pages 22 to 26

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 27 to 98

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 99 to 112

Section 6: Notice of meeting – pages 113 to 113(a).

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

In the consideration of this case, the panel also 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 Ms Corston on 3 December 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 Ms Corston 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.

Ms Corston was previously engaged by Workwell Limited trading as Engage Education, on an agency basis. She was an Early Years Foundation Stage teacher.

From around November 2022, she was regularly placed at Rye Community Primary School (“the School”) on a short term, supply basis.

On 11 September 2024, whilst working at the School, concerns were raised that Ms Corston may have had an OnlyFans account, after a push notification from that site was seen on Ms Corston’s phone by a colleague.

This was accepted by Ms Corston. She declared that the account was hers and it involved nudity but not sexual acts. It was not in her personal name.

This led to Ms Corston being asked to close the account and to sign an enhanced code of conduct, which she did.

However, on 6 January 2025, Engage Education was notified that Ms Corston had been identified on a pornographic website engaging in sexual activity.

This led to an investigation and a LADO referral.

Ms Corston was subsequently referred to the TRA.

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

- 1. You appeared in explicit content available to the general public and/or behind a paywall, including:**
  - a. on an unknown date in 2024, you created and/or appeared on an OnlyFans account, which included nudity;**
  - b. between January 2023 and January 2025, you engaged in making a sexually explicit video or videos, which appeared on the internet;**
  - c. you appeared on pornographic websites under the description “granny schoolteacher”.**

Ms Corston admitted the facts of allegations 1(a) to (c), which the panel considered together.

She fully accepted that:

- She created and appeared on an OnlyFans account, which included nudity.
- She appeared in an explicit video involving sexual intercourse, which was available on the internet, either behind a paywall freely available.
- She consented to the production of the video and willingly participated in it.
- The video appeared on one or more pornographic websites, under the description ‘granny schoolteacher’.

The panel did take into account that there was limited, first-hand direct evidence in relation to the allegations and Ms Corston’s conduct. Not least, no images or recordings were included in evidence and whilst there is reference to certain individuals having viewed them, the precise circumstances were vague and unclear.

However, Ms Corston had consistently and unequivocally accepted her actions as alleged, during the course of the previous investigations, on several occasions, and in these proceedings, culminating in her completion of a statement of agreed facts.

On this basis, on the balance of probabilities, the panel found allegations 1(a) to (c) proved.

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

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

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

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

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school ...
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach ...

The panel also considered whether Ms Corston’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 offences was relevant.

Over and above these matters, the panel recognised that whilst Ms Corston had a right to a private life and there is a limit to the scope of professional regulation, that was not an unqualified right.

In this instance, Ms Corston was working as a teacher at the time of her behaviour. She was required to comply with the School’s policies and procedures whilst she was placed there. In relation to the video, it was accepted by Ms Corston that she was identifiable as a teacher, whether or not through positive choice. It was not apparent that there were any limitations placed by her upon the extent to which the video could be used. She was plainly at risk of being recognised, which happened, and that in turn brings public confidence into consideration. She chose to be depicted in the manner she was and willingly participated in a publicly accessible pornographic video and a personal OnlyFans account. She was in a position of responsibility as a teacher and members of the public rightly expect teachers to set a good example.

Accordingly, whilst conduct outside of the education setting, this was conduct that linked to the way she fulfilled her teaching role and could, potentially, have led to pupils being exposed to, or influenced by, the behaviour in a harmful way. The panel could not exclude the possibility that, had these matters become widely known within the School community, older pupils at the School could have become aware of Ms Corston's actions.

The panel was, therefore, satisfied that the conduct of Ms Corston amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Ms Corston was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel also concluded that Ms Corston's conduct was such that it may bring the profession into disrepute.

In arriving at that conclusion, 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 findings of misconduct are serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher. As a teacher and as a professional person, Ms Corston had an obligation to behave appropriately outside of the scope of exercising professional duties. The panel considered that Ms Corston ought to have been aware of the extent to which her personal conduct could impact on how the public, to include learners, perceived her as a teacher and perceived the profession.

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

## **Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State**

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

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

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely:

- 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 Ms Corston, which involved participation in online activity including an explicit sexual video in which she was publicly identified as a teacher, there was a strong public interest consideration in terms of public confidence in the profession. It could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Corston were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Ms Corston 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 Ms Corston in the profession.

The conduct took place outside the classroom and there was no reason to conclude she was anything other than a competent professional. The School appeared to be pleased with her work as a supply teacher. However, the panel was not presented with references or testimonials. There was no evidence Ms Corston ought to be regarded as having made an exceptional contribution to teaching. Accordingly, there was not a strong public interest consideration in retaining her in the profession.

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the behaviour, noting that the Advice states that the expectation of both the public and pupils, is that members of the teaching profession maintain an exemplary level of integrity and ethical standards at all times.

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

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, relevant in this case was:

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

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors.

Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

The panel identified the following factors which it considered to be relevant in mitigation:

- Ms Corston seemingly had a prior good record. This was the only known issue in an otherwise unblemished career.
- Her actions did not occur in the course of teaching and children were not directly impacted.
- Ms Corston fully participated in these proceedings and made full admissions.
- Ms Corston apologised for her actions and stated she recognised the seriousness of this matter, taking responsibility for her conduct and expressing regret.
- There was some evidence of insight, whereby Ms Corston now recognised and accepted that her behaviour was wrong. However, the panel noted that when first challenged about her conduct, her response was somewhat different, referencing, for example, that she did not necessarily regret her choice and alluding to the right to a private life outside of her teaching. The panel therefore concluded Ms Corston's insight was emerging rather than complete.
- Ms Corston stated her actions occurred within the context of [REDACTED]. Whilst no independent, supporting documentation was advanced in that regard, the panel accepted, based on Ms Corston's explanations, this was indicative of a [REDACTED], although this did not excuse her actions.
- Ms Corston stated she was not aware that the video would be widely accessible, believing it would be behind a private paywall, though the panel had noted in its findings she had nonetheless fully consented to participate and no limitations were placed on the use to which the video could be put. There was no evidence she was coerced and her actions were voluntary.

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 was sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Ms Corston 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 Ms Corston. The impact of her actions on public confidence in the profession and the extent of her departure from the personal and professional elements of the Teachers' Standards were significant factors in forming that opinion.

Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate to recommend that a review period of the order should be considered.

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 behaviours that, if proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. These behaviours were not relevant in this case.

The panel decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provision for a review period, for the following reasons in particular.

The panel had in mind, firstly, that prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive.

Ms Corston had already been impacted by her actions and the panel's findings and decision would likely affect her professional reputation and future employment prospects.

Further, her conduct took place in the context of an otherwise unblemished career and did not directly link to her teaching or to children. Ms Corston had shown regret, remorse and some insight. The panel did consider the wider backdrop whereby, whilst plainly wrong, Ms Corston was driven to act as she did by [REDACTED] and she had taken steps to anonymise her OnlyFans account.

In that context and when the other mitigating factors were taken into account, the panel concluded that recommending no review period would not be appropriate and would be disproportionate.

The panel also considered that, in time, it would be possible for Ms Corston to gain further insight, reflect on her actions and demonstrate that she was suitable to return to the profession.

The panel proceeded to consider the minimum period before which an application could be made, by Ms Corston, to have the prohibition order reviewed and set aside.

The Advice specifies that where a case involves certain factors, 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. Once again, the panel did not consider these to be directly relevant in this case.

The panel concluded that a review period of two years was appropriate in this case.

A period of two years will afford Ms Corston sufficient time and opportunity, should she wish to do so, to take steps to demonstrate that she has gained further insight into the nature, effect and implications of her conduct. It will also allow her to demonstrate that there has been no repetition of the same or similar behaviour, whereby continued participation in these types of activities would be incompatible with a desire to return to teaching.

In the view of the panel, a period of two years is proportionate in the specific circumstances of this case.

## **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 all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Ms Corston should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of two years.

In particular, the panel has found that Ms Corston is in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school ...
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach ...

The panel finds that the conduct of Ms Corston fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the

profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself, whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Ms Corston, 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 safeguard pupils. The panel has observed,

*“...whilst conduct outside of the education setting, this was conduct that linked to the way she fulfilled her teaching role and could, potentially, have led to pupils being exposed to, or influenced by, the behaviour in a harmful way”.*

A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which includes,

*“There was some evidence of insight, whereby Ms Corston now recognised and accepted that her behaviour was wrong. However, the panel noted that when first challenged about her conduct, her response was somewhat different, referencing, for example, that she did not necessarily regret her choice and alluding to the right to a private life outside of her teaching. The panel therefore concluded Ms Corston's insight was emerging rather than complete”.*

The panel has also commented that Ms Corston showed some insight, but the panel characterised that as *“emerging rather than complete”*. In my judgement, the lack of full insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe,

*“The panel 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 Ms Corston was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated”.*

I have had to consider that the public has a high expectation of professional standards of all teachers and that the public might regard a failure to impose a prohibition order as a failure to uphold those high standards. In weighing these considerations, I have had to

consider the matter from the point of view of an “ordinary intelligent and well-informed citizen.”

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Ms Corston herself. The panel comment,

*“Ms Corston had already been impacted by her actions and the panel's findings and decision would likely affect her professional reputation and future employment prospects”.*

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel's comments concerning the lack of full insight.

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

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

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

In doing so, it has referenced the Advice as follows:

*“The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. These behaviours were not relevant in this case”.*

The panel has also said that a two year review period “*is proportionate in the specific circumstances of this case.*”

I have considered whether a two year 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 my view, the factors in this case mean that a two year review period is sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession, is proportionate, and in the public interest.

**This means that Ms Lyndi Corston is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England.** She may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 20 January 2028, 2 years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If she does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Ms Corston remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Ms Corston has a right of appeal to the High Court within 28 days from the date she is given notice of this order.



**Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield**

**Date: 20 January 2026**

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