



Ms Kaodi O'Loughlin Campbell: 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	5
Documents	5
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	10
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	14

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

Teacher: Ms Kaodi O'Loughlin Campbell

Teacher ref number: 2056188

Teacher date of birth: 15 November 1991

TRA reference: 23876

Date of determination: 22 January 2026

Former employer: Ferndale Primary School, Birmingham

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 22 January 2026 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Ms O'Loughlin Campbell.

The panel members were Ms Geraldine Baird (lay panellist – in the chair), Mr Tim Foy (lay panellist) and Mrs Georgina Bean (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Clare Strickland of Blake Morgan 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 O'Loughlin Campbell that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Ms O'Loughlin Campbell 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 or Ms O'Loughlin Campbell.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 13 January 2026.

It was alleged that Ms O'Loughlin Campbell was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that while a teacher at Ferndale Primary School:

1. Between January and March 2023, she engaged in inappropriate communication with a former pupil, Pupil A, in that she:
 - a. Provided Pupil A with her mobile phone number.
 - b. Exchanged messages with Pupil A.
 - c. Told Pupil A to delete the messages she had exchanged with Pupil A.
 - d. Told Pupil A to contact her via social media.
2. At the time of the conduct as described at paragraph 1 above, she knew or ought to have known that Pupil A was vulnerable.
3. On one or more occasions between January 2023 to December 2023, in response to investigations into her conduct, she falsely claimed not to have contacted Pupil A via social media and/or exchanged messages with Pupil A.
4. Her conduct as described at paragraphs 1.c. and 3 above was dishonest in that she attempted to cover up for her conduct as described at paragraphs 1.a. and/or 1.b. and/or 1.d. above.
5. Her conduct as described at paragraph 1 above breached professional boundaries between her and Pupil A.

Ms O'Loughlin Campbell admitted the allegations.

Ms O'Loughlin Campbell admitted that her conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the teaching profession into disrepute.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Anonymised person list – page 3

Section 2: Statement of agreed facts and notice of meeting – pages 4 to 10

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 11 to 53

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 54 to 146

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 147 to 161

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

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

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Ms O’Loughlin Campbell on 4 November 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 O’Loughlin Campbell 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 O’Loughlin Campbell qualified as a teacher in 2021 and took up a post at Ferndale Primary School in September 2023. Between September 2021 and May 2022, she worked occasionally as a supply member of staff at Elmwood School (“the School”), a

special secondary school for children with social, emotional and mental health needs. During her teacher training, she had not worked in a secondary school or school for children with social, emotional or mental health needs.

Pupil A was a pupil at the School [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] met Ms O'Loughlin Campbell at the School.

Concerns were raised about potential social media contact between Ms O'Loughlin Campbell and Pupil A in January and May 2023. Ms O'Loughlin Campbell was asked about this at the time but did not disclose anything. In October 2023, Pupil A made disclosures to [REDACTED] about Ms O'Loughlin Campbell. [REDACTED] provided [REDACTED] with screenshots of messages that Ms O'Loughlin Campbell had sent to [REDACTED], starting in January 2023, along with a screenshot of Ms O'Loughlin Campbell's contact details.

Multi-agency investigations followed. It was established that in January 2023, Ms O'Loughlin Campbell provided Pupil A with her contact details, and they became friends on Snapchat. Thereafter, they exchanged messages. On 1 February 2023, Ms O'Loughlin Campbell sent Pupil A a message saying:

“Make sure you delete all the messages from here”

In a further message, she told [REDACTED] not to save her number under her name.

On 5 March 2023, she asked Pupil A to *“Add me back on Snap”* and subsequently sent [REDACTED] a text message telling him to *“delete these messages”*.

On 22 November 2023, the School interviewed Ms O'Loughlin Campbell, and she said that she had not communicated with any pupils from the School after leaving in May 2022. She also said that her interactions with pupils were always formal. When shown a copy of the messages between her and Pupil A dating from 2023 she admitted that she had sent and received them.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

While a teacher at Ferndale Primary School:

- 1. Between January and March 2023, you engaged in inappropriate communication with a former pupil, Pupil A, in that you:**

- a. Provided Pupil A with your mobile phone number.**
- b. Exchanged messages with Pupil A.**
- c. Told Pupil A to delete the messages you had exchanged with Pupil A.**
- d. Told Pupil A to contact you via social media.**

This allegation was admitted and supported by evidence presented to the panel. The panel was satisfied that the admission was unequivocal and consistent with the evidence. The allegation was therefore found proved.

2. At the time of the conduct as described at paragraph 1 above, you knew or ought to have known that Pupil A was vulnerable.

This allegation was admitted and supported by evidence presented to the panel. The panel was satisfied that the admission was unequivocal and consistent with the evidence. [REDACTED] Ms O'Loughlin Campbell admitted that she was aware [REDACTED]. The allegation was therefore found proved.

3. On one or more occasions between January 2023 to December 2023, in response to investigations into your conduct, you falsely claimed not to have contacted Pupil A via social media and/or exchanged messages with Pupil A.

Ms O'Loughlin Campbell admitted that in a disciplinary interview in November 2023, she initially denied communicating with any of the pupils from the school after leaving in May 2022 and said her interactions with pupils were “always formal”. She also admitted that this had not been true. In her written submissions, she said that she had previously denied communicating with Pupil A when asked about it, and that she had maintained that denial in her disciplinary interview. This was consistent with the other evidence before the panel. The panel therefore found that this allegation was proved.

4. Your conduct as described at paragraphs 1.c. and 3 above was dishonest in that you attempted to cover up for your conduct as described at paragraphs 1.a. and/or 1.b. and/or 1.d. above.

Ms O'Loughlin Campbell admitted this allegation. The panel was satisfied that her admission was unequivocal and consistent with other evidence, and therefore found this allegation proved.

5. Your conduct as described at paragraph 1 above breached professional boundaries between you and Pupil A.

Ms O'Loughlin Campbell admitted this allegation, and the panel concluded that as a matter of fact, her conduct did breach professional boundaries. It recognized that it did not have a copy of the school's policy on this, but the panel was clear that her conduct towards a recent past pupil who had significant vulnerabilities was a breach of professional boundaries. The panel could envisage no circumstances in which the nature and type of contact that she had with Pupil A between January and March 2023 would fall within appropriate professional boundaries. Accordingly, it accepted her admission, which was unequivocal, and found this allegation proved.

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

Having found all 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 Ms O'Loughlin Campbell, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Ms O'Loughlin Campbell was in breach of the following standards:

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

The panel also considered whether Ms O'Loughlin Campbell'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 the offence of fraud or serious dishonesty was relevant.

The panel concluded that Ms O'Loughlin Campbell breached professional boundaries in a way that potentially presented a risk of harm, given Pupil A's [REDACTED]. The panel accepted that she had acted without any malicious intent, and it recognised that there was no evidence of direct harm to Pupil A as a result. However, although the panel found she was motivated by a desire to support Pupil A, it concluded that there were other routes she could and should have taken which would not have amounted to misconduct. She had also acted dishonestly in an attempt to cover up what she had done. In her written submissions to the TRA, she admitted that she had been dishonest in a self-interested attempt to avoid the consequences of her actions, rather than from any desire to protect Pupil A.

The panel noted that the allegations arose shortly after Pupil A had left School and when Ms O'Loughlin Campbell was no longer his teacher. Nevertheless, [REDACTED] knew her as [REDACTED] teacher. The allegations clearly stemmed from her role as a teacher.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Ms O'Loughlin Campbell amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

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

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

In considering the issue of disrepute, the panel also considered whether Ms O'Loughlin Campbell's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice.

As set out above in the panel's findings as to whether she was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that fraud or serious dishonesty was relevant.

The panel noted that while engaged in inappropriate contact with Pupil A, Ms O'Loughlin Campbell appeared to recognise how her conduct might be perceived, and how

damaging that perception might be, when she sent Pupil A a message saying "*I ain't trying to move to you like that I ain't a pedo I just think you're a lovely person and I want the best for you*". Even recognising that her motives were benign, the public would rightly be concerned about the judgement of a teacher who engaged in private conversation like this with a [REDACTED] ex-pupil.

The panel was clear that Ms O'Loughlin Campbell's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher.

For these reasons, the panel found that her 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/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 safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, 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 O'Loughlin Campbell, which involved a breach of professional boundaries with a [REDACTED] ex-pupil and a dishonest and self-interested cover up, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and maintaining public confidence.

The panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms O'Loughlin Campbell 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 O'Loughlin Campbell 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 O'Loughlin Campbell in the profession. The panel decided that this factor was present, as no doubt had been cast upon her abilities as an educator, and there were some positive character references. The panel concluded that it might be possible for Ms O'Loughlin Campbell to make a positive contribution to education in the future.

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 the teacher.

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 panel concluded that the teacher's conduct was serious.
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- The panel recognised there was no specific evidence of harm to Pupil A but continued that the teacher's conduct placed him at risk of harm, and that unless Ms O'Loughlin Campbell could demonstrate that there was no risk she would act similarly in future, there was a continuing risk of harm to other pupils in the future.
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- The panel concluded that Ms O'Loughlin Campbell had not demonstrated that she was worthy of the trust placed in her as a teacher when she deliberately and dishonestly covered up what she had done in order to protect herself. She had also developed an inappropriate social relationship with Pupil A in circumstances where he and the adults around him should have been able to trust her not to do so.
- 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);

- The panel concluded that when Pupil A first contacted her, Ms O'Loughlin Campbell should have taken appropriate action by raising this with the School and/or her School. The panel concluded that her failure to do so was a breach of her duty of care to him.
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions or purposeful destruction of evidence, especially where these behaviours have been repeated or had serious consequences, or involved the coercion of another person to act in a way contrary to their own interests;
- The panel was satisfied that Ms O'Loughlin Campbell deliberately sought to conceal her actions, including through requests that evidence be destroyed. These requests were repeated. However, the panel was not satisfied that her actions involved the coercion of Pupil A.
- collusion or concealment including:
 - any activity that involves knowingly substantiating another person's statements where they are known to be false;
 - failure to challenge inappropriate actions, defending inappropriate actions or concealing inappropriate actions;
 - encouraging others to break rules;
 - lying to prevent the identification of wrongdoing;

The panel was satisfied that the teacher lied to prevent the identification of her wrongdoing.

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.

There was evidence that the teacher's actions were deliberate, and there was no evidence that she was acting under extreme duress.

The panel recognized that she had not completed her training in a secondary or special school, and that she was early in her teaching career, and considered that this did mitigate her conduct to a degree. However, the general principles that she would have been trained on were applicable, and she should at least have been on notice that she might need to raise the matter when Pupil A first contacted her. Instead, she did not do so, and she actively sought to conceal what she had done for a long time. She only admitted what she had done when confronted with clear evidence of it.

Ms O'Loughlin Campbell did have a previously good history, with evidence that she has a valuable contribution to make and no evidence of any prior formal concerns.

However, the panel was concerned that she did not yet appear to have learned that her desire to help and support children needed to be channelled in an appropriate and professional way. In mitigation, she submitted cards sent to her by pupils which suggested that they perceived her as a friend, and expressed love for her in terms that the panel did not find reassuring when considering if she really understood the boundaries applicable to her role as a teacher.

The panel recognised that Ms O'Loughlin Campbell had made full and honest admissions and expressed an understanding of what she had done wrong in terms of breaching professional boundaries. However, it did not have sufficient assurance that she had fully remediated her conduct and would not act in a similar way in future. There was no evidence before the panel of what work, if any, she has done since 2023. The panel had no information about any professional training or practice since then, and there was no evidence that she could apply her learning in practice. There was limited reflection on her boundary breach, on why it had happened, and how she would act differently in future, and there was no real reflection on her dishonesty.

In these circumstances, the panel was concerned that there was a risk of repetition of similar conduct in the future.

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 Ms O'Loughlin Campbell 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 the teacher. The ongoing risk of repetition, and the risk of harm that would result if her conduct was repeated 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.

These include:

- fraud or serious dishonesty;

However, the panel considered this in context. Ms O'Loughlin Campbell's misconduct occurred very early in her teaching career, and she has made very full and honest admissions to the TRA. She had no malign intent towards Pupil A. Her submissions demonstrate real potential for her to develop her insight and articulate it in a way that does provide full assurance that she presents no future risk.

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 provision for a review period.

The panel considered that a 2-year review period would be appropriate. This should give Ms O'Loughlin Campbell enough time to reflect fully and develop her insight. The panel recognised that she may not be working professionally with children but considered that this should not be a bar to her being able to demonstrate that she is safe to practise in future. Reflective discussions with professionals experienced in working with children would assist her in developing and demonstrating a mature understanding of the importance of professional boundaries and honesty.

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 Kaodi O'Loughlin Campbell should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of 2 years.

In particular, the panel has found that Ms O'Loughlin Campbell is in breach of the following standards:

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

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Ms O'Loughlin Campbell 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 Ms O'Loughlin Campbell fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include findings of dishonesty and breaching professional boundaries.

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 Ms O'Loughlin Campbell, 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 and safeguard pupils. The panel has observed:

“In the light of the panel’s findings against Ms O'Loughlin Campbell, which involved a breach of professional boundaries with a [REDACTED] ex-pupil and a dishonest and self-interested cover up, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and maintaining public confidence.”

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 has set out as follows:

“The panel recognised that Ms O'Loughlin Campbell had made full and honest admissions and expressed an understanding of what she had done wrong in terms of breaching professional boundaries. However, it did not have sufficient assurance that she had fully remediated her conduct and would not act in a similar way in future. There was no evidence before the panel of what work, if any, she has done since 2023. The panel had no information about any professional training or practice since then, and there was no evidence that she could apply her learning in practice. There was limited reflection on her boundary breach, on why it had happened, and how she would act differently in future, and there was no real reflection on her dishonesty.”

In my judgement, Ms O'Loughlin Campbell’s lack of full insight into her breach of professional boundaries and dishonesty, and how she would act differently in future, 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 has observed:

“Even recognising that her motives were benign, the public would rightly be concerned about the judgement of a teacher who engaged in private conversation like this with a [REDACTED] ex-pupil.

The panel was clear that Ms O'Loughlin Campbell’s conduct could potentially damage the public’s perception of a teacher.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of dishonesty 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 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 O’Loughlin Campbell herself. The panel has commented:

“The panel recognized that she had not completed her training in a secondary or special school, and that she was early in her teaching career, and considered that this did mitigate her conduct to a degree.”

“Ms O’Loughlin Campbell did have a previously good history, with evidence that she has a valuable contribution to make and no evidence of any prior formal

A prohibition order would prevent Ms O’Loughlin Campbell 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 seriousness of a teacher developing an inappropriate relationship with a pupil and then dishonestly attempting to cover this up. The panel has said:

“The panel concluded that Ms O’Loughlin Campbell had not demonstrated that she was worthy of the trust placed in her as a teacher when she deliberately and dishonestly covered up what she had done in order to protect herself. She had also developed an inappropriate social relationship with Pupil A in circumstances where he and the adults around him should have been able to trust her not to do so.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that there was an ongoing risk of repetition and therefore a risk of harm to pupils if Ms O’Loughlin Campbell’s conduct was repeated. The panel has said:

“However, the panel was concerned that she did not yet appear to have learned that her desire to help and support children needed to be channelled in an

appropriate and professional way. In mitigation, she submitted cards sent to her by pupils which suggested that they perceived her as a friend, and expressed love for her in terms that the panel did not find reassuring when considering if she really understood the boundaries applicable to her role as a teacher.”

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

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended a 2-year review period.

The panel has noted that the Advice indicates that where a case involves serious dishonesty the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer review period. I have considered the panel's comments:

“However, the panel considered this in context. Ms O'Loughlin Campbell's misconduct occurred very early in her teaching career, and she has made very full and honest admissions to the TRA. She had no malign intent towards Pupil A. Her submissions demonstrate real potential for her to develop her insight and articulate it in a way that does provide full assurance that she presents no future risk.

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 provision for a review period.

The panel considered that a 2-year review period would be appropriate. This should give Ms O'Loughlin Campbell enough time to reflect fully and develop her insight. The panel recognised that she may not be working professionally with children but considered that this should not be a bar to her being able to demonstrate that she is safe to practise in future. Reflective discussions with professionals experienced in working with children would assist her in developing and demonstrating a mature understanding of the importance of professional boundaries and honesty.”

I have considered whether a 2-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 this case, factors mean that I agree with the panel that allowing a 2-year review period is sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. A 2-year review period will give Ms O'Loughlin Campbell sufficient time to demonstrate that she has developed full insight into her behaviour and that she understands the importance of professional boundaries and honesty, and to provide assurance that there would be no risk of repetition should the prohibition order be set aside after 2 years.

I consider therefore that a 2-year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

This means that Ms Kaodi O'Loughlin Campbell 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 29 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 O'Loughlin Campbell remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely

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

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

Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 23 January 2026

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