



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Moses Forson: 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: Mr Moses Forson

Teacher ref number: 1131391

Teacher date of birth: 6 March 1974

TRA reference: 21535

Date of determination: 21 January 2026

Former employer: Kew House School (“the School”)

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 21 January 2026 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Moses Forson.

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 Miss 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 Mr Forson that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Forson provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, Mr Forson or his representative.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 12 January 2026.

It was alleged that Mr Forson was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst employed as a Teacher of Business at Kew House School:

1. He provided false and/or misleading information to one or more teaching agencies by;
 - a. Providing one or more character and/or professional references for Individual A confirming that he had worked at Kew House School, when this was not the case;
 - b. Stating on one or more occasions he was the Head of Department at Kew House School when in fact he was a Teacher of Business;
 - c. Providing one or more character and/or professional references for Individual A, when in fact he knew some or all of the information contained was supplied by Individual A and the reference(s) were not wholly completed by himself.
2. His behaviour as may be found proven at 1 above was dishonest and/or lacked integrity.

Mr Forson admitted the facts alleged.

Mr Forson admitted that his 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: Notice of referral and response – pages 7 to 43

Section 2: Statement of agreed facts – pages 45 to 47

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 49 to 62

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 64 to 149

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 152 to 172

In addition, the panel received an additional document, an undated personal statement from Mr Forson.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle in advance of the hearing, and that they had read the additional document on receipt, before making any final decisions on the case.

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

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Forson on 7 January 2026.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

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

Mr Forson was employed as a Teacher of Business at the School from 1 January 2021. On 23 January 2023, Vision Teaching Agency contacted the School to query a verbal reference provided by Mr Forson for Individual A. Individual A had informed Vision Teaching Agency that he was employed at the School between January 2018 and July 2022, and had said that Mr Forson was his Head of Department. Mr Forson confirmed this information in a call with Vision Teaching Agency.

Mr Forson was not Head of Department, and Individual A had never worked at the School.

When first spoken to by the School, Mr Forson said he had only provided one character reference for Individual A, and that he had not done anything wrong. He denied having spoken to Vision Teaching Agency. When shown references that purported to have been completed by him, he denied that he had completed them.

The School investigated further, including by reviewing Mr Forson’s school email account. It found that between November 2022 and January 2023 he had been providing

professional references to other agencies about Individual A and/or allowing Individual A to provide references in his name. These references included the false claims that Mr Forson was Head of Department and that Individual A had worked at the School. There was at least one occasion when he had forwarded an online reference link to Individual A so that Individual A could complete the reference himself.

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:

Whilst employed as a Teacher of Business at Kew House School:

- 1. You provided false and/or misleading information to one or more teaching agencies by;**
 - a. Providing one or more character and/or professional references for Individual A confirming that he had worked at Kew House School, when this was not the case;**
 - b. Stating on one or more occasions you were the Head of Department at Kew House School when in fact you were a Teacher of Business;**
 - c. Providing one or more character and/or professional references for Individual A, when in fact you knew some or all of the information contained was supplied by Individual A and the reference(s) were not wholly completed by yourself.**
- 2. Your behaviour as may be found proven at 1 above was dishonest and/or lacked integrity.**

The allegations were admitted and supported by the evidence received by the panel. The panel was satisfied that the admissions were consistent with the other evidence, and that the admissions were unequivocal. The panel therefore found the allegations 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 proven 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 Forson, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Forson 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
 - 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 Mr Forson'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 noted that the allegations took place within the education setting. In providing and facilitating the provision of false references, Mr Forson misused the trust placed in him by the School.

The panel concluded that the conduct had the potential to cause risk of harm to pupils by facilitating the employment of a person as a teacher who may not be suitable. On the face of it, Mr Forson put the interests of an old acquaintance ahead of the interests of the schools that might consider hiring that person, and ahead of the interests of their pupils.

The evidence before the panel suggested that the conduct took place over a period of time between November 2022 and January 2023, and only stopped after Vision Teaching Agency raised concerns about information provided directly to it by Mr Forson on 24 January 2023.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Forson amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

In relation to whether Mr Forson'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 Mr Forson'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 Mr Forson was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that the offence of fraud or serious dishonesty was relevant.

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 it gave rise to an unacceptable risk of harm to pupils, and amounted to a significant breach of the trust placed in Mr Forson by the School.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Forson'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/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 Mr Forson, which involved the dishonest provision of false information in references for a potential teacher, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils. The integrity of references is a key factor in keeping children safe.

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

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Mr Forson 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 Forson in the profession. It accepted that there were no previous matters known against him, and there was some evidence, in the form of positive character references, to the effect that he could make a valuable contribution as a teacher. However, the panel noted that these references were undated and there was no indication that the referees were aware of the allegations admitted by Mr Forson.

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 Forson.

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);
- 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;
- 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;
 - lying to prevent the identification of 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 no evidence that Mr Forson's actions were not deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Forson was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation.

Mr Forson did have a previous good history.

The panel carefully considered his submissions and undated personal statement, to assess his level of insight and the risk of repetition. It noted that when first confronted by the allegations in January 2023, he did not make any admissions, but soon after that, in February 2023, he expressed an apology to the School and took full responsibility for his conduct. Since then, he has continued to accept responsibility.

However, he has not provided any explanation into why he acted as he did. In his representations in May 2023, he said that he considered he was helping an old acquaintance. He did not give any explanation as to why he, an experienced teacher who had undergone safeguarding training, should act in a way that put pupils and schools at risk. The panel considered that his latest (undated) personal statement did not adequately address that question.

Mr Forson has suggested that at the time he was dealing with significant personal and health related issues. However, the panel has seen no medical evidence to help the panel to assess what impact any issues had on him and his ability to comply with his basic professional obligation to be honest. Nor has the panel seen any evidence about the resolution of those issues, and how Mr Forson has overcome or addressed them in a way that reduces any risk of repetition.

In 2024, Mr Forson completed some refresher training in safeguarding, and said that he now understands that honesty in the provision of references is essential. However, there is no explanation as to why he did not understand that at the time of his misconduct, given he had previously undertaken safeguarding training. The panel was concerned that refresher training would not necessarily address the reasons why he acted as he did, or prevent them from recurring in future. The panel was concerned that refresher training (which all teachers are required to complete every year) was insufficient to address his particular shortcomings.

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 Forson of prohibition.

The panel concluded that the evidence before it did not provide sufficient assurance that Mr Forson sufficiently understood why he had acted as he did, and had addressed those reasons to prevent any future repetition. Any repetition would give rise to an unacceptable risk of harm to pupils.

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 Forson. The future protection of pupils 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;

Notwithstanding that this factor was present, given his previous good history and the fact that he had accepted his wrongdoing, the panel considered that the public interest would be satisfied if Mr Forson could demonstrate that he had fully addressed and remediated his conduct, to the extent that he presented no risk of repetition and harm in the future.

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 provision for a review period after 2 years.

This would give Mr Forson the opportunity to reflect on and address the reasons why he had acted as he did, and to undertake remediation activity focussed on those specific reasons. The panel considered that safeguarding training specifically related to recruitment would also be beneficial, to ensure that Mr Forson has a current understanding of the role that references play in safeguarding children.

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 Mr Moses Forson should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of 2 years.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Forson 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
 - 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 finds that the conduct of Mr Forson fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding of conduct that was dishonest and lacked integrity.

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 Mr Forson, 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 Mr Forson, which involved the dishonest provision of false information in references for a potential teacher, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils. The integrity of references is a key factor in keeping children safe.”

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. The panel has noted that “when first confronted by the allegations in January 2023, he did not make any admissions, but soon after that, in February 2023, he expressed an apology to the School and took full responsibility for his conduct. Since then, he has continued to accept responsibility.” However, the panel has also “concluded that the evidence before it did not provide sufficient assurance that Mr Forson sufficiently understood why he had acted as he did, and had addressed those reasons to prevent any future repetition. Any repetition would give rise to an unacceptable risk of harm to pupils.”

In my judgement, the lack of evidence of full insight and sufficient remedial action 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:

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

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 Mr Forson himself. The panel has commented:

“It accepted that there were no previous matters known against him, and there was some evidence, in the form of positive character references, to the effect that he could make a valuable contribution as a teacher. However, the panel noted that these references were undated and there was no indication that the referees were aware of the allegations admitted by Mr Forson.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Forson 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 findings concerning the seriousness of the dishonest conduct which amounted to a significant breach of trust and put the protection of pupils at risk. The panel has said:

“The panel concluded that the conduct had the potential to cause risk of harm to pupils by facilitating the employment of a person as a teacher who may not be suitable. On the face of it, Mr Forson put the interests of an old acquaintance ahead of the interests of the schools that might consider hiring that person, and ahead of the interests of their pupils.

The evidence before the panel suggested that the conduct took place over a period of time between November 2022 and January 2023, and only stopped after Vision Teaching Agency raised concerns about information provided directly to it by Mr Forson on 24 January 2023.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the findings of the panel concerning the lack of evidence of full insight and the lack of evidence of action that Mr Forson had taken to reduce the risk of repetition.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Mr Forson 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,

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:

“Notwithstanding that this factor was present, given his previous good history and the fact that he had accepted his wrongdoing, the panel considered that the public interest would be satisfied if Mr Forson could demonstrate that he had fully addressed and remediated his conduct, to the extent that he presented no risk of repetition and harm in the future.

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 provision for a review period after 2 years.

This would give Mr Forson the opportunity to reflect on and address the reasons why he had acted as he did, and to undertake remediation activity focussed on those specific reasons. The panel considered that safeguarding training specifically related to recruitment would also be beneficial, to ensure that Mr Forson has a current understanding of the role that references play in safeguarding children.”

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 Mr Forson sufficient time to demonstrate that he has developed full insight into his behaviour and taken remedial action so that there is no risk of repetition and harm to pupils 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 Mr Moses Forson 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 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 he does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Mr Forson remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr Moses Forson 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 'David Oatley', with a large, sweeping loop at the end.

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.