



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Nicholas Ryde: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome**

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

**December 2025**

## **Contents**

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Allegations</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Summary of evidence</b>	<b>4</b>
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	5
<b>Decision and reasons</b>	<b>5</b>
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	8
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	11

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

<b>Teacher:</b>	Mr Nicholas Ryde
<b>Teacher ref number:</b>	1571668
<b>Teacher date of birth:</b>	17 February 1985
<b>TRA reference:</b>	23570
<b>Date of determination:</b>	19 December 2025
<b>Former employer:</b>	The King Alfred School, London

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 19 December 2025 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Nicholas Ryde.

The panel members were Julie Wells (teacher panellist – in the chair), Christopher Taylor (lay panellist), and Tony Coyne (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was John Lucarotti 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 Mr Ryde that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Ryde provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted conviction of a relevant offence. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer or Mr Ryde.

The meeting took place in private.

## **Allegations**

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 1 October 2025.

You have been convicted, at any time, of a relevant offence, in that;

1. On or around 22 November 2024 you were convicted at Barkingside Magistrates Court of the offence of:

a. Making indecent or pseudo-photograph of children on 27 February 2024 contrary to s.1 (a) Protection of Children Act 1978;

b. Making indecent or pseudo-photograph of children on 27 February 2024 contrary to s.1 (a) Protection of Children Act 1978;

c. Making indecent or pseudo-photograph of children on 27 February 2024 contrary to s.1 (a) Protection of Children Act 1978;

d. Distributing indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children on 2 December 2023 contrary to s.1 Protection of Children Act 1978;

e. Distributing indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children on 2 December 2023 contrary to s.1 Protection of Children Act 1978;

f. Distributing indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children on 2 December 2023 contrary to s.1 Protection of Children Act 1978;

Mr Ryde admitted that he had been convicted of the specified offences.

Mr Ryde also admitted that the offences were relevant offences.

## **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 4-18b

Section 2: Statement of agreed facts – pages 20-24

Section 3: TRA documents – pages 27-157

Section 4: Teacher documents – pages 160-169

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

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

## **Statement of agreed facts**

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Ryde on 30 May 2025.

## **Decision and reasons**

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 Ryde 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 Ryde was employed as a teacher at the King Alfred School, Golders Green between 1 September 2015 and 20 March 2024.

On 27 February 2024, Mr Ryde was arrested for making and distributing indecent images of children.

On 22 July 2024, Mr Ryde appeared at Barkingside Magistrates Court and pleaded guilty to 3 counts of making indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children and three counts of distributing indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children.

On 22 November 2024, Mr Ryde appeared at Snaresbrook Crown Court and was sentenced in total to a 2 year sentence of imprisonment suspended for 2 years, a rehabilitation activity requirement, an unpaid work requirement, a Sexual Harm Prevention Order and a requirement to sign the Sexual Offenders Register for 10 years.

The panel noted that the offending did not relate to pupils at the school at which Mr Ryde taught.

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

**It was alleged that you have been convicted of relevant offences, in that:**

**1. On or around 22 November 2024 you were convicted at Barkingside Magistrates Court of the offence of:**

- a. Making indecent or pseudo-photograph of children on 27 February 2024 contrary to s.1 (a) Protection of Children Act 1978;**
- b. Making indecent or pseudo-photograph of children on 27 February 2024 contrary to s.1 (a) Protection of Children Act 1978;**
- c. Making indecent or pseudo-photograph of children on 27 February 2024 contrary to s.1 (a) Protection of Children Act 1978;**
- d. Distributing indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children on 2 December 2023 contrary to s.1 Protection of Children Act 1978;**
- e. Distributing indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children on 2 December 2023 contrary to s.1 Protection of Children Act 1978;**
- f. Distributing indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children on 2 December 2023 contrary to s.1 Protection of Children Act 1978;**

Mr Ryde admitted that he was convicted of the specified offences and he signed a statement of agreed facts to that effect. In addition, the panel was provided with a certificate of conviction from the Snaresbrook Crown Court which confirmed Mr Ryde's conviction in Barkingside Magistrates' Court on 22 July 2024 and sentence at Snaresbrook Crown Court on 22 November 2024.

The certificate of conviction confirmed that Mr Ryde pleaded guilty to 3 counts of making and 3 counts of distributing indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of a child.

The panel found allegation 1(a) to (f) proved.

## **Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence**

Having found the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proven allegations amounted to conviction of a relevant offence.

Mr Ryde admitted that the convictions were for relevant offences. The panel took these admissions into account but made its own determination.

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 Ryde, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Ryde 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 was satisfied that Mr Ryde’s convictions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offences could have had an impact on the safety and/or security of pupils.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Ryde’s behaviour in committing the offences could affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community.

The panel noted that Mr Ryde’s behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of 2 years imprisonment, (albeit that it was suspended), which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed. The sentence also included a rehabilitation activity requirement, an unpaid work requirement, a Sexual Harm Prevention Order, and a requirement to sign the Sexual Offenders Register for 10 years. The Sexual Harm Prevention Order prohibits Mr Ryde having any unsupervised contact or communication with any person under the age of 18 other than (a) such as is inadvertent and not reasonably avoidable in the course of lawful daily life or (b) with both the express consent of the child’s parent or guardian given after having been informed of the terms of this order and with the express approval of the Public Protection Unit for the area in which he resides.

The panel also considered the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice. The Advice states that offences involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing, or publishing any indecent photograph or image or pseudo photograph or image of a child are likely to be considered relevant offences.

The panel noted that Mr Ryde's convictions included indecent images of children in the most serious category (category A).

The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the convictions was relevant to Mr Ryde's ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding that the convictions were for a relevant offence was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

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

Given the panel's findings in respect of conviction of a relevant offence, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

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

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of making and distributing images of children.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Ryde 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 Ryde 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 Ryde in the profession. The panel was not presented with evidence of Mr Ryde's proficiency as a teacher which might have enabled the panel to conclude that such a public interest existed. In any event, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any potential public interest in retaining Mr Ryde in the profession since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.

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

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 Ryde.

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

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of the Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- sexual misconduct, e.g. involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature;
- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing, or publishing any indecent photograph or image, or indecent pseudo photograph or image, of a child, or permitting such activity, including one-off incidents;

Even though some of the behaviours 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 teacher's actions were deliberate. There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Ryde was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation.

Mr Ryde did have a previously good history in that there was no evidence of any previous conviction or adverse disciplinary finding. The panel also had regard to the fact that Mr Ryde pleaded guilty to the charges that he faced and also admitted that his convictions were for relevant offences.

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 Ryde of prohibition.

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Ryde. The serious nature of the offending behaviour 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. These include:

- serious sexual misconduct e.g. where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons;
- any sexual misconduct involving a child;
- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing, or publishing any indecent photograph or image or indecent pseudo photograph or image of a child, including one off incidents;

The sentence imposed was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed and the ongoing risk to children. The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended without provisions for a review period.

## Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

I have given very careful consideration to this case and to the recommendation of the panel in respect of both sanction and review period.

In considering this case, I have also given very careful attention to the Advice that the Secretary of State has published concerning the prohibition of teachers.

In this case, the panel has found all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to a relevant conviction.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Ryde 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 findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of a relevant conviction for the offences of making and distributing indecent images of children, which resulted in a suspended custodial sentence.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of a relevant conviction, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Mr Ryde, 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 that “There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of making and distributing images of children.” A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

The panel has not commented on insight and remorse but has noted that “Mr Ryde pleaded guilty to the charges that he faced and also admitted that his convictions were for relevant offences.”

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel has observed that “public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Ryde were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of a relevant conviction for making and distributing indecent images of children in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

I have had to consider that the public has a high expectation of professional standards of all teachers and that the public might regard a failure to impose a prohibition order as a failure to uphold those high standards. In weighing these considerations, I have had to consider the matter from the point of view of an “ordinary intelligent and well-informed citizen.”

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of a relevant conviction, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mr Ryde himself. The panel has commented that “Mr Ryde did have a previously good history in that there was no evidence of any previous conviction or adverse disciplinary finding.”

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments concerning the seriousness of the offences for which Mr Ryde was convicted and received a suspended custodial sentence. The panel has noted that Mr Ryde’s convictions included indecent images of children in the most serious category (category A). The panel has also noted that Mr Ryde’s sentence included a Sexual Harm Prevention Order and a requirement to sign the Sexual Offenders Register for 10 years.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Mr Ryde has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition

order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended that no provision should be made for a review period.

The panel has noted that the Advice indicates that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period in cases that include serious sexual misconduct, any sexual misconduct involving a child and any activity involving taking, making, possessing, distributing, or publishing any indecent photograph or image or indecent pseudo photograph or image of a child. The panel has commented that the "sentence imposed was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed and the ongoing risk to children."

I have considered whether not allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the serious nature of the offences of which Mr Ryde was convicted and the potential damage to the public's perception of the teaching profession.

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

**This means that Mr Nicholas Ryde is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England.** Furthermore, in view of the seriousness of the allegations found proved against him, I have decided that Mr Ryde shall not be entitled to apply for restoration of his eligibility to teach.

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

Mr Nicholas Ryde has a right of appeal to the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this order.



**Decision maker: David Oatley**

**Date: 23 December 2025**

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