



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Ms Beverley Dunnage: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome**

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

**February 2026**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
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>	Ms Beverley Jane Dunnage
<b>Teacher ref number:</b>	0052000
<b>Teacher date of birth:</b>	9 January 1974
<b>TRA reference:</b>	24094
<b>Date of determination:</b>	10 February 2026
<b>Former employer:</b>	St George's School Ascot, Berkshire

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 10 February 2026 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Ms Dunnage.

The panel members were Mr Carl Lygo (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Pamela Thompson (lay panellist) and Mrs Joanne Arscott (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mrs Samantha Cass of Birketts LLP Solicitors.

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Ms Dunnage that the allegation be considered without a hearing. Ms Dunnage 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 Mr Jon Walters, Ms Dunnage or her representative Mr Dunnage.

The meeting took place in private.

## **Allegations**

The panel considered the allegation set out in the notice of meeting dated 21 January 2026.

It was alleged that Ms Dunnage was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:

1. On 25 July 2024, she was convicted at Taunton Crown Court for 2 counts of sexual activity with a child [REDACTED], contrary to [REDACTED] of the Sexual Offences Act 2003.

Ms Dunnage admitted to the facts of allegation 1 in her statement of agreed facts which she signed on 20 December 2025. Ms Dunnage also admitted that those facts amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section A: Pleadings – pages 3 to 4

Section B: TRA Documents – pages 5 to 81

Section C: Documents from the Court – pages 82 to 86

Section D: Teacher Documents – pages 87 to 125

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 May 2020, (the “Procedures”).

## Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Ms Dunnage on 20 December 2025 and the presenting officer 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 Ms Dunnage for the allegation 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.

On 1 January 2023, Ms Dunnage commenced her employment with St George's School (the "School") as Head of Year 8 and Boarding Housemistress for Upper Sixth.

On 31 May 2024, it was alleged that Ms Dunnage had been drinking alcohol with Person A that night and incited Person A to engage in sexual activity with her, which another person had allegedly witnessed and recorded a video and took photographs of Ms Dunnage's alleged conduct. Ms Dunnage was subsequently reported to Avon and Somerset Police and was arrested.

On 3 June 2024, the LADO informed the School of Ms Dunnage's arrest.

On 12 July 2024, Ms Dunnage's employment with the School was terminated.

On 25 July 2024, Ms Dunnage was convicted with offences under the Sexual Offences Act 2003.

## Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

- 1. On 25 July 2024, you were convicted at Taunton Crown Court for 2 counts of sexual activity with a child [REDACTED], contrary to [REDACTED] of the Sexual Offences Act 2003.**

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts, signed by Ms Dunnage on 20 December 2025. In the statement of agreed facts, Ms Dunnage admitted the particulars of allegation 1 and accepted that her conduct amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

The panel noted page 8 of the Teacher misconduct: The prohibition of teachers (“the Advice”) which states that where there has been a conviction at any time, of a criminal offence, the panel will accept the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction, unless exceptional circumstances apply. The panel did not find that any exceptional circumstances applied in this case.

The panel had been provided with a certificate of conviction from Taunton Crown Court which set out that on 25 July 2024, Ms Dunnage was convicted of two counts of engaging in sexual activity with a child [REDACTED].

Ms Dunnage was sentenced to a total of 45 months imprisonment.

Following examination of the documents before it, the panel was satisfied that allegation 1 was proven.

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

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

In doing so, the panel had regard to the Advice.

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

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Ms Dunnage 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
  - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
  - not undermining fundamental British values, including...the rule of law...

- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel noted that although the offence occurred outside of a school setting, Ms Dunnage's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting. Ms Dunnage had engaged in sexual activity with a [REDACTED]-year-old boy [REDACTED].

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

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Ms Dunnage's behaviour in committing the offence could affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. Her conduct ran counter to what should have been at the very core of her practice as a teacher with a duty of care towards children.

The panel noted that Ms Dunnage's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed.

The panel also considered the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

This was a case concerning an offence involving sexual activity, which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel took the view that this was a serious offence involving a child leading to a term of imprisonment.

The panel considered Ms Dunnage's [REDACTED] report dated 7 November 2024 which stated that Ms Dunnage had suffered from [REDACTED].

The panel also had sight of emails from [REDACTED] who attested to Ms Dunnage's previous "*impeccable*" character. The panel further noted that [REDACTED] stated that Ms Dunnage was restricted in providing evidence given her imprisonment and that she had a good record during her teaching career prior to the incident.

The panel noted that Ms Dunnage in her email to the presenting officer dated 11 August 2025 stated that she had been undertaking counselling to develop strategies to help her [REDACTED]. The panel also read Ms Dunnage's evidence that she committed the offences following an argument that had left Ms Dunnage distraught and not thinking clearly.

The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Ms Dunnage's ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding that this conviction was 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 a 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; declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct; and that prohibition strikes the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest, if they are in conflict.

In light of the panel's findings against Ms Dunnage, which involved engaging in sexual activity with a child [REDACTED], there was a strong public interest consideration in the protection of pupils and other members of the public. Her actions raised obvious and significant public and child protection concerns.

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of inappropriate relationships with children.

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

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Ms Dunnage 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 Dunnage in the profession. Although the panel noted that there was a suggestion that Ms Dunnage had previous good character and ability as an educator, the panel considered that the seriousness of

Ms Dunnage's conduct found proven significantly outweighed any public interest in retaining her as a teacher. The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Ms Dunnage in the profession, since her behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and she sought to exploit her position of trust.

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

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

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;
- abuse of position or trust...;
- sexual misconduct, e.g. involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature...;
- 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); and
- actions or behaviours that...undermine...the rule of law...

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 Ms Dunnage's actions were deliberate even though she had consumed alcohol at the time.

There was no evidence to suggest that Ms Dunnage was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation. However, the panel did note that Ms Dunnage had provided evidence [REDACTED].

The panel considered evidence relating to Ms Dunnage's previous good character and, although there was some evidence of her previous unblemished teaching record, the panel did not find that she had provided evidence to having demonstrated exceptionally high standards in her personal and professional conduct or having contributed significantly to the education sector.

In relation to mitigation, the panel again considered Ms Dunnage's [REDACTED]. The panel also noted that Ms Dunnage's certificate of conviction recorded that Ms Dunnage pleaded guilty. The panel further noted that in Ms Dunnage's handwritten note attached to [REDACTED]'s letter dated 12 March 2025, she had stated that she accepted that she would "*never be able to teach again*".

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 not be sufficient and would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Ms Dunnage of prohibition.

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Ms Dunnage. The severity of Ms Dunnage's conduct and the impact that this continued to have on the victim 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, particularly where the

individual has used their professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons; and

- any sexual misconduct involving a child.

The panel found that Ms Dunnage had been convicted of engaging in sexual activity with a child [REDACTED].

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

None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel's findings. However, the panel considered that the gravity of the offending which resulted in a term of imprisonment was so serious that this was relevant to the consideration of whether or not a review period was appropriate in the circumstances.

Although the panel considered that Ms Dunnage had recognised the seriousness of her offending at the time of the incident by way of the impact that this clearly had [REDACTED], the panel was provided with limited evidence of any further insight and/or remorse or the impact that this had had on the child involved.

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 the allegation proven and found that those proven facts amount to the conviction of a relevant conviction.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Ms Beverley Dunnage should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Ms Dunnage 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
  - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
  - not undermining fundamental British values, including...the rule of law...
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards...
- 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 sexual offences towards a child.

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 Ms Dunnage, 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. The panel has observed, "*Her actions raised obvious and significant public and child protection concerns.*" A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows,

*"Although the panel considered that Ms Dunnage had recognised the seriousness of her offending at the time of the incident by way of the impact that this clearly had [REDACTED], the panel was provided with limited evidence of any further insight and/or remorse or the impact that this had had on the child involved".*

In my judgement, the lack of full insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, *“that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Dunnage was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession”*.

I am particularly mindful of the finding of sexual conduct towards a child 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 Ms Dunnage herself. The panel comment *“...she had stated that she accepted that she would “never be able to teach again”*.

A prohibition order would prevent Ms Dunnage 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 findings of the seriousness of the conduct, as well as the panel’s comments concerning the limited nature of her insight. The panel has said, *“Recommending that the publication of adverse findings would not be sufficient and would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Ms Dunnage of prohibition”*.

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that Ms Dunnage’s *“...conduct ran counter to what should have been at the very core of her practice as a teacher with a duty of care towards children”*.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Ms Dunnage 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.

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.

I have considered the panel's comments "*the panel considered that the gravity of the offending which resulted in a term of imprisonment was so serious that this was relevant to the consideration of whether or not a review period was appropriate in the circumstances*".

The panel has also said that "*...it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended without provisions for a review period*".

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 a conviction of serious sexual misconduct which was towards a child.

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 Ms Beverley Dunnage 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 her, I have decided that Ms Dunnage shall not be entitled to apply for restoration of her eligibility to teach.

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

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



**Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield**

**Date: 12 February 2026**

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