



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Paul Michael Stubblings: 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	4
Decision and reasons	4
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

Teacher:	Mr Paul Michael Stubbings
Teacher ref number:	330870
Teacher date of birth:	8 April 1969
TRA reference:	21287
Date of determination:	10 February 2026
Former employer:	Westminster Cathedral Choir School, London

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 Mr Paul Michael Stubbings.

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 Mr Stubbings that the allegation be considered without a hearing. Mr Stubbings 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 Stubbings, or any representative of Mr Stubbings.

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 Mr Stubbings was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:

1. On or around 29 January 2025 he was convicted of indecent assault on a man aged 16 or over.

Mr Stubbings admitted allegation 1 and further admitted that his conduct amounted to conviction of a relevant offence, as set out in the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Stubbings on 22 December 2025.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology, list of key people and anonymised pupil list – pages 3 to 4

Section 2: Notice of referral and response – pages 5 to 11

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts – pages 12 to 14

Section 4: TRA documents – pages 15 to 64

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 Mr Stubbings on 22 December 2025 and subsequently signed by the presenting officer on 23 December 2025.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

In advance of the meeting the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Stubbings 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.

In December 1999, Mr Stubbings was actively employed as Master of Music at St Martin-in-the-Fields Church.

On 15 December 1999, Mr Stubbings indecently assaulted Person A. Person A was [REDACTED] old at the time and a [REDACTED].

In May 2022, the police matter was reopened as Person A was willing to provide a statement regarding the incident.

On 2 September 2022, Mr Stubbings commenced employment at Westminster Cathedral Choir School ('the School') as Head of Music.

On 5 September 2022, Mr Stubbings was suspended by the School and he subsequently resigned on 17 November 2022

On 24 November 2022, the matter was referred to the TRA by the School.

On 29 January 2025, Mr Stubbings entered a guilty plea and was then convicted of indecent assault at Westminster Magistrates' Court.

On 2 May 2025, Mr Stubbings was sentenced at Southwark Crown Court.

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 or around 29 January 2025 you were convicted of indecent assault on a man aged 16 or over.

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Stubbings on 22 December 2025. In that statement of agreed facts, Mr Stubbings admitted the allegation and further admitted that the facts of the allegation amounted to conviction of a relevant offence. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the facts available to it.

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 copy of the certificate of conviction from Westminster Magistrates’ Court dated 29 January 2025, which detailed that Mr Stubbings had been convicted of indecent assault on a man aged 16 or over. The panel noted that Mr Stubbings pleaded guilty to the offence.

In respect of the offence, Mr Stubbings was sentenced to a custodial sentence of 2 years, suspended for 2 years; 300 hours of unpaid work; a 25-day rehabilitation activity requirement; [REDACTED]; and was ordered to sign the sex offender register for 10 years.

On examination of the documents before the panel and the admissions in the signed statement of facts, 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 conviction of a relevant offence.

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

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Stubbings, in relation to the facts it found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considered that by reference to Part 2, Mr Stubbings 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 a school setting, it remained directly relevant to Mr Stubbings' position in education, working with children and/or working in an education setting. Mr Stubbings had indecently assaulted a [REDACTED] while employed as Master of Music at St Martin-in-the-Fields, after inviting [REDACTED] to stay overnight at his flat and plying him with alcohol.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved abuse of trust, the use of alcohol to facilitate the offence, and a significant power imbalance, factors which are relevant to the safety and welfare of pupils and Mr Stubbings' suitability to work with children.

The panel also took account of how the teaching profession is viewed by the public. The panel considered that Mr Stubbings' criminal conduct, could undoubtedly affect public confidence in the teaching profession, particularly given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. His conduct ran counter to what should have been at the very core of his practice as a teacher with a duty of care towards children.

The panel noted that Mr Stubbings' behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment (albeit that it was suspended), 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, child cruelty and controlling or coercive behaviour, 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 further noted that in the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Stubbings, Mr Stubbings admitted the facts amounted to the conviction of a relevant offence.

Notwithstanding his admission, the panel, having considered all evidence before them, was satisfied on the evidence before it that Mr Stubbings had been convicted of a relevant offence.

The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Stubbings' 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 of 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.

The panel was aware that 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 and 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 Mr Stubbings, which involved an indecent assault on a man aged 16 or over, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public.

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

The panel decided that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Mr Stubbings 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 Stubbings in the profession. The panel was provided with no evidence regarding Mr Stubbings' ability as an educator. However, the panel considered that the seriousness of Mr Stubbings conduct found proven significantly outweighed any public interest in retaining him as a teacher. The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Stubbings in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and he sought to exploit his position of trust.

Notwithstanding 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 Stubbings. The panel was mindful of the need to strike the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest.

In carrying out the balancing exercise, the panel had regard to the public interest considerations both in favour of, and against, prohibition as well as the interests of Mr Stubbings. 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 (particularly involving pupils);
- an abuse of any trust, knowledge, or influence gained through their professional position in order to advance a romantic or sexual relationship with a pupil or former pupil;
- sexual misconduct, e.g. involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature and/or that use or exploit the trust, knowledge or influence derived from the individual's professional position;
- 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);
- violation of the rights of pupils; 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 no evidence that Mr Stubbings' actions were not deliberate. Mr Stubbings had inappropriately and deliberately used alcohol in his offending.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Stubbings was acting under extreme duress.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Stubbings demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both personal and professional conduct or that he has contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel considered the evidence in the bundle of Mr Stubbings' good character relating to the relevant offence and the fact that there was acceptance by the Judge in the sentencing of some mitigation and previous good character with no awareness of any other complaints having been raised or of any reoffending. The panel also considered that Mr Stubbings had made a prompt guilty plea as part of this process.

The panel first considered whether it would be proportionate to conclude this case with no recommendation of prohibition, considering whether the publication of the findings made by the panel would be sufficient.

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings was sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Stubbings 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 Stubbings. The nature and seriousness of the offences was a significant factor in forming that opinion in addition to the impact that this continued to have on the victim. 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 Mr Stubbings did indecently assault a man aged [REDACTED] at the time.

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.

The panel noted that the only evidence of insight or remorse into Mr Stubbings' actions was by way of an early guilty plea as part of the criminal proceedings. However, the panel was provided with no further evidence as to Mr Stubbings' insight or remorse into his behaviour. In light of the lack of evidence concerning Mr Stubbings' level of insight and remorse, the panel considered that may be a risk of repetition.

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 provision 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 a relevant conviction.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Stubbings 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 panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Stubbings involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in /or involved breaches of Working Together to Safeguard Children.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of a relevant conviction for indecent assault on a man aged 16 or over, 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 Stubbings, 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:

“The panel noted that although the offence occurred outside a school setting, it remained directly relevant to Mr Stubbings' position in education, working with children and/or working in an education setting. Mr Stubbings had indecently assaulted a [REDACTED] while employed as Master of Music at St Martin-in-the-Fields, after inviting [REDACTED] to stay overnight at his flat and plying him with alcohol.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved abuse of trust, the use of alcohol to facilitate the offence, and a significant power imbalance, factors which are relevant to the safety and welfare of pupils and Mr Stubbings' suitability to work with children."

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 noted that the only evidence of insight or remorse into Mr Stubbings' actions was by way of an early guilty plea as part of the criminal proceedings. However, the panel was provided with no further evidence as to Mr Stubbings' insight or remorse into his behaviour. In light of the lack of evidence concerning Mr Stubbings' level of insight and remorse, the panel considered that may be a risk of repetition."

In my judgement, the lack of evidence of insight and remorse 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:

"The panel considered that Mr Stubbings' criminal conduct, could undoubtedly affect public confidence in the teaching profession, particularly given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. His conduct ran counter to what should have been at the very core of his practice as a teacher with a duty of care towards children."

I am particularly mindful of the finding of a conviction for indecent assault 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 Stubbings himself. The panel has commented:

“There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Stubbings demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both personal and professional conduct or that he has contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel considered the evidence in the bundle of Mr Stubbings’ good character relating to the relevant offence and the fact that there was acceptance by the Judge in the sentencing of some mitigation and previous good character with no awareness of any other complaints having been raised or of any reoffending. The panel also considered that Mr Stubbings had made a prompt guilty plea as part of this process.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Stubbings 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 Mr Stubbings’ behaviour which fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher. The panel has said:

“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 Stubbings. The nature and seriousness of the offences was a significant factor in forming that opinion in addition to the impact that this continued to have on the victim.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel concerning the lack of evidence of insight and remorse.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Mr Stubbings 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, in cases involving serious sexual misconduct, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period. The panel has noted that Mr Stubbings indecently assaulted a man aged [REDACTED] at the time and “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.”

I have considered the panel’s comments and 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 offence of which Mr Stubbings was convicted, the lack of evidence of insight and remorse, and the risk of repetition.

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 Paul Michael Stubbings 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 allegation found proved against him, I have decided that Mr Stubbings 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 Stubbings 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 'D Oatley', written in a cursive style.

Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 12 February 2026

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