



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Alex Mohammed: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

February 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	13
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	17

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

Teacher:	Mr Alex Mohammed
Teacher ref number:	1262277
Teacher date of birth:	24 January 1991
TRA reference:	21566
Date of determination:	26 February 2026
Former employer:	Durrington High School, Worthing, West Sussex

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 25 – 26 February 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Alex Mohammed.

The panel members were Mr Terry Hyde (former teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Victoria Kelly (teacher panellist) and Mr Andrew Hearn (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Clare Strickland of Blake Morgan solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Zahra Evans of Capsticks solicitors.

Mr Mohammed was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public, save that portions of the hearing were heard in private, and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 28 November 2025

It was alleged that Mr Mohammed was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that:

1. Between around 7 April and 13 May 2022 he engaged in inappropriate communication with Pupil A, such communication being inappropriate in that:
 - a. The communication was of a personal nature.
 - b. There was no good professional reason for it.
 - c. Some or all of the communication was outside of regular school hours.
 - d. It included the receipt and/or sending of personal photographs.
 - e. It included the receipt and/or sending of photographs of alcohol.
2. On 12 May 2022 he engaged in inappropriate communication with Pupil E, such communication being inappropriate in that:
 - a. The communication was of a personal nature.
 - b. There was no good professional reason for it.
 - c. Some or all of the communication was outside of regular school hours.
3. He failed to report his communications with any or all of Pupils A and/or B and/or C and/or D and/or E as a safeguarding concern.
4. His conduct as may be proved at Allegation 1 was sexually motivated.

In statement of agreed facts dated 9 September 2025 Mr Mohammed admitted all of the factual allegations apart from Allegation 4. He denied that his conduct at Allegation 1 was sexually motivated.

In the statement of agreed facts, Mr Mohammed also admitted that his conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

[REDACTED].

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 5

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 6 to 33

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts – pages 34 to 44

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 45 to 431

Section 5: Teacher documents and correspondence – pages 432 to 467

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

- Proceeding in absence application bundle

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the hearing and the additional document[s] that the panel decided to admit.

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

Witnesses

The panel heard oral evidence from the following witnesses called by the presenting officer:

Witness A – [REDACTED].

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

Mr Mohammed joined the school on 1 September 2014. In 2022 he was employed as a teacher of science and co-director of science.

On three occasions between January and July 2022, some of his colleagues raised concerns about Mr Mohammed’s conduct around some of his Year 11 students. In particular, there were concerns that his conduct may not have observed appropriate professional boundaries.

On 31 January 2022, during a one-to-one meeting, the [REDACTED]. warned him after colleagues raised concerns about there being groups of (mostly) female Year 11 pupils in his classroom outside regular lessons, and the atmosphere appearing “too informal”.

On 23 May 2022, he was again warned after similar concerns were raised.

After a Year 11 leavers’ ball on 30 June 2022, other teachers raised concerns about his interactions with a similar group of Year 11 female pupils.

Following this, the school investigated further, by speaking to the pupils and by reviewing Mr Mohammed’s school email account. The pupils did not raise any concerns, but the review of his email account showed that between 7 April and 13 May 2022, he had engaged in extensive email correspondence with five female Year 11 pupils.

In particular, he had exchanged over 2000 emails with Pupil A. Pupil A was 15 years old at the time. The review of emails identified:

- Emails sent after 8pm, at weekends and during school holidays.
- Exchanges of photographs, including photographs of each of them in their beds.
- References to alcohol, including references to Pupil A drinking alcohol.
- Mention of a potential future meeting outside of school.

The school notified the police, who conducted an investigation into whether any criminal offence had been committed. In December 2022, having completed their investigation, the police confirmed that there would be no criminal proceedings.

The school then resumed its investigation, during which it interviewed Mr Mohammed. He acknowledged the inappropriateness of some of the emails as to their timing and content.

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:

- 1. Between around 7 April and 13 May 2022 you engaged in inappropriate communication with Pupil A, such communication being inappropriate in that:**
 - a. The communication was of a personal nature.**
 - b. There was no good professional reason for it.**
 - c. Some or all of the communication was outside of regular school hours.**

d. It included the receipt and/or sending of personal photographs.

e. It included the receipt and/or sending of photographs of alcohol.

In the agreed statement of facts, Mr Mohammed admitted all particulars of this allegation. The panel concluded that his admission was unequivocal, and consistent with all of the evidence it read in the bundle, in particular, the evidence of the emails he exchanged with Pupil A.

Mr Mohammed accepted that the overall flow of messages between him and Pupil A could be considered flirtatious in tone, and he accepted that his email conversations with her were inappropriate given the nature and timing of them.

The emails included messages of a personal nature – indeed, the panel concluded that in the exchanges it saw, there were very few messages that could be categorised as professional in nature. For instance, the emails included:

- Discussion about what Pupil A wears in bed.
- Use of phrases such as:
 - “you look good!”
 - “It’s cute” (in reference to Pupil A’s hair).
 - “it makes me think of you”:
 - “I wouldn’t let you pass out and if you did I’d look after you obv’s”
 - “I’m in bed”
 - “you gone to sleep yet?” [a message at 12:37am]
 - “wait until the summer till we waffle and we both be bad!”
 - “I’m glad you aren’t with him any more lol” [referring to Pupil A’s ex-boyfriend]
- The discussion of physical appearance, and Mr Mohammed encouraging Pupil A to comment on his physical appearance, for instance:
 - “never nice actually about me ... not physically me anyways”
 - “I always say nice things about your hair etc”
 - “you don’t need to be sarcastic about my figure haha”
- A conversation about what might happen if they met in a sauna

- References to Pupil A drinking alcohol, including use of slang and/or coded language to refer to alcohol.

The panel concluded that this communication was clearly of a personal nature and was inappropriate between a male teacher and a 15-year-old female pupil.

Mr Mohammed accepted that there was no good professional reason for this communication with Pupil A. The panel agreed and found proved that there was no good professional reason for the communication, and that it was inappropriate for this reason.

Mr Mohammed also accepted that emails were sent outside regular school hours, for instance:

- An exchange of photographs with Pupil A on 11 May 2022, in which he sent her a photograph of him in bed, and she responded with a photograph of her wearing a dressing gown. This took place between 6.41pm and 6.45pm.
- An exchange of photographs with Pupil A on 12 May 2022 between 10.10pm and 10.15pm, in which Mr Mohammed was lying in his bed and Pupil A was sitting in her bed.
- An email sent by Mr Mohammed to Pupil A at 12.37am saying he was in bed and asking her if she had gone to sleep yet.
- Mr Mohammed sending Pupil A a photograph of a part-drunk pint of beer on Saturday 9 April 2022 at 7.00pm.

The panel was satisfied on the basis of Mr Mohammed's admission and the evidence of the emails that some of the communication was outside regular school hours, and that this was inappropriate.

In addition to the photographs described above, Mr Mohammed accepted that he had sent Pupil A photographs of himself at the gym on 10 May 2022 at 5.57pm and 6.14pm.

The panel was satisfied that the photographs exchanged were of a personal nature, and that the exchange of these photographs was inappropriate.

As well as the photograph of a part-drunk pint of beer that Mr Mohammed sent to Pupil A on Saturday 9 April, he received from her a photograph of her workbook and pen with an open bottle of beer next to it at 6.48pm.

The panel concluded that photographs of alcohol were exchanged, and that it was inappropriate for Mr Mohammed to do this with a 15-year-old pupil.

2. On 12 May 2022 you engaged in inappropriate communication with Pupil E, such communication being inappropriate in that:

- a. **The communication was of a personal nature.**
- b. **There was no good professional reason for it.**
- c. **Some or all of the communication was outside of regular school hours.**

Mr Mohammed accepted that his emails with Pupil E included messages of a personal nature, such as him saying to her:

- “you’re a fantastic person and student”
- “you’re amazing”

The panel was satisfied that these messages were personal in nature, and that there was no good professional reason for them. It concluded that these exchanges were inappropriate.

Mr Mohammed also admitted, and the panel saw evidence of emails exchanged with Pupil E outside school hours, for instance, all of the emails exchanged on 12 May 2022 were timed between 5.14pm and 8.58pm. The panel was satisfied that this was inappropriate.

3. You failed to report your communications with any or all of Pupils A and/or B and/or C and/or D and/or E as a safeguarding concern.

Mr Mohammed accepted that he failed to report his communications with Pupils A, B, C, D and E as a safeguarding concern.

He accepted that his messages with Pupil A included references to her drinking alcohol, and to her feeling down on occasion. He also accepted that the messages may have suggested that she was becoming infatuated with him, something that should have been raised as a potential safeguarding concern.

He also accepted that Pupil E sent him messages suggesting that there may be concerns with her well-being, and the well-being of other pupils, which he did not report.

In addition, Mr Mohammed accepted that Pupils B, C and D made references to struggling at home in their emails with him and he replied in over-friendly terms, without raising any concerns about this.

Mr Mohammed accepted that Keeping Children Safe in Education (“KCSIE”) (2022) warned teachers against being “over-friendly” and “having favourites”, and that the school’s child protection policy required him to report any such concerns. He did not do so.

The panel was satisfied that there was a clear requirement on him to raise these messages as a safeguarding concern, and he failed to do so. The panel noted that during the school investigation, Mr Mohammed suggested he had raised some concerns with a colleague, [REDACTED]. However, there was no evidence from any source to support this. The panel concluded that even if he had raised some matters with a pastoral lead, this was not enough to satisfy his duty to raise safeguarding concerns with the designated safeguarding lead in the context of the exchanges he was having with the students.

4. Your conduct as may be proved at Allegation 1 was sexually motivated.

The panel considered this allegation in light of all the evidence about Mr Mohammed's interactions with Pupil A and considered whether it was satisfied that Mr Mohammed's actions were in pursuit of sexual gratification and/or a future sexual relationship.

The panel noted that Mr Mohammed had been unable to provide any reason, over and above a desire to support his students and/or stupidity on his part, why he had acted as he did when confronted by the evidence of his email exchanges. However, the panel recognised that it was not for him to disprove this allegation, and so it considered whether the evidence produced by the TRA demonstrated that a sexual motivation was more likely than not.

The panel had regard to:

- The volume of personal messages.
- The timing of the messages, with some being late at night.
- The flirtatious nature of the messages.
- The use of slang and/or coded language.
- His comments about Pupil A's personal appearance, and Mr Mohammed's attempts to solicit comments about his personal appearance.
- His reference to Pupil A's former boyfriend, and him being glad she was no longer with him.
- Discussions about being in bed, and exchanges of photographs in bed and/or of Pupil A wearing a bathrobe.
- Mr Mohammed referring to seeing Pupil A in School and giving her information about where he would be during the day.
- The messages containing oblique references to meeting up outside School and/or continuing to engage with each other after Pupil A had finished Year 11.

The panel was satisfied that all these factors were suggestive of sexual grooming.

The panel also had regard to evidence that in January 2022, professional colleagues had previously raised a concern about Mr Mohammed's "informal" contacts with Year 11 female pupils, and he had been warned about this. The panel considered that having received such a warning, any teacher would have been very alert to how any future personal communications were likely to be interpreted.

Given his previous warning and the extensive training he had undergone, the panel was satisfied that there was no inadvertent error of judgment on his part. Instead, the panel was satisfied that Mr Mohammed's communications with Pupil A were sexually motivated, in that they were in pursuit of sexual gratification and/or a future sexual relationship.

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

Having found all the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In doing so, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: The prohibition of teachers, which is referred to as "the Advice".

The panel first considered whether the conduct of Mr Mohammed, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Mohammed 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 and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- 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 the teacher'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 offences of sexual activity and sexual communication with a child were not present, because at the time his actions were discovered, Mr Mohammed's conduct had not crossed the line into activity or communication that was sexual in nature. However, his conduct towards Pupil A was sexually motivated.

The conduct was directly relevant to teaching, involving inappropriate and sexually motivated conduct towards pupils, carried out over School email systems.

The panel concluded that Mr Mohammed's conduct had the potential to harm children, in that professional boundaries exist to protect children's well-being, and any breaches may cause harm to their well-being. Further, his safeguarding failures also exposed the pupils to the risk of harm.

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

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

In relation to whether Mr Mohammed'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 Mohammed'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 Mohammed was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that although none of these offences were directly relevant, it had found that Mr Mohammed had acted in a sexually motivated way towards a 15-year-old pupil. The panel noted that the advice is not intended to be exhaustive and there may be other behaviours that panels consider to be "conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute". The panel was satisfied that grooming a 15-year-old pupil in pursuance of sexual gratification and/or a future sexual relationship was

something that would be shocking and deeply troubling to a reasonable member of the public. It amounts to a significant breach of trust.

Further, the public is entitled to expect that teachers will maintain appropriate professional boundaries and safeguard their pupils appropriately. The panel was satisfied that in this case; Mr Mohammed's failings were serious enough to significantly undermine public confidence.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Mohammed'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 Mohammed, which involved findings that he had groomed a 15-year-old pupil for sexual gratification and/or in pursuit of a future sexual relationship, there was a strong public interest consideration in the future protection of pupils. The panel considered that the conduct found proved against Mr Mohammed carried with it a real risk of significant harm to pupils, albeit the panel accepted that there was no evidence that such harm had been caused on this occasion. Further, the panel noted that Mr Mohammed was the subject of two warnings about his professional boundaries with pupils in January and May 2022, and the relevance of this is explored further below. The panel considered that the absence of harm was at least partly due to the school's diligence in encouraging staff to raise concerns and taking appropriate action once concerns were raised.

The panel also considered that there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given its serious findings that Mr Mohammed had failed to fulfil his safeguarding duties.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Mohammed 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 Mr Mohammed 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 Mohammed in the profession. Whilst there is evidence that Mr Mohammed worked hard and had ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining him in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standards 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. The panel noted that a teacher's behaviour that seeks to exploit their position of trust should be viewed very seriously in terms of its potential influence on pupils and be seen as a possible threat to the public interest.

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 Mohammed.

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).
- an abuse of any trust [...], 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 to act on evidence that indicated a child's welfare may have been at risk e.g. failed to notify the designated safeguarding lead and/or make a referral to children's social care, the police or other relevant agencies when abuse, neglect and/or harmful cultural practices were identified.
- 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).

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.

The panel concluded that Mr Mohammed's actions were deliberate, and he was not acting under duress.

The panel recognised that the teacher had not previously been the subject of any formal regulatory findings, and there was evidence that before 2022, his performance as a teacher had met expectations. Witness A described Mr Mohammed as a hard-working teacher who knew his subject well. The panel did not receive any further references or testimonials, other than supportive comments made by Mr Mohammed's representative during the school's proceedings.

When considering his previous character and the risk of repetition in future, the panel considered it relevant that twice in 2022, Mr Mohammed was warned by the school that he needed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with his pupils. The first of these warnings came in January 2022, before he entered into the email exchanges with that are the subject of the proven allegations. The second was in May 2022, after there were further concerns about his "informal" interactions with his pupils. Then yet more concerns were raised after the leavers' ball in July 2022. This sequence of events suggests that conversations with him about maintaining boundaries, and warnings about adverse consequences if he did not, were not sufficient to make him modify his behaviour.

The panel considered that this was relevant to his insight into professional boundaries in general, and the risk that he would go on to commit further professional boundary breaches in future.

The panel paid close regard to the information provided by Mr Mohammed in his interviews with the school, and in his written submissions during the course of these

proceedings. It considered that on occasion, he had sought to normalise his conduct by suggesting it was part of the culture in his department, and to implicate other teachers. However, when that was investigated by the school, there was no evidence to support his suggestion.

The panel did take into account Mr Mohammed's personal circumstances in February 2022, and also, noted that he did demonstrate insight about the problems with the way in which he communicated with his pupils. His written reflections did demonstrate that he understood the seriousness of the conduct that he admitted, and he expressed remorse for his admitted conduct. However, he did not appear to recognise that his admitted conduct was potentially harmful. Further, there was a lack of any substantial insight on his part into why he had acted as he did, such as why his concern for students or his personal circumstances led him to exchange personal photos Pupil A. The panel found as a fact that the true explanation for his conduct, at least in part, was a sexual motivation, which he has not addressed.

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 Mohammed 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 Mohammed. The risk of future harm to 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.

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.

- any sexual misconduct involving a child.

Having found that Mr Mohammed's conduct towards Pupil A was sexually motivated, and as such, had the potential to cause harm to a child, these factors were relevant in this case.

The panel accepted that Mr Mohammed had shown some remorse for his admitted conduct, and some insight into its seriousness. However, his insight was limited, and the panel has found that he has not remediated his conduct. As such, there remains a real risk of harm. Further, the seriousness of his breach of trust is fundamentally incompatible with being a teacher.

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 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 Alex Mohammed should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Mohammed 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 and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- 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 Mohammed fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of sexually motivated conduct towards a pupil.

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 Mohammed, 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, *"The panel concluded that Mr Mohammed's conduct had the potential to harm children, in that professional boundaries exist to protect children's well-being, and any breaches may cause harm to their well-being. Further, his safeguarding failures also exposed the pupils to the risk of harm"*.

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, *"The panel did take into account Mr Mohammed's personal circumstances in February 2022, and also, noted that he did demonstrate insight about the problems with the way in which he communicated with his pupils. His written reflections did demonstrate that he understood the seriousness of the conduct that he admitted, and he expressed remorse for his admitted conduct. However, he did not appear to recognise that his admitted conduct was potentially harmful"*.

The panel has also commented, *"Further, there was a lack of any substantial insight on his part into why he had acted as he did, such as why his concern for students or his*

personal circumstances led him to exchange personal photos Pupil A. The panel found as a fact that the true explanation for his conduct, at least in part, was a sexual motivation, which he has not addressed”.

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, “...*the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Mohammed was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession*”. I am particularly mindful of the finding of sexually motivated conduct towards a pupil 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 Mohammed himself. The panel comment “*The panel recognised that the teacher had not previously been the subject of any formal regulatory findings, and there was evidence that before 2022, his performance as a teacher had met expectations. Witness A described Mr Mohammed as a hard-working teacher who knew his subject well*”.

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Mohammed 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 lack of insight or remorse. The panel has said, “*The panel accepted that Mr Mohammed had shown some remorse for his admitted conduct, and some insight into its seriousness. However, his insight was limited, and the panel has found that he has not remediated his conduct*”.

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that Mr Mohammed’s conduct has been found to be sexually motivated towards a pupil.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Mohammed has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, that is not backed up by full remorse or 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 that no provision should be made for a review period.

I have considered the panel's comments "*...there remains a real risk of harm. Further, the seriousness of his breach of trust is fundamentally incompatible with being a teacher.*"

I have considered whether allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is proportionate 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 proven sexually motivated conduct towards a pupil.

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



Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield

Date: 3 March 2026

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