



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Michael Younan: Professional conduct panel outcome**

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

**March 2026**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	7
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	10

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

**Teacher:** Mr Michael Younan

**TRA reference:** 20839

**Date of determination:** 2 March 2026

**Former employer:** Plume Maldon’s Community Academy, Essex

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 2 March 2026 at Cheylesmore House, 5 Quinton Road, Coventry, CV1 2WT, to consider the case of Mr Michael Younan.

The panel members were Mrs Christine McLintock (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Emma Barnett (lay panellist) and Mr Jonathan Wettreich (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Graham Miles of Blake Morgan LLP solicitors.

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

Mr Michael Younan was not present and not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

## **Allegations**

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 17 December 2025.

It was alleged that Mr Michael Younan was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:

1. On 28 November 2022, at Southend-on-Sea Magistrates' Court, he was convicted of:
  - a. On 16/05/2022 at Westcliff-on-Sea in the county of Essex, had in his possession a quantity of cannabis, a controlled drug of Class B in contravention of section 5(1) of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971,
  - b. On 16/05/2022 at Westcliff-on-Sea in the county of Essex, had in his possession 0.20g of Ketamine, a controlled drug of Class B in contravention of section 5(1) of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971,
  - c. On 16/05/2022 at Westcliff-on-Sea in the county of Essex, drove a motor vehicle when the proportion of a controlled drug, namely Ketamine, in his blood, exceeded the specified limit.

Mr Younan admitted that he had been convicted of these offences, but he did not admit they were relevant offences.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

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

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 5 to 19

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 20 to 40

Section 4: Teacher documents – pages 41 to 225

The panel also agreed to accept a proceeding in absence bundle which included:

Section 1: Correspondence with the TRA– pages 4 to 25

Section 2: Correspondence with Capsticks – pages 26 to 85

In addition, the panel requested and received:

- an email to Mr Younan dated 17 December 2025;
- Royal mail proof of delivery dated 28 February 2026

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**

There were no witnesses.

## **Decision and reasons**

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

The panel carefully considered the case and reached a decision.

Mr Michael Younan was employed as a teacher and subject leader of Design Technology at Plume Maldon’s Community Academy (“the School”). He had been employed there since January 2017.

On 16 May 2022, Mr Younan was arrested by Essex Police on suspicion of possession drugs and driving whilst unfit through drink or drugs.

On 28 November 2022, Mr Younan appeared at Southend-on-Sea Magistrates’ Court, when he pleaded guilty to possession of controlled drugs, namely cannabis and ketamine. He also pleaded guilty to driving a motor vehicle when the proportion of a controlled drug, namely ketamine, in his blood, exceeded the specified limit. He resigned from his position at the School the day before his appearance in court.

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

**It was alleged that you are guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:**

**1. On 28 November 2022, at Southend-on-Sea Magistrates’ Court, you were convicted of:**

**a. On 16/05/2022 at Westcliff-on-Sea in the county of Essex, had in your possession a quantity of cannabis, a controlled drug of Class B in contravention of section 5(1) of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971,**

**b. On 16/05/2022 at Westcliff-on-Sea in the county of Essex, had in your possession 0.20g of Ketamine, a controlled drug of Class B in contravention of section 5(1) of the Misuse of Drugs Act 1971,**

**c. On 16/05/2022 at Westcliff-on-Sea in the county of Essex, drove a motor vehicle when the proportion of a controlled drug, namely Ketamine, in your blood exceeded the specified limit.**

Mr Younan admitted that he had been convicted of each of the offences in allegations 1a, b and c.

The panel was also provided with the memorandum of conviction for each offence from Southend-on-Sea Magistrates' Court. The panel accepted the legal advice that each memorandum could be treated as conclusive proof of commission of the offence to which it related.

The panel noted from the documents disclosed by Essex Police that, on 16 May 2022, Mr Younan had left a bar in Southend-on-Sea in his vehicle. The vehicle was tracked by CCTV and police officers attended at the location and asked Mr Younan to complete a roadside breath test. This did not show Mr Younan to be over the alcohol limit to drive. However, upon the vehicle being searched a quantity of cannabis was located in the glovebox and a quantity of powder was located in Mr Younan's wallet. Mr Younan was then arrested and taken into custody. He then provided a sample of saliva, which proved positive for cannabis. He also provided a sample of blood which was submitted for analysis. The results of the analysis showed that the proportion of ketamine in Mr Younan's blood exceeded the specified limit for that drug. Mr Younan was fined £440 and disqualified from driving for 12 months.

The panel found allegations 1a, b and c proved.

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

Having found all of the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the convictions were for relevant offences.

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 Younan, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Younan 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
  - not undermining ... the rule of law
  - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others

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

In relation to allegation 1c, the panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety and/or security members of the public.

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

In relation to allegation 1c, it was submitted that this was a case involving a serious driving offence involving drugs, which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel was satisfied that Mr Younan's conviction for the offence in allegation 1c was serious. The panel noted that he knew that he had taken an illicit substance before driving, having disregard for the safety of other road users and his passengers. The panel concluded that the conviction was for a relevant offence, namely a serious driving offence involving drugs.

In relation to allegations 1a and 1b, the panel noted that the Advice states that minor offences involving personal use of class B drugs away from children and education contexts are less likely to be considered relevant offences. These offences took place at the same time as the offence in allegation 1c, which were aggravating features to the overall conduct. However, the panel was not satisfied that, in isolation, allegations 1a or 1b were relevant offences.

Accordingly, the panel concluded that allegation 1c alone amounted to a relevant offence.

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

Given the panel's findings in respect of a conviction of a relevant offence in relation to allegation 1c, 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 a punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely: the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, the protection of other members of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

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

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Mr Younan 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 Younan in the profession. The panel decided that there was a public interest consideration in retaining the teacher in the profession, since no doubt had been cast upon his abilities as an educator and he had made a valuable contribution to the profession. The panel noted he had engaged in several extra activities and responsibilities in addition to his subject lead role. These included Duke of Edinburgh award scheme coordinator, the School's STEM primary liaison coordinator and the School's STEM programme lead. The panel noted that, under his subject leadership, Mr Younan said that the number of students taking A Level had nearly quadrupled.

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. Whilst this was a serious driving offence involving drugs, the sentence imposed by the Court was at the lower end of the spectrum and there were few aggravating features in line with the sentencing guidelines. He was also given the minimum period of driving disqualification.

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 Younan and the fact that prohibition orders are not intended to be punitive.

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;

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 Mr Younan's actions deliberate. There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Younan was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation. [REDACTED]

The panel noted that Mr Younan has carved out an alternative career and it is not clear from the papers whether it is his current intention to return to the classroom. However, he provided mitigation in writing in May 2024. In this document, the panel found that Mr Younan demonstrated that he had reflected on the impact his conduct could have on public confidence in the teaching profession and the impact that it could have had on pupils and their families. He said:

- 'I fully regret the decisions that I made, and I understand the impact this would have on families is detrimental to the teaching profession.'
- 'I believe the public's confidence and trust in me has been affected and I know that I need to rectify this'
- 'When I was a teacher, I had a high level of professionalism through my career and my poor decision-making on 16 May 2022 affected not only myself, but the children I taught and their families'.

He explained he had taken steps to address the offending behaviour. He said:

- 'I have addressed the issues relating to the charges and conviction against me and have put things right in the past 18 months and continue to do so'.

Mr Younan had a previously good history and had contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel accepted Mr Younan's assertion that the incident was out of character.

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, the recommendation of no prohibition order would be both a proportionate and an appropriate response. Given that the nature and severity of the behaviour were at the less serious end of the possible spectrum and, having considered the mitigating factors that were present, the panel determined that a recommendation for a prohibition order would not be appropriate in this case. The panel considered that the publication of the adverse findings it had made was sufficient to send an appropriate message to the “teacher as to the standards of behaviour that are not acceptable, and the publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession.

## **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 sanction.

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 some of those proven facts amount to a relevant conviction.

In this case, the panel has also found that some of the allegations do not amount to a relevant conviction. I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that the findings of a relevant conviction should be published and that such an action is proportionate and in the public interest.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Michael Younan 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
  - not undermining ... the rule of law
  - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a teacher receiving a relevant conviction for driving a motor vehicle when the proportion of a controlled drug, namely Ketamine, in his blood exceeded the specified limit.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In assessing 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 Younan, 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. While it does not record having heard evidence that Mr Younan's behaviour posed a direct risk to the wellbeing of pupils, the panel offers this observation:

"In relation to allegation 1c, the panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety and/or security members of the public."

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

"The panel noted that Mr Younan has carved out an alternative career and it is not clear from the papers whether it is his current intention to return to the classroom. However, he provided mitigation in writing in May 2024. In this document, the panel found that Mr Younan demonstrated that he had reflected on the impact his conduct could have on public confidence in the teaching profession and the impact that it could have had on pupils and their families. He said:

- *'I fully regret the decisions that I made, and I understand the impact this would have on families is detrimental to the teaching profession.'*
- *'I believe the public's confidence and trust in me has been affected and I know that I need to rectify this'*
- *'When I was a teacher, I had a high level of professionalism through my career and my poor decision-making on 16 May 2022 affected not only myself, but the children I taught and their families'.*

He explained he had taken steps to address the offending behaviour. He said:

- *'I have addressed the issues relating to the charges and conviction against me and have put things right in the past 18 months and continue to do so'.*

Mr Younan had a previously good history and had contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel accepted Mr Younan's assertion that the incident was out of character."

In my judgement, this evidence of insight and remorse means that there is a low risk of the repetition of this behaviour. I have therefore given this some 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 comments:

"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 Younan was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated."

I am particularly mindful of the finding of a teacher being convicted of a serious driving offence involving drugs in this case and the impact that such a finding may have 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 Younan himself. The panel notes the following:

"The panel decided that there was a public interest consideration in retaining the teacher in the profession, since no doubt had been cast upon his abilities as an educator and he had made a valuable contribution to the profession. The panel noted he had engaged in several extra activities and responsibilities in addition to his subject lead role. These included Duke of Edinburgh award scheme coordinator, the School's STEM primary liaison coordinator and the School's STEM programme lead. The panel noted that, under his subject leadership, Mr Younan said that the number of students taking A Level had nearly quadrupled."

The panel also offers this observation:

“Mr Younan had a previously good history and had contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel accepted Mr Younan’s assertion that the incident was out of character.”

I have also noted the evidence heard by the panel relating to mitigating circumstances in this case.

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Younan 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 relative seriousness of the misconduct found:

“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. Whilst this was a serious driving offence involving drugs, the sentence imposed by the Court was at the lower end of the spectrum and there were few aggravating features in line with the sentencing guidelines. He was also given the minimum period of driving disqualification.”

I have also considered and given weight to the panel’s concluding comments:

“The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, the recommendation of no prohibition order would be both a proportionate and an appropriate response. Given that the nature and severity of the behaviour were at the less serious end of the possible spectrum and, having considered the mitigating factors that were present, the panel determined that a recommendation for a prohibition order would not be appropriate in this case. The panel considered that the publication of the adverse findings it had made was sufficient to send an appropriate message to the “teacher as to the standards of behaviour that are not acceptable, and the publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession.”

For these reasons, I have concluded that a prohibition order is not proportionate or in the public interest. I consider that, while the misconduct found in this case was serious, the publication of the findings made would be sufficient to send an appropriate message to Mr Younan as to the standards of behaviour that were not acceptable and that the publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. C. C. C.', enclosed within a large, loopy oval stroke.

**Decision maker: Marc Cavey**

**Date: 9 March 2026**

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