



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Nicholas Saxon: Professional conduct panel meeting 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
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	8
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	11

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

Teacher:	Mr Nicholas Saxon
Teacher ref number:	1964111
Teacher date of birth:	18 September 1996
TRA reference:	25251
Date of determination:	24 March 2026
Former employer:	The Wordsley School, Stourbridge

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 24 March 2026 way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Nicholas Saxon.

The panel members were Mr Chris Major (teacher panellist – in the chair), Ms Sue Davies (lay panellist) and Mr Dara Islam (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr James Corrish 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 Saxon that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Saxon 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, Ms Shannett Thompson of Kingsley Napley, and without Mr Saxon, or any representative for Mr Saxon.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 20 February 2026.

It was alleged that Mr Saxon was guilty of having been convicted of one or more relevant offences whilst working as a science teacher at The Wordsley School ('the School') in that:

1. On or around 26 March 2025, he was convicted at Wolverhampton Crown Court of the following offences:
 - a. Between 17 February 2025 and 20 February 2025 he attempted to engage in sexual communication with a child contrary to Section 15A(1) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003;
 - b. Between 17 February 2025 and 20 February 2025 he attempted to cause/incite a female child under 13 to engage in sexual activity as an offender 18 or over contrary to Section 10(1)(a) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003

Mr Saxon admitted the facts of allegation 1(a) and 1(b) and that the admitted facts amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence, as set out in the response to the notice of referral signed by Mr Saxon on 28 August 2025 and in the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Saxon on 16 December 2025.

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 referral and response – pages 5 to 13

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts and PO representations – pages 14 to 17

Section 4: TRA exhibits – pages 18 to 78

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

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

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Saxon on 16 December 2025 and subsequently signed by the presenting officer.

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 Saxon for the allegations to be considered without a hearing. The panel had the ability to direct that the case be considered at a hearing if required in the interests of justice or in the public interest. The panel did not determine that such a direction was necessary or appropriate in this case.

Mr Saxon was employed as a science teacher at the School from 1 September 2024, until his employment terminated on 11 April 2025.

Between 17 February 2025 and 20 February 2025, Mr Saxon allegedly a) attempted to engage in sexual communication with a child; and b) attempted to cause a female child under 13 to engage in sexual activity. Mr Saxon was arrested on 24 February 2025 by West Midlands Police.

On 27 February 2025, the matter was referred to the TRA.

On 25 February 2025, Mr Saxon was charged with two sexual offences contrary to section 15A(1) and 10(1)(a) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003.

Mr Saxon was later convicted at Wolverhampton Crown Court on or around 26 March 2025 and was sentenced to a community order until 27 March 2027. Mr Saxon was also ordered to complete rehabilitation activities for 55 days and undergo alcohol treatment programme for 4 months. Further, Mr Saxon was required to sign the sex offenders register for 5 years; be subject to a sexual harm prevention order for 5 years; pay £150 in court costs to the CPS and pay a £114 victim surcharge.

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. On or around 26 March 2025, you were convicted at Wolverhampton Crown Court of the following offences:**

a. Between 17 February 2025 and 20 February 2025 you attempted to engage in sexual communication with a child contrary to Section 15A(1) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003

b. Between 17 February 2025 and 20 February 2025 you attempted to cause/incite a female child under 13 to engage in sexual activity as an offender 18 or over contrary to Section 10(1)(a) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Saxon on 16 December 2025. In this statement of agreed facts, Mr Saxon admitted the allegation and further admitted that the facts of the allegation amounted to a 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 any exceptional circumstances applicable in this case.

The panel had been provided with a copy of the certificate of conviction, dated 16 May 2025, from Wolverhampton Crown Court, which detailed that Mr Saxon had been convicted of one count of "*Adult attempt to engage in sexual communication with a child*", and one count of "*Attempt to cause/incite a female child under 13 to engage in sexual activity – offender 18 or over*".

Mr Saxon was sentenced to a community order until 27 March 2027. Mr Saxon was also ordered to complete rehabilitation activities for 55 days and undergo alcohol treatment programme for 4 months. Further, Mr Saxon was required to sign the sex offenders register for 5 years; be subject to a sexual harm prevention order for 5 years; pay £150 in court costs to the CPS; and pay a £114 victim surcharge.

The panel also reviewed a copy of the PNC record which also recorded these offences.

After examining the documents before the panel and the admissions in the signed statement of agreed facts, the panel was satisfied that allegations 1(a) and 1(b) were both proven.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

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

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Saxon 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 democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, [...]
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach [...].
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel noted that Mr Saxon's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting given that the offences he was convicted of involved children.

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

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

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

The panel noted that this was a criminal offence concerning a child under the age of 13 and Mr Saxon's engagement with that child whilst he was a teacher.

Whilst noting that Mr Saxon's behaviour did not lead to a sentence of imprisonment the panel considered that the offence was extremely serious.

The panel also found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Saxon's ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding that these convictions were for relevant offences 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. Prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

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

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Saxon, which involved convictions for relevant offences, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of inappropriate relationships with children.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Saxon 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 Saxon 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 Saxon in the profession. The panel considered that the public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Saxon in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.

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

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

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 the panel considered 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);
- 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);
- [...] other deliberate behaviour that undermines pupils, the profession, the school or colleagues;
- actions or behaviours [...] that undermine fundamental British values of democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty, [...]

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 Saxon's actions were not deliberate.

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

Mr Saxon did not demonstrate exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct and there was no evidence that he had contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel noted that Mr Saxon had pleaded guilty and that he appeared to have asserted that he had [REDACTED].

Mr Saxon had not though provided material mitigating evidence for the panel to consider, and the panel was unable to find that Mr Saxon showed any insight or remorse for his actions.

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 prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Saxon. The seriousness of the offences and that they involved sexual communication and activities with a child under 13, were significant factors in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate for it to decide to recommend a review period of the order. The panel was mindful that the Advice states that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances, in any given case, that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 2 years.

The Advice indicates that there are certain types of case where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period.

These include:

- serious sexual misconduct e.g. where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons, particularly where the individual has used their professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons; and
- any sexual misconduct involving a child.

These factors were clearly demonstrated by the convictions.

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.

The panel again noted that they had found that Mr Saxon had been convicted of serious criminal offences concerning sexual activity and communication with a child under the age of 13. Though the panel noted there was no custodial sentence given to Mr Saxon the panel nevertheless found the offending to be extremely serious.

The panel noted that they had no material evidence of insight or remorse and no evidence that Mr Saxon would not proceed to commit similar misconduct in the future were he allowed to continue teaching.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended without provisions for a review period.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

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

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

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Saxon 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 democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, [...]
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach [...].
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Saxon involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE).

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of a conviction for attempting to engage in sexual communication and activity with a child.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of a relevant conviction, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Mr Saxon, 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:

“In light of the panel’s findings against Mr Saxon, which involved convictions for relevant offences, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of inappropriate relationships with children.”

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:

“Mr Saxon had not though provided material mitigating evidence for the panel to consider, and the panel was unable to find that Mr Saxon showed any insight or remorse for his actions.”

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:

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

I am particularly mindful of the finding of a conviction for offences involving attempted sexual communication and activity with a child in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

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

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

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mr Saxon himself. The panel has commented:

“Mr Saxon did not demonstrate exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct and there was no evidence that he had contributed significantly to the education sector.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Saxon 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 extremely serious nature of the offences of which Mr Saxon was convicted. 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 Saxon. The seriousness of the offences and that they involved sexual communication and activities with a child under 13, were significant factors

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.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that there was no evidence of insight and remorse on the part of Mr Saxon and no evidence that he would not repeat similar misconduct in the future.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Mr Saxon has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

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

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

The panel has noted that the Advice indicates that the public interest will weigh in favour of not offering a review period where cases involve serious sexual misconduct or any sexual misconduct involving a child.

I have considered the panel’s comments:

“The panel again noted that they had found that Mr Saxon had been convicted of serious criminal offences concerning sexual activity and communication with a child under the age of 13. Though the panel noted there was no custodial sentence given to Mr Saxon the panel nevertheless found the offending to be extremely serious.

The panel noted that they had no material evidence of insight or remorse and no evidence that Mr Saxon would not proceed to commit similar misconduct in the future were he allowed to continue teaching.”

I have considered whether not allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate response to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the serious nature of the offences of which Mr Saxon was convicted, the lack of evidence of insight or remorse, and 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 Nicholas Saxon 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 Saxon shall not be entitled to apply for restoration of his eligibility to teach.

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

Mr Nicholas Saxon 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: 26 March 2026

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