



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Ms Natasha Blackmore: 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	5
Documents	5
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	16
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	20

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

Teacher:	Ms Natasha Blackmore
Teacher ref number:	1477188
Teacher date of birth:	25 February 1993
TRA reference:	25470
Date of determination:	24 March 2026
Former employer:	Westfield Academy, Somerset

Introduction

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

The panel members were Mr Gamel Byles (teacher panellist – in the chair), Ms Wendy Shannon (lay panellist) and Mr Benjamin Drouet (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mrs Luisa Gibbons of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP Solicitors.

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Ms Blackmore that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Ms Blackmore provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer Mr Jon Walters of Brabners LLP or Ms Blackmore.

The meeting took place in private and was not recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 19 December 2025.

It was alleged that Ms Blackmore was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that while employed as a teacher at Westfield Academy:

1. On various dates during the academic year 2023 – 2024 and 2024- 2025 she inappropriately communicated with one or more pupils in that she:
 - a. Disclosed significant inappropriate details about her personal life to one or more pupils;
 - b. Spent excessive time with one or more pupils.
2. On various dates during the academic year 2023 – 2024 and 2024- 2025, she:
 - a. Allowed one or more pupils to contact her via her personal social media account;
 - b. Exchanged messages with one or more pupils via social media group chats;
 - c. On one or more occasions arranged a meeting with one or more pupils at Yeovil Recreation Centre during the school holidays which was not authorised by the school.
3. On 5 August 2024, she met with one or more pupils at Yeovil Recreation Centre when she was not authorised to do so by the school.
4. By her actions at paragraphs 1 – 3 above, she failed to maintain professional boundaries with pupils.

Ms Blackmore admitted the allegations and also admitted that she was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Anonymised person list – page 3

Section 2: Signed statement of agreed facts – pages 4 to 7

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 8 to 72

Section 4: Teacher documents – pages 73 to 74

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

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

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Ms Blackmore on 17 November 2025.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

In advance of the meeting the TRA agreed to a request from Ms Blackmore 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.

From September 2022, Ms Blackmore was employed as the head of department for design and technology at Westfield Academy Trust (“the School”). The School is a co-educational secondary academy for pupils aged 11 – 16.

On 5 December 2024, a parent reported concerns to the headteacher, and an investigation began the following day.

On 11 March 2025, a disciplinary hearing was held and Ms Blackmore was dismissed from the School for gross misconduct.

On 16 April 2025, a referral was made by the School to the TRA.

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:

While employed as a teacher at Westfield Academy:

- 1. On various dates during the academic year 2023 – 2024 and 2024- 2025 you inappropriately communicated with one or more pupils in that you:**
 - a. Disclosed significant inappropriate details about your personal life to one or more pupils;**
 - b. Spent excessive time with one or more pupils.**

In the statement of agreed facts, Ms Blackmore admitted that Pupil A, Pupil B, Pupil C, Pupil D and Pupil E were pupils at the School in Year [REDACTED] during the academic year 2023/2024 and Year [REDACTED] during the academic year 2024/2025. It was admitted that these pupils attended Ms Blackmore's classroom on various occasions during breaks and at lunchtime whilst Ms Blackmore was present.

Ms Blackmore admitted that during these meetings she discussed the following with pupils:

- a) Her romantic relationships, including breakups and new partners;
- b) [REDACTED];
- c) Details of her social life, including drinking, vaping and smoking on nights out; and
- d) Showing pupils text messages between herself and [REDACTED], describing him in derogatory terms.

During the School's investigation, Pupil E was interviewed. The notes of that interview stated that a few months after Ms Blackmore joined the School, they "grew a bond with her as a friend". Pupil E stated that Pupil D, Pupil A and Pupil B were the lunch group. Pupil E stated that he was close friends with Pupil C and didn't like going in the playground or loitering around so spent social times in Ms Blackmore's room every day. Pupil E stated that Pupil B left and became friends with another student, and Pupil A followed and left. It had then become just Pupil E, Pupil D and Pupil C for a while. Pupil E stated that whilst they were in her room, Ms Blackmore would sit there and engage sometimes, such as telling them to watch their language, or if she heard anything, she

might ask “what’s going on here”, but it had mostly just been the pupils having a conversation and Ms Blackmore was just there. Pupil E stated that Ms Blackmore did not share a lot, it was the pupils who asked the questions. Pupil E stated he would ask Ms Blackmore what was wrong, and Ms Blackmore had tried to say that it didn’t concern them. Pupil E stated that Ms Blackmore had shared little bits like [redacted] “not supporting her” and that he had heard about texts between Ms Blackmore and [redacted] “about him not being supportive and him rather being in the pub”. Pupil E also stated that Ms Blackmore shared that she had been on a hen night with her friends, had got drunk, smoked and vaped.

Pupil E also stated that there had been an occasion when Ms Blackmore had returned to School and was very upset and had tears in her eyes. He stated that Ms Blackmore had spoke with the pupils at break time, burst into tears and told them that her pet had died. Pupil E stated that Ms Blackmore had a “massive attachment to animals” and the pet was the only one living with her at the time. Pupil E stated that Ms Blackmore saw them as friends not students. He stated that Pupil C called her “Tash”, but Ms Blackmore had always told him “no”, it’s Miss”.

During the School’s investigation, Pupil C was also interviewed. The notes of that interview stated that Pupil E, Pupil D, Pupil A and Pupil B sat with Ms Blackmore at every break and lunch in her room. She stated that the conversations were regarding “how our day has been, behaviour, their home life, friends, arguments. The normal”. He stated that Ms Blackmore was more of a friend, “we’ve got that bond with her. She knows a lot about us, we are up there all the time”.

Pupil C was asked what Ms Blackmore chatted with them about. He stated that Ms Blackmore had told them about her [REDACTED], her dogs, having a baby, friends, family. He also stated that regarding Ms Blackmore’s [REDACTED] she had shared that she hoped [redacted] would be there more and that Ms Blackmore had showed some of her texts between herself and [REDACTED].

During the School’s investigation, Pupil A was also interviewed. The notes of that interview stated that Pupil D, Pupil B and Pupil A had, towards the end of [REDACTED] started to go to Ms Blackmore’s room at break and lunch to stay warm. She stated that, at the beginning of [REDACTED], Pupil C and Pupil E joined them at social times. Pupil A stated that initially they would chat about their day and their lessons, and between the middle and beginning of [REDACTED], Ms Blackmore started to talk about her dog, and then it progressed to talking about her new dog. She stated that just before the summer break, Ms Blackmore had said that they could come and meet the new dog in the holidays. Pupil A also stated that before they broke up at the end of [REDACTED], Ms Blackmore had told them she had a [REDACTED]. Pupil A also stated that Ms Blackmore would tell them that she had [REDACTED], and also said that she went on a hen do and “got really drunk and she was vaping and smoking.”

Pupil A stated that Ms Blackmore had told them she was [REDACTED] and that [redacted] was struggling with it and wasn't talking to her. She stated that, on one occasion, Ms Blackmore had shown her messages between her and [redacted]. She also referred to Ms Blackmore having said that she and [redacted] had had an argument.

Pupil A stated that she stopped going to Ms Blackmore's classroom as she had "consciously started to hang out with other people". She stated that, on one day, she went to see Ms Blackmore who asked where she had been and when Pupil A told her, Ms Blackmore had said "you ditched us for food when you could have had a nice conversation with us." Pupil A stated that it was "almost as if I had to be there". She stated that Ms Blackmore had been speaking in a serious tone, and she later "felt that Ms Blackmore was trying to get back at me for not seeing her". Pupil A stated that she had thought that it was all fine in the beginning, but it had developed into "some kind of weird relationship" where they told each other things, "everything". Pupil A stated that she felt that Ms Blackmore favoured Pupil D and had said that if she [REDACTED]. Pupil A stated that, she believed it had been in [REDACTED], Ms Blackmore had asked if they had told anyone about their group, as she could get into trouble if they had.

During the School's investigation, Pupil D was also interviewed. The notes of that interview stated that Pupil D had said that Ms Blackmore had said to her tutor group that if the weather was bad, they could come to her room in social times. She stated that it was raining one day, around half way through [REDACTED], or the start of [REDACTED] and they went up there. She stated that her, Pupil B, Pupil A and sometimes a few others from the tutor group would go to her room. She stated that most of the time, they would go there for a chat about "life, what we're up to", "lessons" and sometimes they would do homework.

Pupil D stated that she had got along really well with Ms Blackmore, that she treated everyone the same and said that she would always look out for their tutor group. She stated that she told "lots of people [REDACTED]" in general conversation, that Ms Blackmore had said that she hadn't seen him in a while. Pupil D stated that she had always said it was nice to have support in school, that she saw Ms Blackmore as a tutor and that she had always helped them. Pupil D stated that she thought Ms Blackmore saw them as "students and friends".

During the School's investigation, Pupil B was also interviewed. The notes of that interview record that Pupil B had stated that she and Pupil A became friends with Pupil D and they had started going to Ms Blackmore's room because it was cold. Pupil B stated that Pupil D knew Ms Blackmore better as she was in Ms Blackmore's [REDACTED]. Pupil B stated that the conversation had been about how their day was going in school. She stated that Ms Blackmore would talk about "stuff", such as "when she [REDACTED]"; and "when her dog died, and got a new one" and "when she got a new house".

Pupil B stated that she spoke with her mother who talked it through with her and said that “it wasn’t right”. Pupil B stated that she made the decision to leave the group. She stated that she felt uncomfortable and left the space. She stated that “thinking back”, she could see why it was “so weird” and that she understood where her mother was “coming from”. Pupil B stated that she never really fitted into the group.

In a meeting conducted with Ms Blackmore as part of the School’s investigation, it is recorded that Ms Blackmore stated that Pupil C, Pupil D, Pupil A, Pupil E and Pupil B had used her room so “they didn’t have to go out in the cold”. She stated that they came “every day but the door was always open with other staff around.” She stated that they had been very supportive when she lost her dog, “[REDACTED]”. She stated that their conversations had been general in nature such as “what they got up to at the weekend”. She stated that they knew when she was moving out, and were excited for her, as well as when she told them that [REDACTED]. She confirmed there had been conversations about her [REDACTED], and about going on a hen night and getting drunk. She stated that she did think the pupils probably felt that she was more of a friend than just a teacher. In a statement Ms Blackmore provided for the School’s investigation, Ms Blackmore stated that “if it hadn’t been for those students and the support they showed me after I lost [REDACTED], I don’t think I would have come back to work properly due to the way I was feeling.”

The panel did consider that Ms Blackmore had disclosed significant inappropriate details about her personal life to one or more pupils. The panel noted the consistency of the evidence provided by the pupils. The panel considered that it may have been appropriate for Ms Blackmore to share that [REDACTED], but that the surrounding details she provided regarding her [REDACTED] was inappropriate. Similarly, it was inappropriate to discuss her [REDACTED] with pupils and her actions on a hen night.

The panel also considered that the pupils were consistent regarding the time they spent with her, and the panel considered this to be excessive. The panel noted that Pupil A stated she consciously decided to hang out with other people and noted that Ms Blackmore’s comment to her suggested that she “had to be there”. The panel considered that this indicated that pupils felt some obligation to spend time with her.

The panel found allegation 1a and 1b proven.

2. On various dates during the academic year 2023 – 2024 and 2024- 2025, you:

- a. Allowed one or more pupils to contact you via her personal social media account;**
- b. Exchanged messages with one or more pupils via social media group chats;**

c. On one or more occasions arranged a meeting with one or more pupils at Yeovil Recreation Centre during the school holidays which was not authorised by the school.

In the statement of agreed facts, Ms Blackmore admitted that, in July 2024, she joined a group chat on the social media platform, Instagram, using a private account. Four pupils (Pupils A, C, D and E) were members of the group chat with Ms Blackmore and the group had been set up by a pupil. Ms Blackmore admitted that the group was used to keep in touch over the summer and arrange meetings with pupils, Ms Blackmore and Ms Blackmore's new dog.

Ms Blackmore further admitted that by a message in the group chat, on 1 August 2024, she invited the pupils to meet at Yeovil Recreation Centre on 5 August 2024.

She also further admitted that in a subsequent message to the group on 29 August 2024, she invited the pupils to meet up on 2 September 2024, although, on that occasion, she did not meet with the pupils.

During the School's investigation Ms Blackmore provided an initial account that the social media group was an Instagram account on "her dogs page". She stated that it was started in July because the students wanted to see when she had her new puppy. She stated that the chat was called "dog". She stated that the pupils' mothers were aware of this. Ms Blackmore stated that since the first week of August, the chat had not been used apart from questions about school start dates and trips which "were answered between them".

The notes of Pupil E's interview as part of the School's investigation stated that he had contact with Ms Blackmore because he did business enterprise and that she had advertised his business enterprise idea by sharing it. He stated that "randomly one day we had a group chat that Ms Blackmore had not wanted to be on called "dog". He stated that the conversation had been about meeting up. Pupil E stated he was sceptical about this, and they had a discussion about the consequences of it and Pupil E concluded they should not be meeting. He stated that the other pupils wanted to see Ms Blackmore's puppy. Pupil E stated that he did not go, and deliberately made other plans. Pupil E stated that Ms Blackmore had to go to the vets near the recreational ground and Pupil C had asked "why can't we see the dog". He stated that Ms Blackmore had responded that she would be there for two minutes and they could "literally see the dog". He stated that he thought Ms Blackmore was sceptical about this, and was worried about being on the group. He stated that Ms Blackmore knew she should not be on the group chat and that it was very rare that they messaged on it.

Pupil E stated that he was not a fan of the group chat, he was worried that Ms Blackmore would get into trouble and they were responsible for it. He stated it had been the pupils idea for the group chat, and their idea to meet up, not Ms Blackmore's idea. He stated

that Ms Blackmore never did anything to start these things. He also stated that they knew when they overstepped the line, as if they were doing “something stupid”, Ms Blackmore would tell them.

In the notes of Pupil C’s interview as part of the School’s investigation, Pupil C confirmed that either he or Pupil E had created the group chat, which was mainly about Ms Blackmore’s dogs. He stated that it had been created because they knew she was getting a new dog, and “we had to meet it”. He stated that Ms Blackmore had said they would have to meet in the summer and the group chat was to keep in touch. Pupil C stated that Ms Blackmore had said not to tell anyone about the group.

In the notes of Pupil A’s interview as part of the School’s investigation, Pupil A stated that the Instagram account was set up, she believed by Pupil E or Pupil C. She stated that Ms Blackmore had said they needed to set a group for the holidays so that she could send photos of her dog. She stated that during the School holidays, Ms Blackmore had posted on the Instagram account that she would be in Yeovil on Monday afternoon if they were around. She stated that the plan had been for Pupil D, Pupil C, Pupil E and Pupil A to meet with Ms Blackmore.

In the notes of Pupil D’s interview as part of the School’s investigation, Pupil D stated that Pupil C had created it, and there had been two messaging groups, one with Ms Blackmore in it, and one without her. Pupil D stated that she had said from the start, that it was not a good idea, and that she had tried to take a step back and not get too involved.

Pupil D stated that she and Pupil A agreed to meet up in the summer in the group chat, Pupil E had made a joke about walking Ms Blackmore’s dog and it went from there.

In the notes of Pupil B’s interview as part of the School’s investigation, Pupil B stated that one of their group had been in contact with Ms Blackmore and asked everyone else along to meet Ms Blackmore’s new puppy at the recreation ground. Pupil B stated that Pupil D was in contact with Ms Blackmore on Instagram. She stated that she did not know who suggested that they meet up, but they would not have known about the puppy if it hadn’t been for that contact.

Person A, the mother of Pupil C was interviewed as part of the School’s investigation. The notes of that meeting record that Person A stated that she was aware that Ms Blackmore had been chatting with the students on an account on Instagram. Person A stated that she was never worried that anything underhand was happening and that Ms Blackmore had been a really good teacher for Pupil C “as she understands him” and was “very supportive”.

The panel was provided with screenshots of group messages exchanged between “[REDACTED]” (which the panel understood to be Ms Blackmore’s dogs), Pupil C, Pupil

D and Pupil E. One message from “Nala and River” stated “we’re not picking River up until Friday now”. On 1 August “Nala and River” messaged to say “I’ll be in Yeovil Monday afternoon... if you guys are around” I am so excited... like a child at Christmas [emoji] xx” and “We’d be available after 3... we’re doing a vet check at 2:45pm so after that we’re free”. On 2 August, “Nala and River” sent a photograph of a dog to the group. On 4 August, “Nala and River” messaged the group to say “I’ll let you know when we leave the vets! We won’t be stopping too long... [redacted] isn’t feeling overly well but I will be there to meet you all at least [emoji]”. A further message was sent from “Nala and River” saying “Just leaving vets now”. On 29 August “Nala and River” sent a message to the group saying “I’m missing my lunch time crew! I can’t wait to here [sic] about your summers [emoji] River is at the vets on Monday at 3:45 if you’re around again [emoji]”. “Nala and River” then sent two more photographs of a dog to the group saying “she’s massive now” and “6 weeks difference”.

In a meeting conducted with Ms Blackmore as part of the School’s investigation, it is recorded that Ms Blackmore stated that she was in an Instagram group with four students called “Dog”. She stated that she did not remember who set it up, but it wasn’t her. She stated that it had started in June 2024 and that the pupils had wanted to see her new puppy. She stated that although she had thought it was not a good idea, she had not done anything about to stop it. With regards to meeting up, she stated that she didn’t remember who had suggested it, and she did not know what was going through her head but “it was more I had this cute bundle of fluff, in my head it was a public place where one of the Mum’s [sic] was there”. She stated that there was no other meet up with the pupils.

The panel noted the consistency of the pupils accounts and this was supported by Ms Blackmore’s admissions.

The panel found allegations 2a, 2b and 2c proven.

3. On 5 August 2024, you met with one or more pupils at Yeovil Recreation Centre when you were not authorised to do so by the school.

In the statement of agreed facts, Ms Blackmore admitted that, on 5 August 2024, she met pupils at Yeovil Recreational Centre bringing her dog and [REDACTED]. She admitted that Pupil A, Pupil D, Pupil D’s cousin and Person A, were present. She also admitted that Pupil C had been due to attend but was unwell so did not.

In the notes of Pupil C’s interview as part of the School’s investigation, Pupil C stated that Ms Blackmore had been in Yeovil one day to take her dog to the vet, and was in the recreational ground, so they went over to see the dog. He stated that Pupil D, Pupil D’s cousin, Pupil C and Pupil C’s mother all met with Ms Blackmore. Pupil C stated that he had asked his mother for a lift to the recreational ground, and she had asked why. Pupil C stated that he had said that it was to see Ms Blackmore’s dog, and his mother said that

she would come too. He stated that his mother had probably come to make sure he was safe. Pupil C confirmed that, at no time, did he feel unsafe around Ms Blackmore.

In the notes of Pupil A's interview as part of the School's investigation, Pupil A stated they had met at the recreational ground at 3pm. She stated that Pupil D and her cousin, and Pupil C and his mother and little brother all came. She stated that they met, made a fuss of the dog and talked about the dog. Pupil A stated that she thought Ms Blackmore, Pupil D and Pupil C were talking about meeting again, but Pupil A did not play a part in it as it "didn't feel right".

In the notes of Pupil D's interview as part of the School's investigation, Pupil D stated she went to the park to meet with Pupil A and was told that Ms Blackmore was there. Pupil D stated that she did not think it was a good idea. She stated that Ms Blackmore's [REDACTED] was there but did not come out of the car. Pupil D said that she said "hello" but that was it. She stated that Pupil C, Pupil A and Pupil C's mother had been there.

Person A, the mother of Pupil C, was interviewed as part of the School's investigation. The notes of that meeting record that Person A stated that she had gone with Pupil C and his brother to meet Ms Blackmore and other students at the recreational ground to meet Ms Blackmore's dog. She stated that she had accompanied Pupil C to ensure he was actually meeting Ms Blackmore and not someone unsafe. She stated that nothing had been said at the meeting to worry her.

The screenshots of messages show that on 5 August, "[REDACTED]" sent a message to the group saying "Was lovely to see you guys [emoji] I miss my daily catch ups with you!! [emoji of heart]"

The panel considered that it had been established that Ms Blackmore was not authorised by the school to meet with the pupils given that the meeting took place during the School holidays. It also contravened the School's Staff Code of Conduct which stated that "Staff should avoid personal organised contact with students outside of school hours".

The panel found this allegation proven.

4. By her actions at paragraphs 1 – 3 above, you failed to maintain professional boundaries with pupils.

In the statement of agreed facts, Ms Blackmore admitted this allegation.

The panel considered that Ms Blackmore had breached the Staff Code of Conduct in a number of ways. She failed to avoid "personal organised contact with students outside of school hours". She also breached the requirement "not to attempt to contact students or their parents via social media, or any other means outside school, in order to develop any sort of relationship".

The panel noted that Pupil E was worried that Ms Blackmore would get into trouble and that they were responsible. Pupil A stated that a comment that Ms Blackmore made after she stopped going to her classroom, made her feel like she was obligated to be there and was concerned about repercussions of this. Pupil A referred to Pupil B having left the group and Ms Blackmore, and the group were “slagging her off” and told them they should distance themselves from her. Pupil B referred to having felt uncomfortable in the group and that it did not “feel right to me”. She stated that she did not tell the group why she left because she couldn’t. She stated that it was hard to talk about and that she felt “blame for it”.

The panel considered that the above illustrated that there had been a failure to maintain appropriate boundaries.

The panel found this allegation proven.

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

Having found all of 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 Ms Blackmore, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Ms Blackmore 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 was satisfied that the conduct of Ms Blackmore in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education (“KCSIE”). The panel noted that Ms Blackmore’s actions were inconsistent with the staff’s code of conduct, including that she had inappropriate contact with children outside of School. The panel also noted that she was “over friendly with children” and there was an indication that Ms Blackmore had “favourites” given that there were a select group that spent their breaks in her classroom and Pupil A referred to Ms Blackmore favouring Pupil D. The panel considered that Ms Blackmore had failed to provide a safe environment in which children can learn, given the reliance she placed on the pupils for her own emotional support. In doing so, Ms Blackmore failed to ensure her approach was child centred, and that she failed to consider what was in the children’s best interests.

The panel was not satisfied that the conduct of Ms Blackmore in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Working Together to Safeguard Children.

The panel also considered whether Ms Blackmore’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 none of these offences was relevant.

The panel noted that the Advice is not intended to be exhaustive and there may be other behaviours that the panel consider to be unacceptable professional conduct. The panel considered that developing an emotional dependence on pupils did constitute unacceptable professional conduct because it placed a burden on the pupils that they ought not to have had to endure.

The panel noted that the contact on social media and the meeting up with the pupils took place outside the education setting. The panel considered that this affected the way that Ms Blackmore fulfilled her teaching role as she had been entrusted by the School and parents to maintain professional boundaries with pupils and she abused that position of trust. The panel considered that it may have led to the pupils being exposed to or influenced by the behaviour in a harmful way given that they felt a sense of responsibility towards her.

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

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Ms Blackmore was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Ms Blackmore'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 Ms Blackmore'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 Ms Blackmore was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that none of these offences were relevant.

Nevertheless, the panel considered that the public would be concerned by a teacher failing to maintain appropriate boundaries and relying upon pupils for emotional support which was not their role. Ms Blackmore's failure to maintain appropriate boundaries led to Pupil E expressing concern that Ms Blackmore would get into trouble, and that they were responsible.

The findings of misconduct are serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher.

The panel considered that Ms Blackmore's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher.

For these reasons, the panel found that Ms Blackmore'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 and 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.

There was a public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings that Ms Blackmore failed to maintain professional boundaries with a group of pupils upon which she became dependent for emotional support. The panel considered that Ms Blackmore had failed to act in the pupil's best interests and adopt a child-centred approach.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Blackmore 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 Ms Blackmore was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

Whilst there was limited evidence that Ms Blackmore had some ability as an educator, for example Person A referred Ms Blackmore having been a "really good teacher for Pupil C as she understands him and is very supportive". Nevertheless, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Ms Blackmore in the profession, since her behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and she abused her position of trust.

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

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);
- 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);
- collusion or concealment including:
 - ...concealing inappropriate actions.

In respect of collusion or concealment, the panel noted that Pupil A had stated that Ms Blackmore had asked if they had told anyone about their group, as she could get in trouble if they did.

Even though 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 Ms Blackmore’s actions were not deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Ms Blackmore was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation.

There was no evidence that Ms Blackmore had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in her personal and professional conduct or that she had contributed significantly to the education sector.

Ms Blackmore did not provide any statements attesting to her character or her abilities as a teacher.

As referred to above, the panel noted Person A referred to Ms Blackmore as a “really good teacher”.

The panel noted that Ms Blackmore admitted the conduct alleged during the School’s investigation. She also admitted the conduct alleged in these TRA proceedings, and agreed that this matter could be dealt with at a professional conduct panel meeting, saving the time and cost of a hearing being convened. Ms Blackmore also provided written representations for the panel to consider, so engaged with these proceedings.

Ms Blackmore has demonstrated insight into her actions. She stated that she is aware that she had “blurred lines of what classes as professional within the classroom and keeping the student and teacher rapport appropriate within the school setting”. She has

recognised that she spoke with the wrong people [REDACTED]. She referred to being fully aware of where she went wrong, who she should have “opened up to” and the support she should have asked for. She stated that she is now in a much better position and fully understands how unprofessional her actions were. She has stated that she has “[REDACTED]” now that she can talk to, albeit did not provide any independent evidence of this.

Ms Blackmore confirmed that she has removed the Instagram account completely, and changed her own personal account name to ensure students are unable to find her.

Ms Blackmore has shown remorse and an insight as to the impact her actions may have had on the pupils saying “I apologise for my actions, to all involved, and I really do hope the students that were involved are in a good place, mentally and emotionally, and I haven’t caused issues which could affect them in a deeper way.”

The panel noted that there was no evidence in this case of the pupils having been harmed by Ms Blackmore’s 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, 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 Ms Blackmore of prohibition.

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Ms Blackmore given the seriousness of the breach of professional boundaries that occurred over a period of time. 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.

None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel’s findings.

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.

There was no evidence of any harm having been caused to pupils in this case. Given the extent to which the teacher has shown insight into her actions, the panel considered that there was little risk of repetition, and that the minimum review period of two years was appropriate in this case.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a review period after two years.

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 Ms Natasha Blackmore should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of two years.

In particular, the panel has found that Ms Blackmore 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 was satisfied that the conduct of Ms Blackmore, involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE).

The panel finds that the conduct of Ms Blackmore fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding of inappropriate contact with children outside of school, as well as a reliance placed on pupils for her own emotional support.

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 Ms Blackmore, 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 safeguard pupils. The panel has observed in relation to Ms Blackmore's proven conduct, *"The panel considered that it may have led to the pupils being exposed to or influenced by the behaviour in a harmful way given that they felt a sense of responsibility towards her"*. 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, *"Ms Blackmore has demonstrated insight into her actions. She stated that she is aware that she had "blurred lines of what classes as professional within the classroom and keeping the student and teacher rapport appropriate within the school setting". She has recognised that she spoke with the wrong people [REDACTED]. She referred to being fully aware of where she went wrong, who she should have "opened up to" and the support she should have asked for. She stated that she is now in a much better position and fully understands how unprofessional her actions were. She has*

stated that she has “[REDACTED]” now that she can talk to, albeit did not provide any independent evidence of this”.

The panel has also commented that *“Ms Blackmore has shown remorse and an insight as to the impact her actions may have had on the pupils”.*

I have therefore given this element 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 Ms Blackmore were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession”.* I am particularly mindful of the finding of arranging to meet pupils outside of the school setting 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 Ms Blackmore herself. The panel comment *“There was no evidence that Ms Blackmore had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in her personal and professional conduct or that she had contributed significantly to the education sector.*

Ms Blackmore did not provide any statements attesting to her character or her abilities as a teacher”.

However, the panel *“...noted Person A referred to Ms Blackmore as a “really good teacher””.*

A prohibition order would prevent Ms Blackmore from teaching. A prohibition order would also clearly deprive the public of her contribution to the profession for the period that it is in force.

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments *“The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Ms Blackmore given the seriousness of the breach of professional boundaries that occurred over a*

period of time". The panel has said that a prohibition was "...both proportionate and appropriate".

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Ms Blackmore has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession.

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended a two-year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments "*There was no evidence of any harm having been caused to pupils in this case. Given the extent to which the teacher has shown insight into her actions, the panel considered that there was little risk of repetition.*" The panel has also said that a two-year review period would be proportionate in this case.

I have considered whether a two-year review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that a two-year review period is sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the seriousness of the proven conduct, and the level of insight and remorse Ms Blackmore has demonstrated.

I consider therefore that a two-year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

This means that Ms Natasha Blackmore is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. She may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 2 April 2028, two years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If she does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Ms Blackmore remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

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



Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield

Date: 27 March 2026

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