



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mrs Patricia Ekhuemelo 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	4
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence	7
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	8
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	14

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

Teacher: Mrs Patricia Ekhuemelo

Teacher ref number: 0942935

Teacher date of birth: 17 March 1973

TRA reference: 25095

Date of determination: 20 March 2026

Former employer: The Lambs (Christian) Tuition Centre, Birmingham

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mrs Patricia Ekhuemelo.

The panel members were Mr Terry Hyde (former teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Shabana Robertson (lay panellist) and Ms Amanda Godfrey (teacher panellist).

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

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Matilda Heselton of Browne Jacobson LLP solicitors.

Mrs Ekhuemelo was present and was represented by Mr Andrew Banks of Stone King LLP.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegation set out in the notice of hearing dated 15 December 2025.

It was alleged that Mrs Ekhuemelo was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:

1. On or around 26 September 2024, she was convicted at Birmingham Magistrates Court of the offence of Conducting an Unregistered Independent Educational Institution between 31/08/2023 and 22/02/2024 at The Lambs (Christan) Tuition Centre, contrary to Section 96(1) and (2) of The Education and Skills Act 2008.

The allegation was amended further to an application by the presenting officer to delete the words “contrary to Section 96(1) and (2) of The Education and Skills Act 2008”.

Mrs Ekhuemelo admitted the conviction and that she had been convicted of a relevant offence.

[REDACTED]

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Notice of hearing and response – pages 4 to 10

Section 2: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 11 to 89

Section 3: Teacher documents – pages 91 to 120

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the hearing. The panel was also provided with a small bundle of documents relating to a potential postponement application that was not pursued.

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

No witnesses were called by the presenting officer. Mrs Ekhuemelo did not give oral evidence.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

Mrs Ekhuemelo was the proprietor and principal of The Lambs Christian School ("the School") which was registered on 22 January 2003 as a mixed sex independent school for pupils aged between 3 to 11 years. The School was de-registered at Mrs Ekhuemelo's request on 28 April 2023.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

The panel found the following particulars of the allegation against you proved, for these reasons:

- 1. On or around 26 September 2024, you were convicted at Birmingham Magistrates Court of the offence of Conducting an Unregistered Independent Educational Institution between 31/08/2023 and 22/02/2024 at The Lambs (Christan) Tuition Centre.**

The panel was provided with the memorandum of conviction which confirmed that Mrs Ekhuemelo had been convicted of the offence set out in the allegation.

The panel accepted the memorandum of conviction as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction.

It was noted that Mrs Ekhuemelo pleaded guilty and was sentenced to a community order to carry out unpaid work for 60 hours, to pay a victim surcharge of £114 and to pay £200 costs of the Crown Prosecution Service.

The panel noted that it was provided with a witness statement of Individual A. This witness statement set out the background of matters leading to the conviction. This explained that Mrs Ekhuemelo was the proprietor of The Lambs Christian School which was registered on 22 January 2003 as a mixed sex independent school for pupils aged between 3 to 11 years. On 27 March 2023, Mrs Ekhuemelo wrote to the Department for Education to advise that the School would cease to exist at the end of Spring term 2023 due the financial pressures caused by the Covid 19 pandemic and requested advice on next steps. Her letter explained that she planned to keep the pre-school open, and to extend the registration to 0 to 5 year olds. Mrs Ekhuemelo did not receive a response to her letter. On 13 June 2023, Mrs Ekhuemelo wrote to the Department for Education to say that the service had changed to an Out-Of-School-Setting to serve the home-schooling community and requested support to ensure that it complied with their

expectations. She stated that they were opening for 17.5 hours per week so as not to “breach the 18-hour recommended limit”. Mrs Ekhuemelo had not received a response to her letter when Ofsted made contact on 26 June 2023. During that call, the School advised Ofsted that it “had closed”, and Ofsted decided that their inspection did not need to go ahead as correspondence had been received regarding the closure of the School, and that action was being taken to remove the School from the register. The Department for Education informed Mrs Ekhuemelo on 26 June 2023 that the School had been deleted from the register of independent schools, and that as she had indicated that the under 5’s provision would continue, she would need to apply for registration with the Ofsted Early Years team. The School had actually been removed from the register on 28 April 2023.

The Department for Education subsequently received an email from the School business manager on 27 June 2023 asking for the School’s registration to be re-opened for a two and a half week period to allow children and families to finish the term together on 12 July 2023, and that a further email asked that the School be placed back on the register until 28 July 2023. The senior Ofsted inspector subsequently sent an internal email within Ofsted stating, “Just for clarity, the headteacher told Ofsted yesterday that there were no children at the setting – we asked this question twice to be absolutely sure”. Mrs Ekhuemelo was informed by the Department for Education on 28 June 2023 that the School could not be added back onto the register of independent schools.

The referral to the TRA from the [REDACTED] of the Ofsted Unregistered Schools team stated that, on 15 January 2024, police attended the scene of a road traffic collision involving a white minibus. There were 14 primary school age children being carried as passengers in the minibus with the driver, who was not a teacher. Mrs Ekhuemelo attended the scene and told the police that the children attended the Lambs Tuition Centre, of which she was principal and that they attended 17.5 hours a week. The police reported the matter to the Department for Education, and consequently the Ofsted Unregistered Schools team. Mrs Ekhuemelo’s representative explained that the driver had called Mrs Ekhuemelo as she was known to him, but that the minibus was not driving on school business at the time. Instead, it was operating on behalf of a parent partnership.

The [REDACTED] referral to the TRA stated that it was established that following the closure of the registered independent school, and the conversion of the school building to The Lambs Christian Day Nursery, the Lambs Tuition Centre was established at Destiny International Christian Assembly.

On 21 February 2024, Ofsted Unregistered School Investigators conducted an inspection at the Destiny International Christian Assembly. 26 children were identified on the premises during the inspection, all engaged in learning a broad curriculum of subjects and wearing Lambs Christian School uniforms.

The referral stated that Mrs Ekhuemelo was interviewed under caution and in the presence of her legal adviser. She indicated that following the closure of the registered independent school, she had come under pressure from parents to continue education provision for the school community and had established the Lambs Tuition Centre to deliver what she described as part-time education to the children with a partnership organisation being established by a group of parents to organise and deliver the remaining education. Investigators considered that the Lambs Tuition Centre was, in fact, delivering all or substantially all of the education to 26 children. A file of evidence was prepared and submitted to the Crown Prosecution Service.

The panel found the allegation proven.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

Having found the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of the proved allegation amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

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

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mrs Ekhuemelo 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
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including..., the rule of law...
- 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 Mrs Ekhuemelo's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting because her conviction related to operating an unregulated education institution. The panel considered that this raised issues around the safeguarding of pupils and the promotion of their best interests, as well as compliance with the rules, regulations and processes of the teaching profession.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence risked having an impact on the safety and/or security of pupils, as it would not have been subject to the same inspection regime as if it had been registered.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mrs Ekhuemelo's behaviour in committing the offence could affect public confidence in the teaching profession.

The panel noted that the Advice states that an offence for which a sentence of imprisonment is imposed is likely to be considered “a relevant offence” and that no sentence of imprisonment was imposed in this case.

The Advice gives examples of what a relevant offence may be, but the offence in this case is not included in that list. However, the panel noted that the advice is not intended to be exhaustive and there may be offences other than those listed that panels consider to be “a relevant offence”. The panel was of the view that the offence raised serious safeguarding issues in respect of children being in an unregistered setting and therefore was a relevant offence.

The panel took into account that the School had received an outstanding Ofsted report in 2019, and that Mrs Ekhuemelo had produced glowing references from former pupils and parents that spoke of the quality of the School, the difference it had made to their lives and Mrs Ekhuemelo’s personal contribution. The panel also noted that Mrs Ekhuemelo had sought external advice regarding the provision of tuition at the School. However, the panel considered that this did not detract from the fact that the School had not been registered for some time when Ofsted inspectors visited on 21 February 2024.

The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mrs Ekhuemelo’s ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding that this conviction was for a relevant offence was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

The panel considered that Mrs Ekhuemelo had been convicted of 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, 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 maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of conducting an unregistered independent education institution. The panel noted that the School had been rated as outstanding by Ofsted in all areas in January 2019 and this included a finding that safeguarding was effective, that staff were highly vigilant and appropriately trained. It was found that pupils learnt how to keep themselves safe, and that they felt safe at school. Nevertheless, the panel had regard to the statement received from the [REDACTED] referred to above and understood that: "The regulatory regime is intended to ensure that all children are safeguarded from potential harm and receive a safe education. Independent schools are required to meet standards at all times. The standards include minimum requirements related to quality of education; spiritual, moral, social and cultural development; welfare, health and safety of pupils; suitability of staff, supply staff and proprietors, premises and accommodation; provision of information; manner in which complaints are handled; and quality of leadership and management. Registered schools are subject to regular inspections to check that all of the standards are met. This allows us to ensure that schools are providing a safe and suitable education." In the absence of the requisite registration, children were exposed to a safeguarding risk.

The panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mrs Ekhuemelo 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 Mrs Ekhuemelo 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 Mrs Ekhuemelo in the profession. Whilst there was evidence that Mrs Ekhuemelo had ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mrs Ekhuemelo in the profession, since her behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher. She failed to uphold the position of trust that parents placed in her to ensure that their children were being educated in a provision that complied with its legal obligations.

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 Mrs Ekhuemelo.

The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours of a teacher have been proved. In the list of such behaviours, those that were relevant in this case were:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of the Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk; and
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils).

The panel considered that a serious criminal offence had been committed, despite the sentence having been relatively light, given the context of a principal conducting an unregistered independent educational institution.

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors. Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

The panel considered that whilst there was no evidence that Mrs Ekhuemelo made a conscious deliberate decision to conduct an unregistered independent educational institution, the panel considered that there had been a fundamental lack of due diligence in ensuring that The Lambs (Christian) Tuition Centre was established correctly.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mrs Ekhuemelo was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation. Whilst there may have been pressure from parents to continue their children's education after the School was de-registered, as a principal, Mrs Ekhuemelo should not have bowed to that pressure, unless she was prepared to ensure the formalities of conducting an independent educational institution were complied with.

The panel accepted that Mrs Ekhuemelo had a previously good history as a teacher. There was no evidence that Mrs Ekhuemelo was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings or warnings. However, the panel was not presented with evidence to

demonstrate that Mrs Ekhuemelo exhibited exceptionally high standards in her personal and professional conduct or that she had contributed significantly to the education sector. However, the panel accepted that Mrs Ekhuemelo was well respected amongst parents and former pupils. The panel also accepted that she had been the principal of the School which had received an outstanding inspection report from Ofsted. Whilst there was evidence of Mrs Ekhuemelo's significant contribution to education within her local Christian community, the panel did not have evidence of a wider impact, and the panel was aware that there were a limited number of pupils attending the School.

The panel was provided with a copy of a letter written by a parent to Ofsted referring to the centre as an "excellent education centre". He referred to it providing academic excellence and nurturing the moral and spiritual development of its students. He stated that "For many black ethnic minority families like ours, Lambs Tuition Centre serves as a haven where our children can learn and grow in an environment that celebrates and affirms their identities".

Another parent provided a reference stating that the Lambs Christian School had been "truly transformative" for her daughter. It referred to the blend of Christian and academic principals having laid the groundwork for her daughter becoming a well-rounded individual. She stated that Mrs Ekhuemelo showed immense passion for her students and their community. She stated that her commitment to creating a supporting and enriching educational experience had made a profound difference in the lives of many students. She stated that Mrs Ekhuemelo's efforts to engage with parents and her active involvement in the community had built a strong, supportive network that extended beyond the School's walls. She referred to Mrs Ekhuemelo's unwavering dedication. This referee also referred to Mrs Ekhuemelo being a compassionate counsellor, and a strong leader who tirelessly advocated for both children and adults.

A former pupil who had known Mrs Ekhuemelo for 20 years, stated that they were taught a wealth of knowledge by Mrs Ekhuemelo. They stated that it was "extremely rare and maybe even impossible to match the teaching standard set by the Lambs". They referred to vividly remembering the range and variation of resources, activities and learning materials they had access to, and that it stood out how different the learning style was. They referred to having had an "incredible primary school experience" that they could never forget and it having shaped their childhood memories in "such a positive way".

A parent of a former pupil and grandparent of another pupil referred to the well-rounded education their son had received, the impact upon him of the "exceptional teaching" and the "exceptional school trips". She referred to her son [REDACTED] but that she had witnessed significant changes and exponential growth in her son. This referee referred to Mrs Ekhuemelo as being an intelligent, highly self-motivated individual" with a strong sense of empathy, effective communication skills and pride in the community with Christian principles.

A friend of Mrs Ekhuemelo for over 36 years attested to her caring personality, and her special gift of empathy. She referred to Mrs Ekhuemelo being loved and celebrated by her church community. She also referred to Mrs Ekhuemelo being determined and hard-working, as well as her deep passion and love for the School which she supported with her time, energy and personal finances.

The panel was provided with a letter from a charitable association from which Mrs Ekhuemelo had sought advice regarding the operation of the Lambs (Christian) Tuition Centre and also a letter written by Mrs Ekhuemelo to the Department for Education on 3 August 2023 stating that the School had transitioned into an Out-Of-School-Setting to serve the home schooling community. The letter to the Department for Education stated that she requested support to ensure that they were in compliance with the Department for Education's expectations and stated that they were ensuring that the provision was staying within guidelines by ensuring that it was not operating for more than 18 hours a week. Representations were made on behalf of Mrs Ekhuemelo that although the advice she had received from the charitable association was wrong, she was entitled to rely upon it, and that she had been transparent with the Department for Education. However, the panel considered that there had been a lack of due diligence in Mrs Ekhuemelo's approach, and that she had obligations as the principal and proprietor of the Lambs (Christian) Tuition Centre to ensure that she obtained appropriate advice, which may have included discussing the matter with the local authority; and to follow up with the Department for Education after she received no response.

The panel did not consider that Mrs Ekhuemelo had demonstrated that she had reflected upon her lack of due diligence or what she would do differently in the future.

There was no evidence that Mrs Ekhuemelo had insight as to the implications of children having been educated in an unregistered setting.

The panel was told that Mrs Ekhuemelo received a warning from Ofsted after their inspection in February 2024. Mrs Ekhuemelo's representative referred to her having sought legal advice regarding that warning letter and following that advice, she decided to close the provision. Mrs Ekhuemelo's representative explained that was not the advice he would have given, but again made representations that Mrs Ekhuemelo was entitled to rely upon it. Nevertheless, it had been open to her to discuss the arrangements for the continuity of study with the local authority or the Department for Education. There was no indication that Mrs Ekhuemelo had reflected upon the impact on pupils and parents of abruptly closing the provision.

The panel noted that the Lambs (Christian) Tuition Centre operated for a period of over 5 months without being registered, which could not be categorised as an administrative hiccup. The panel was concerned that there was no evidence as to how the provision had been organised and delivered, and the information provided to the Department for Education was scant. The panel was concerned that Mrs Ekhuemelo had not

acknowledged that as the principal she had the responsibility to ensure that the provision was established and operated in line with legal requirements. There was no indication that Mrs Ekhuemelo had learned from this experience or what she would do differently in the future.

The panel noted that Mrs Ekhuemelo had pleaded guilty and had admitted the allegations. However, there was no evidence of any remorse. As a result of the lack of evidence of any insight, the panel was concerned at the risk of repetition.

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 Mrs Ekhuemelo 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 Mrs Ekhuemelo. The period of time over which The Lambs (Christian) Tuition Centre operated whilst it was unregistered, Mrs Ekhuemelo's position as proprietor and principal of the provision and her lack of insight 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.

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.

The panel noted that these lists are not intended to be exhaustive and panels should consider each case on their individual merits taking into account all the circumstances involved. In this case, the panel considered that, given the lack of insight, there was a risk of repetition. This was a serious matter given that it was Mrs Ekhuemelo's responsibility to ensure that the provision was established correctly and operating in accordance with legal requirements.

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 3 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 the allegation proven and found that those proven facts amount to a relevant conviction.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mrs Patricia Ekhuemelo should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of three years.

In particular, the panel has found that Mrs Ekhuemelo 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
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including..., the rule of law...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The findings of misconduct are serious as "...this raised issues around the safeguarding of pupils and the promotion of their best interests, as well as compliance with the rules, regulations and processes of the teaching profession."

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 Mrs Ekhuemelo, 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, "...that the behaviour involved in committing the offence risked having an impact on the safety and/or security of pupils, as it would not have been subject to the same inspection regime as if it had been registered." A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, "The panel did not consider that Mrs Ekhuemelo had demonstrated that she had reflected upon her lack of due diligence or what she would do differently in the future."

The panel has also commented that "There was no evidence that Mrs Ekhuemelo had insight as to the implications of children having been educated in an unregistered setting".

In my judgement, the lack of insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, "...that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mrs Ekhuemelo were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct 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 Mrs Ekhuemelo herself. The panel comment,

“The panel accepted that Mrs Ekhuemelo had a previously good history as a teacher. There was no evidence that Mrs Ekhuemelo was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings or warnings. However, the panel was not presented with evidence to demonstrate that Mrs Ekhuemelo exhibited exceptionally high standards in her personal and professional conduct or that she had contributed significantly to the education sector. However, the panel accepted that Mrs Ekhuemelo was well respected amongst parents and former pupils. The panel also accepted that she had been the principal of the School which had received an outstanding inspection report from Ofsted. Whilst there was evidence of Mrs Ekhuemelo’s significant contribution to education within her local Christian community, the panel did not have evidence of a wider impact, and the panel was aware that there were a limited number of pupils attending the School.”

I have also given weight to the panel’s summary of references provided on Mrs Ekhuemelo’s behalf.

A prohibition order would prevent Mrs Ekhuemelo 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 concerning the lack of insight or remorse. The panel has said, “The panel noted that Mrs Ekhuemelo had pleaded guilty and had admitted the allegations. However, there was no evidence of any remorse. As a result of the lack of evidence of any insight, the panel was concerned at the risk of repetition.”

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

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended a 3 year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments, "This was a serious matter given that it was Mrs Ekhuemelo's responsibility to ensure that the provision was established correctly and operating in accordance with legal requirements".

The panel also noted "...that Mrs Ekhuemelo had pleaded guilty and had admitted the allegations. However, there was no evidence of any remorse. As a result of the lack of evidence of any insight, the panel was concerned at the risk of repetition."

I have considered whether a 3 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 allowing a three-year review period is sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the seriousness of the conduct and the associated safeguarding risks in conducting an unregistered independent school, and the lack of insight and remorse.

I consider therefore that a 3 year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

This means that Mrs Patricia Ekhuemelo 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 02 April 2029, 3 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, Mrs Ekhuemelo remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mrs Ekhuemelo 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: 26 March 2026

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