



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Jodi Swan: 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	4
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	13

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

**Teacher:** Mr Jodi Swan

**Teacher ref number:** 007072

**Teacher date of birth:** 7 December 1975

**TRA reference:** 19648

**Date of determination:** 27 March 2026

**Former employer:** Oakbank School, Reading

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 27 March 2026 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Jodi Swan.

The panel members were Mrs Shabana Robertson (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Bernie Whittle (teacher panellist) and Dr Andrew Harries (lay 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 Mr Swan that the allegation be considered without a hearing. Mr Swan 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, Mr Callum Heywood of Browne Jacobson LLP, or Mr Swan.

The meeting took place in private and was not recorded.

## **Allegations**

The panel considered the allegation set out in the notice of meeting dated 18 December 2025.

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

1. On 25 October 2024 he was convicted at Staines Magistrates Court of the following offences:
  - a. One or more counts of engaging in sexual communication with a child contrary to the Sexual Offences Act 2003 section 15A between 1 July 2014 to 15 August 2014.
  - b. One or more counts of engaging in sexual activity with a girl 13 – 17 – adult abuse of position of trust – contrary to the Sexual Offences Act 2003 section 16(1)(e) between 27 January 2014 to 17 July 2014.

Mr Swan admitted the allegations and that he had been convicted of a relevant offence.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section 1: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 4 to 10

Section 2: Notice of referral – pages 11 to 17

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 19 to 149

In addition, the panel was provided with the notice of meeting.

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 Mr Swan on 6 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 Mr Swan for the allegation 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 Swan was employed as an assistant headteacher at Oakbank School ("Oakbank") from 18 April 2017.

Disclosures were made to the police by a former pupil of another school ([REDACTED]) at which Mr Swan was previously employed. Following Oakbank having been made aware of this by the LADO, Mr Swan was suspended on 9 November 2020.

Mr Swan was arrested on 12 November 2020.

Mr Swan was dismissed from Oakbank on 19 November 2020.

## 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 25 October 2024 you were convicted at Staines Magistrates Court of the following offences:**
  - a. One or more counts of engaging in sexual communication with a child contrary to the Sexual Offences Act 2003 section 15A between 1 July 2014 to 15 August 2014.**
  - b. One or more counts of engaging in sexual activity with a girl 13 – 17 – adult abuse of position of trust – contrary to the Sexual Offences Act 2003 section 16(1)(e)(i) between 27 January 2014 to 17 July 2014.**

In the statement of agreed facts Mr Swan accepted that, on 25 October 2024, he was convicted of one count of sexual communication with a child contrary to the Sexual Offence Act section 15A. He admitted that the circumstances of the offence were that between 1 July 2014 and 15 July 2014, he sent one or more emails to a person under 16 containing sexually explicit conversation and detailing penetrative sexual activity.

He also accepted that, on the same date, he was convicted of the offence of sexual activity with a girl 13 to 17 – adult abuse of position of trust – contrary to the Sexual Offences Act 2003 section 16(1)(e)(i). He admitted that the circumstances of the offence were that Mr Swan had, between 27 January 2014 and 17 July 2014, engaged in intentional sexual touching of a person aged 15.

The statement of agreed facts stated that Mr Swan pleaded guilty to both offences at the first hearing in the magistrates' court and was sentenced to 6 months' imprisonment suspended for two years.

It was confirmed that Mr Swan admitted allegation 1 in its entirety.

The panel was provided with the certificate of conviction which confirmed that Mr Swan had been convicted on 25 October 2024 of the offences of "Engage in sexual communication with a child" and "Sexual activity with a girl 13 to 17 – not s21 premises – adult abuse of position of trust". It also confirmed the dates over which the offences were committed which corresponded with the dates set out in allegation 1a and 1b.

The certificate of conviction confirmed that Mr Swan received a sentence of 6 months' imprisonment suspended for 2 years, he was also ordered to undertake a rehabilitation activity requirement, an unpaid work requirement, a notification requirement to register with the police and a sexual harm prevention order was made until 5 January 2030.

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

The panel was also provided with a print of the national police database which confirmed the convictions as set out in the allegations, including references to the relevant provisions of the Sexual Offences Act.

The panel was provided with the police's MG5 report. This stated that on 8 November 2020, a female contacted the police to say that she had been sexually assaulted by a teacher when she attended [REDACTED]. She named the teacher as Mr Swan and stated that he no longer worked at [REDACTED] but was working at a different school. She reported that Mr Swan had manipulated her into a sexual relationship.

The panel was provided with a statement prepared by [REDACTED] which confirmed that on 10 November 2020 after Mr Swan had been suspended, Mr Swan had called [REDACTED] to say that there had been an incident in which he had had "sexual relations with a student" whilst teaching at [REDACTED] and that he anticipated that was the case that the police were investigating.

The police summary reported that Mr Swan had been legally represented at his police interview and that he provided a prepared statement. In that statement, he admitted to

kissing and sexual touching, but he denied intentionally grooming the student. He then answered “no comment” to all questions.

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

Having found the allegation proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to convictions of relevant offences.

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

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

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Swan 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... the rule of law...
- 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.

Mr Swan breached his obligation to safeguard children. He failed to protect the welfare of the pupil.

The panel noted that the individual’s actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting. The convictions related to sexual offences against a child who was a pupil in the school in which Mr Swan was employed. It clearly indicates a risk to working with children and working in an education setting.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offences impacted on the safety and security of a pupil.

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

The panel noted that Mr Swan's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, (albeit that it was suspended), which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed.

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

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

The panel took into account that there was some evidence of Mr Swans abilities as a teacher at Oakbank. Nevertheless, the panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Swan'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.

The panel found that the convictions were of relevant offences.

## **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 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 sexual activity and engaging in sexual communications with a pupil.

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

Whilst there was some evidence that Mr Swan had abilities as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Swan in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and he exploited his 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 Mr Swan.

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;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- an abuse of any trust, knowledge, or influence gained through their professional position in order to advance a romantic or sexual relationship with a pupil or former pupil;

- sexual misconduct, e.g. involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature and/or that use or exploit the trust, knowledge or influence derived from the individual's professional position;
- failure 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);
- violation of the rights of pupils;
- actions or behaviours that ... undermine fundamental British values of..., the rule of law...
- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour; and
- collusion or concealment including:
  - ... concealing inappropriate actions;
  - lying to prevent the identification of wrongdoing.

The panel noted that a reference was provided for Mr Swan in 2018 from [REDACTED] for the purpose of previous professional conduct panel proceedings against Mr Swan. This referred to him having fully disclosed at the time of his application to Oakbank (in 2017) that he had been dismissed from a previous school as a result of having become involved in a personal relationship with a sixth form student and that he had driven a student in his car without correct insurance or a valid licence. It was apparent that Mr Swan, at that time, also referred to a "pending disciplinary process" that was being undertaken.

The panel was provided with Mr Swan's statement for those professional conduct panel proceedings and noted that it referred to events leading to his dismissal from a previous school, "St Paul's", in March 2008. Therefore, the matters that were disclosed when Mr Swan applied to Oakbank were not the same as those that led to his convictions in 2014. In applying to the School, Mr Swan concealed his inappropriate actions that he had also engaged in sexual activity with a pupil and sexual communications with a child in 2014.

Furthermore, in a statement for the School's disciplinary proceedings, [REDACTED] described having met with Mr Swan in June 2019 as the promotion of Mr Swan to the senior leadership team ("SLT") was under consideration. [REDACTED] stated that he wanted to assure himself that everything was in the open, and that there would be "no more surprises" if he were to appoint Mr Swan to the SLT. [REDACTED] stated that they had discussed how important it was to be open and that they needed to have an honest relationship. [REDACTED] stated that Mr Swan had told him "there were no other issues" despite knowing that he had engaged in sexual activity with another pupil in 2014. The panel considered that Mr Swan had lied to prevent the identification of wrongdoing.

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

There was evidence that Mr Swan's actions were deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Swan was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation. In Mr Swan's statement to the police in November 2020, he stated that he [REDACTED] and that he thought he had some difficulty in assessing appropriate behaviour. He referred [REDACTED] which he described as being "behind what happened maybe". He stated that he had been [REDACTED], although the panel had no independent evidence regarding why he behaved as he did, or regarding any steps he has taken to address his behaviours. The panel noted that at the time of Mr Swan's misconduct that led to his dismissal from St Paul's in 2008, he referred to having [REDACTED]. There was no indication that Mr Swan was affected by this when he engaged in the sexual offences in 2014 for which he was convicted.

Mr Swan did not demonstrate exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel did not accept that the incident was out of character.

The panel noted that [REDACTED] provided testimonial evidence for the previous professional misconduct proceedings in 2018 that stated that Mr Swan had been a model practitioner whilst at the School in all aspects of his actions and behaviours. It was stated that his teaching had always been judged to be good or outstanding and that he had been instrumental in supporting the development of the school at a strategic leadership level. It stated that Mr Swan had not, to [REDACTED]'s knowledge, repeated his behaviours at [REDACTED] and at Oakbank he had been transparent and honest about his mistakes and his regret for them. The panel placed no weight upon this statement given that the principal had not been made aware by Mr Swan that he had engaged in sexual activity with a pupil whilst he worked at [REDACTED].

As referred to above, the panel saw evidence that showed that Mr Swan was previously subject to regulatory proceedings in 2018. Unacceptable professional conduct was found arising from a relationship with a sixth form student and driving a student without any insurance and a licence. The panel noted that there was reference in the bundle to Mr Swan not having been prohibited on that occasion.

In Mr Swan's statement for those proceedings, he referred to having denied on two occasions any form of relationship with a student whilst he was at St Paul's, having been asked about it. He stated at the time that he had "compounded his mistakes, showing a blatant disregard for the processes put in place to safeguard both the students and staff

at St Paul's". The panel noted that, at the time of writing this statement on 15 March 2018, he had also engaged in 2014 in the sexual offences for which he was later convicted in 2024. He referred in his 2018 statement to the events whilst he was at St Paul's School as being over a decade ago, and that it no longer reflected the professional or person that he was. This was despite him being aware that he had engaged in sexual activity with a pupil as recently as 2014.

The panel noted that when Mr Swan provided a prepared statement to the police he stated that he had engaged in "irreprehensible behaviour", and that he was "ashamed of his actions". Nevertheless, the panel considered that Mr Swan had not demonstrated insight. Mr Swan made no reference to the impact on the pupil and instead referred to "If I thought for a moment that she was not enjoying what we did together I would not have ended up doing it at all." Given his repeated behaviours of breaching professional boundaries, his concealment of inappropriate actions and his apparent failure to learn from his mistakes, the panel was very concerned about the risk of repetition.

The panel noted that Mr Swan did admit the 2014 conduct to Oakbank and the police, having been confronted with the allegations. He pleaded guilty in the criminal proceedings. He also admitted the allegations in the present TRA proceedings and agreed to the matter being determined at a professional conduct panel meeting, saving the time and resources of a hearing being convened.

The panel first considered whether it would be proportionate to conclude this case with no recommendation of prohibition, considering whether the publication of the findings made by the panel would be sufficient.

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings would be sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Swan of prohibition.

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Swan. The seriousness of the offences and the risk of repetition 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.

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 considered that the offences in this case were so serious that they warranted a prohibition order without provision for a review period. This was particularly the case given that Mr Swan had previously been found to have engaged in unacceptable professional conduct relating to a relationship with another pupil and there was a significant risk of repetition.

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 provision for a review period.

## **Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State**

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

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

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

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Swan 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... the rule of law...
- 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 *“Mr Swan breached his obligation to safeguard children. He failed to protect the welfare of the pupil”*.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of a conviction of engaging in sexual activity with a 15-year-old pupil.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself, whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of 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 Swan, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children. The panel has observed, *“The convictions related to sexual offences against a child who was a pupil in the school in which Mr Swan was employed. It clearly indicates a risk to working with children and working in an education setting”*. 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 noted that when Mr Swan provided a prepared statement to the police he stated that he had engaged in “irreprehensible behaviour”, and that he was “ashamed of his actions”. Nevertheless, the panel considered that Mr Swan*

*had not demonstrated insight. Mr Swan made no reference to the impact on the pupil and instead referred to "If I thought for a moment that she was not enjoying what we did together I would not have ended up doing it at all."*

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, "*...the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Swan were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession*". I am particularly mindful of the finding of a conviction of sexual 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 Swan himself. The panel comment that whilst there is some evidence of his ability as an educator, "*Mr Swan did not demonstrate exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel did not accept that the incident was out of character*".

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel's comments concerning the lack of insight or remorse. The panel has said, "*Given his repeated behaviours of breaching professional boundaries, his concealment of inappropriate actions and his apparent failure to learn from his mistakes, the panel was very concerned about the risk of repetition*".

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Swan 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 that no provision should be made for a review period.

I have considered the panel's comments *"The panel considered that the offences in this case were so serious that they warranted a prohibition order without provision for a review period. This was particularly the case given that Mr Swan had previously been found to have engaged in unacceptable professional conduct relating to a relationship with another pupil and there was a significant risk of repetition"*.

I have considered whether allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate response to the misconduct found in this case, and 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 seriousness of the conduct.

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



**Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield**

**Date: 30 March 2026**

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