



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Michael Pierce: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome**

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

**April 2026**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	10
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:** Mr Michael Pierce

**Teacher ref number:** 1840254

**Teacher date of birth:** 13 September 1991

**TRA reference:** 20706

**Date of determination:** 2 April 2026

**Former employer:** The Featherstone Academy, Pontefract

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 2 April 2026 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Michael Pierce.

The panel members were Mr Carl Lygo (lay panellist – in the chair), Ms Antonia Jackson (teacher panellist) and Mrs Lucy Conley (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 Mr Pierce that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Pierce 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 David Drew of Browne Jacobson LLP, or Mr Pierce.

The meeting took place in private.

## **Allegations**

The panel considered the allegation set out in the notice of meeting dated 8 January 2026.

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

1. On 3 May 2024, he was convicted at Leeds Crown Court of the offences of:
  - a. 1 count of Distribute and indecent photograph/pseudo-photograph of a child;
  - b. 1 count of Offender 18 or over cause a child under 13 to watch/look at an image of sexual activity;
  - c. 2 counts of Cause/Incite a girl under 13 to engage in sexual activity – no penetration.

Mr Pierce admitted the allegations and that he is guilty of having 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: Chronology – page 4

Section 2: Notice of referral, response and notice of meeting – pages 5 to 26

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 27 to 38

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 40 to 73

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 74 to 79

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 Pierce on 21 June 2025 as well as an amended statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Pierce on 1 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 Pierce 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 Pierce was employed as a teacher of mathematics and PE at The Featherstone Academy ("the School") from 1 September 2019. On or around 26 August 2021, a police investigation commenced into serious child protection allegations against Mr Pierce regarding sexual communication with a child. Mr Pierce was employed by the School until his resignation on 16 March 2022.

## 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 3 May 2024, you were convicted at Leeds Crown Court of the offences of:**
  - a. 1 count of Distribute and indecent photograph/pseudo-photograph of a child;**
  - b. 1 count of Offender 18 or over cause a child under 13 to watch/look at an image of sexual activity;**
  - c. 2 counts of Cause/Incite a girl under 13 to engage in sexual activity – no penetration.**

In the amended statement of agreed facts, Mr Pierce admitted that, on 3 May 2024, he was convicted at Leeds Crown Court of the offences as set out in the allegation.

He accepted that he was sentenced to imprisonment for a total of six years, that he was ordered to pay a court surcharge of £190 and that he was made the subject of a sexual harm prevention order.

The panel was provided with the certificate of conviction and accepted it as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily applied by the conviction. The certificate confirmed that Mr Pierce had been convicted on 3 May 2024 at Leeds Crown Court of the offences as set out in the allegation and that he was sentenced on 27 June 2024 as accepted by Mr Pierce in the statement of agreed facts.

The panel was provided with the sentencing remarks. The panel noted that the first victim (Pupil A) [REDACTED]. Those offences began when he made contact with her via Snapchat, having specifically searched out her profile.

Mr Pierce made contact under a pseudonym and lied about his age, saying that he was 16 years of age. He engaged in what the Judge described as “classic grooming behaviour to gain her trust” and sent her photographs which purported to be of him but who were, in fact, images of young boys aged 16 or 17. The victim started to express doubts as to whether he was the person in the images, and he became angry. He added some of her friends onto Snapchat, and one of her friends blocked him because she suspected that he was older.

Mr Pierce continued to contact Pupil A and progressed to asking for intimate pictures. Pupil A was concerned regarding showing her body and about the images being leaked. Mr Pierce first requested photographs of her legs which she sent to him, then her bare legs, which she sent after some hesitation. He then asked for photographs of her bottom. Pupil A did not want to do this, and he encouraged her to send them with her clothes on. Again, she repeated that she did not want to. Mr Pierce became angry and threatened to block her and tell her friends that she had been sending things that she had not and that he and Pupil A had had sexual activity.

One of the offences referred to in allegation 1c related to an occasion one night when Pupil A said that she would send an image but told him that she was crying. Mr Pierce said that there was no need to cry because he would not send the image to anyone else, and she sent a photograph of herself naked from the waist up to her neck. Mr Pierce commented that she was beautiful.

Mr Pierce then sent her a photograph of his erect penis with his face obscured by an emoji. This was the offence referred to in allegation 1b.

The following morning, Mr Pierce asked for more photographs of Pupil A's bottom. She stated that she did not want to do this and again he made threats to block her and tell her friends, saying that he had retained copies of the images she had previously sent, and sent her a video which showed the photograph Pupil A had sent of her legs. At that point,

Pupil A said that she was going to block and unfriend Mr Pierce and he told her that she had to send further images or he was going to send those pictures out. Pupil A sent a photograph of her bottom, wearing knickers.

At the time of this conversation, Pupil A was at her [REDACTED] and was crying. She told her [REDACTED] what was happening and Pupil A deleted her Snapchat account. A few days later she created another with a different name. Mr Pierce found her again and requested to be friends using an account with a different pseudonym. Pupil A thought this person was the brother of someone in school with that surname. That reassured her and she accepted his friend request. Soon after, Mr Pierce sent her a message saying that he had found her, and that she should not block him or delete her account. Pupil A responded that what he was doing was illegal, that she had [REDACTED] about him sending images to her friends. His response stated "Listen to what I'm saying carefully, I won't say anything if you keep me on here, but block me again and I will. I was fucking fuming..."

Pupil A responded that she would do nothing for him. He responded that he would send her a video of him deleting the images and that they could carry on where they had left off. She replied that [REDACTED] and that she had lied about her age and was, in fact, [REDACTED]. This was a fact known to Mr Pierce, him having sought out Pupil A in the first instance.

Mr Pierce then moved to Pupil A's friend, Pupil B and sent her the photograph of Pupil A where she was naked from neck to waist and told Pupil B to tell Pupil A that if she did not unblock him, he would send that photograph to more of her friends. This was the offence referred to in allegation 1a.

Still using the second pseudonym, Mr Pierce then repeatedly asked Pupil B to send photographs of herself naked. She refused, informed Pupil A and blocked the account.

Mr Pierce then contacted Pupil B using the first pseudonym and told her that he was in year 10. He asked for nude photographs of Pupil B and, when she refused, he called her "frigid", "a fucking psycho" and a "weird freak". This was the other offence referred to in allegation 1c. Pupil B threatened Mr Pierce with her [REDACTED] and called Mr Pierce a paedophile.

The matters came to light as a result of Pupil B telling her [REDACTED], and Pupil B's [REDACTED] contacting the police. Mr Pierce was tracked down through the IP addresses associated with his Snapchat accounts. When interviewed under caution he denied the offences.

The Judge concluded from Pupil A's victim personal statement that she had [REDACTED].

The panel found this allegation proven in its entirety.

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

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

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

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Pierce was in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
  - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
  - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
  - not undermining fundamental British values, including ... the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect...
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, 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.

Mr Pierce failed in his duty pursuant to Keeping Children Safe in Education ("KCSIE") to safeguard and promote the welfare of children.

The panel noted that Mr Pierce's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting given that he had searched for a pupil he had taught, and then groomed Pupil A via social media to engage in sexual activity, and sought to elicit further indecent photographs from her by threatening her.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence had an impact on the safety and/or security of Pupil A.

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

The panel noted that Mr Pierce's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, 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; revenge pornography (sharing private, sexual materials, either photos or videos, of another person without their consent); sexual communication with a child; and any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or pseudo photograph or image of a child, or permitting any such activity, including one-off incidents; controlling or coercive behaviour; harassment and/or stalking, which the Advice states are likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel considered this to be an extremely serious offence given the severity of the harm caused to Pupil A. It was a gross abuse of trust, given his position as her teacher. He used his knowledge of her age, her appearance and her character to target her online for his own sexual gratification. He recorded, retained, solicited and shared sexual images of Pupil A (including sharing them with her friend) with a view to coercing Pupil A to act in a way that served his own interests. He pursued her and engaged in harassing behaviour by going to the extent of using a different account with a different pseudonym to contact her after she had blocked him. There was a further abuse of trust in respect of his contact with Pupil B, whose [REDACTED] had also entrusted him to behave appropriately towards her. He sent Pupil B indecent photographs of Pupil A in revenge for Pupil A blocking him.

The panel took into account that Mr Pierce had no previous convictions, and that the sentencing remarks refer to having received references as to Mr Pierce's positive good character. The panel noted that a document stated to have been written on behalf of Mr Pierce refers to him being only able to "offer some reasoning of [REDACTED]." The document continues "As [sic] the time he had [REDACTED] and all this during the Covid restrictions. Whilst no excuse he was [REDACTED]". No supporting evidence has been provided regarding any health condition Mr Pierce was suffering at the time.

In this case, the panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Pierce's ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding that this conviction was for relevant offences was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

The panel found Mr Pierce 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 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 that Mr Pierce abused his position of trust to commit serious sexual offences against two children in this case.

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

In addition to the public interest considerations set out above, the panel went on to consider whether there was a public interest in retaining Mr Pierce in the profession. The panel had no evidence of Mr Pierce's ability as an educator, but in any event, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Pierce 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 Pierce.

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;
- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing, or publishing any indecent photograph or image, or indecent pseudo photograph or image, of a child, or permitting such activity, including one-off incidents;
- failure to act on evidence that indicated a child's welfare may have been at risk e.g. failed to notify the designated safeguarding lead and/or make a referral to children's social care, the police or other relevant agencies when abuse, neglect and/or harmful cultural practices were identified;
- failure in their duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk or failing to promote the safety and welfare of the children (as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE);
- violation of the rights of pupils;
- sustained or serious bullying (including cyberbullying), or other deliberate behaviour that undermines pupils, the profession, the school or colleagues;
- actions or behaviours that ... undermine fundamental British values of ... the rule of law, individual liberty, and mutual respect ...;

- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour;
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions or purposeful destruction of evidence, especially where these behaviours have been repeated or had serious consequences, or involved the coercion of another person to act in a way contrary to their own interests;
- collusion or concealment including:
  - ...
  - ...concealing inappropriate actions;
  - encouraging others to break rules;
  - lying to prevent the identification of wrongdoing.

The panel considered that Mr Pierce had acted dishonestly, and that his behaviour lacked integrity. He used pseudonyms in his communications and he coerced Pupil A to act in a way contrary to her own interests. He sought to conceal his inappropriate actions and lied to prevent the identification of wrongdoing by concealing his identity. He sought to encourage Pupil A to break the rules by relatedly asking her to send indecent images of herself.

The panel noted that it should attach appropriate weight and seriousness to online behaviours including, but not limited to: online misconduct, facilitating online abuse; or facilitating inappropriate relationships. The panel considered that the online conduct in this case was particularly serious given the considerable impact on Pupil A.

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

There was no evidence Mr Pierce's actions were not deliberate. He acted in a calculated manner motivated for his own sexual gratification.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Pierce was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation. The document presented on behalf of Mr Pierce refers to him having been [REDACTED] during the covid restrictions, but no independent evidence has been provided regarding this.

Mr Pierce did not demonstrate exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he contributed significantly to the education sector.

There was no evidence that Mr Pierce was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings or warnings, although the referral to the TRA referred to him having been previously subject to an informal management instruction in May 2021.

Mr Pierce did not provide any references for these professional conduct proceedings attesting to either his character or his abilities as a teacher. The panel noted that the sentencing remarks refer to having received references as to Mr Pierce's positive good character, but these were not provided for the purpose of the present proceedings.

The panel noted that Mr Pierce denied the offences when interviewed under caution but pleaded guilty in the criminal proceedings. In terms of insight, the document written on behalf of Mr Pierce states that "whilst we fully understand the trauma the victim and the family have suffered, we do not feel a public hearing will help them further". It was unclear whether this was a sentiment being expressed by Mr Pierce personally.

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 Pierce 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 Pierce as a result of the seriousness of the offences he committed against children. 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;

- any sexual misconduct involving a child; and
- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or indecent pseudo photograph or image of a child, including one off incidents.

All of these were relevant in this case.

There was no evidence before the panel that the risk of repetition was low. The panel noted that a sexual harm prevention order was placed upon him.

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 relevant convictions.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Pierce is in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
  - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
  - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others

- not undermining fundamental British values, including ... the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect...
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, 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 Mr Pierce, involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE).

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding “...*that Mr Pierce’s behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment...*”.

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 Pierce, 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, “...*that Mr Pierce’s actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting given that he had searched for a pupil he had taught, and then groomed Pupil A via social media to engage in sexual activity, and sought to elicit further indecent photographs from her by threatening her.*”

*The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence had an impact on the safety and/or security of Pupil A.”*

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, “*There was no evidence Mr Pierce’s actions were not deliberate. He acted in a calculated manner motivated for his own sexual gratification.*”

The panel has also commented that “*The panel noted that Mr Pierce denied the offences when interviewed under caution but pleaded guilty in the criminal proceedings. In terms*

*of insight, the document written on behalf of Mr Pierce states that "whilst we fully understand the trauma the victim and the family have suffered, we do not feel a public hearing will help them further". It was unclear whether this was a sentiment being expressed by Mr Pierce personally."*

In my judgement, the lack of evidence 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 Mr Pierce were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.*" I am particularly mindful of the finding of that Mr Pierce acted dishonestly in this case, coercing Pupil A to act in a way contrary to her own interests.

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 Pierce himself. The panel comment "*Mr Pierce did not provide any references for these professional conduct proceedings attesting to either his character or his abilities as a teacher. The panel noted that the sentencing remarks refer to having received references as to Mr Pierce's positive good character, but these were not provided for the purpose of the present proceedings.*"

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Pierce 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. The panel has said, "*There was no evidence before the panel that the risk of repetition was low. The panel noted that a sexual harm prevention order was placed upon him.*"

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel 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.”*

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction, therefore, to the contribution that Mr Pierce 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 *“There was no evidence before the panel that the risk of repetition was low. The panel noted that a sexual harm prevention order was placed upon him.”*

The panel has also said that not allowing a review period would be proportionate and appropriate in all of the circumstances.

I have considered whether not allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is proportionate 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. This element is 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 Michael Pierce 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 Pierce 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 Pierce 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: 2 April 2026**

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