



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Miss Alexandra Slay: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

April 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	6
Documents	6
Witnesses	7
Decision and reasons	7
Findings of fact	7
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	39
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	44

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

Teacher: Miss Alexandra Slay

Teacher ref number: 3847757

Teacher date of birth: 13 April 1992

TRA reference: 22940

Date of determination: 10 April 2026

Former employer: Epsom and Ewell High School, Epsom

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 8 to 10 April 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Miss Alexandra Slay.

The panel members were Mrs Shabana Robertson (lay panellist – in the chair), Mr Robert Dowey (teacher panellist) and Ms Amy Barron (lay panellist).

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

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Lee Bridges of Kingsley Napley LLP solicitors.

Miss Slay was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public save that portions of the hearing were heard in private and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Proceedings dated 21 January 2026.

It was alleged that Miss Slay was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that, whilst working as Teacher of Maths at Epsom and Ewell High School (“the School”):

1. Between 2019 and 2023, she gave her personal mobile number and/or personal email address to one or more pupil(s) in Schedule A.
2. Between 2019 and 2023, she:
 - a) sent inappropriate and/or over familiar text messages and/or emails and/or letters to one or more of the pupils in Schedule B; and/or
 - b) sent emails to one or more of the pupils in Schedule C within which she shared details of her personal life; and/or
 - c) sent emails to one or more of the pupils in Schedule D within which she shared details of other pupil(s) and/or School staff members; and/or
 - d) sent emails and/or text messages and/or letters to one or more pupils in Schedule E within which she fabricated stories about her being in a conflict and/or war zone and/or sustaining injuries
3. As a result of her conduct at paragraphs 1 and/or 2a and/or 2b and/or 2c and/or 2d, she developed inappropriate relationships with one or more pupil(s) and/or breached the boundaries of a teacher-pupil relationship with one or more pupil(s);
4. As a result of her conduct in paragraph 2d she caused and/or had the potential to cause stress and/or alarm to one or more pupil(s).
5. She did not report on CPOMs and/or to the Designated Safeguarding Lead (DSL) and/or to the deputy DSL, the safeguarding concerns referred to in Schedule F.

Schedule A

- i. Pupil A;
- ii. Pupil B;
- iii. Pupil C;
- iv. Pupil I;

- v. Pupil J.

Schedule B

- i. Pupil A;
- ii. Pupil B;
- iii. Pupil C;
- iv. Pupil D;
- v. Pupil E;
- vi. Pupil F;
- vii. Pupil G;
- viii. Pupil H;
- ix. Pupil I;
- x. Pupil J.

Schedule C

- i. Pupil A
- ii. Pupil B
- iii. Pupil F

Schedule D

- i. Pupil A
- ii. Pupil C
- iii. Pupil D
- iv. Pupil E
- v. Pupil H
- vi. Pupil I

Schedule E

- i. Pupil A

- ii. Pupil B
- iii. Pupil C

Schedule F

- i. Concerns regarding Pupil A's [REDACTED]
- ii. Concerns raised by Pupil B regarding [REDACTED]
- iii. Concerns regarding Pupil C's [REDACTED]
- iv. Concerns regarding Pupil H's [REDACTED]
- v. Concerns regarding Pupil I's [REDACTED]
- vi. Concerns regarding Pupil J's [REDACTED]

In the absence of a response from the teacher, the allegations were not admitted. There was also no admission of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology and list of key people – pages 7 to 8

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 9 to 13

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 17 to 37

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 38 to 1002

The panel also had sight of an anonymised list, which was provided separately to the hearing bundle, together with a timeline which was provided by the presenting officer (which cross-referenced to the relevant evidence in the bundle).

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

Witnesses

The panel heard oral evidence from the following witness called by the presenting officer:

1. Witness A, [REDACTED]

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 December 2016, Miss Slay commenced work as a Teacher of Mathematics at Epsom and Ewell High School (“the School”). On 26 May 2023, Miss Slay became Head of Year at the School.

On 16 August 2023, the Individual C met with the [REDACTED] of the School to raise concerns about communications between Miss Slay and Pupil A. A referral was made to the Local Authority Designated Officer (“the LADO”), and also to the police.

On 1 September 2023, an Investigating Officer was appointed by the School.

On 4 September 2023, a second referral was made to the LADO and the police.

On 8 September 2023, the School interviewed Pupil B, Pupil G and Pupil H as part of its investigation.

On 18 September 2023, the police informed the School that they would not be continuing their investigation.

On 3 October 2023, Miss Slay attended a disciplinary interview.

On 16 October 2023, the investigation report was finalised and submitted.

On 9 November 2023, Miss Slay resigned from the School.

On 16 November 2023, a disciplinary hearing took place.

On 19 December 2023, Miss Slay was referred to the TRA.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

1. Between 2019 and 2023, you gave your personal mobile number and/or personal email address to one or more pupil(s) in Schedule A.

The panel heard oral evidence from Witness A, who [REDACTED] at the time of the investigation, and who was appointed [REDACTED] by the School. The panel also had sight of Witness A's written witness statement to the TRA dated 21 November 2024. The panel found Witness A to be a credible witness as her testimony was consistent, and her evidence was supported by a large volume of contemporaneous documentary evidence within the bundle.

The panel heard how concerns first came to light when Individual C met with the [REDACTED] of the School on 16 August 2023, to raise concerns regarding Miss Slay's communications with Pupil A that she had found on Pupil A's mobile phone. Witness A explained that the concerns were that Miss Slay was communicating with Pupil A via a personal mobile phone. Witness A stated that Individual C provided photos that she had taken from Pupil A's phone, which were of text messages exchanged between Miss Slay and Pupil A. Witness A stated that Individual C appeared to be genuinely concerned for Miss Slay's welfare, as the messages indicated that Miss Slay had been injured whilst fighting in combat.

The panel had sight of the photos of the text messages on Pupil A's phone which were provided by Individual C to the School in the hearing bundle. These photos showed text messages that Pupil A had been exchanging with a contact named "[REDACTED] Slay". The panel also had sight of a photo taken of the contact information saved to Pupil A's phone for "[REDACTED] Slay", which revealed a mobile telephone number. Witness A confirmed that the mobile number that was used for the contact "[REDACTED] Slay" and in the accompanying text messages matched that of Miss Slay's mobile number, which was on her personal file.

The panel had sight of the investigation report prepared by Witness A, which was finalised and submitted on 16 October 2023. The investigation report stated that Miss Slay "admitted to sharing her mobile number with [Pupil A] in June."

The panel also had sight of the typed-up notes of Miss Slay's disciplinary interview at the School on 16 October 2023. The interview notes were not signed but Witness A confirmed that these were the notes taken from her interview with Miss Slay. The notes showed that, during her disciplinary interview, Miss Slay was asked: "The messages are on personal devices, from yours to [Pupil A]. Can you explain how this happened?". In response to this question, Miss Slay stated:

"It was just before Pupil A's exams had finished – [they] said [they] felt at a bit of a blocked road – [they] said 'you have been a big support. I'm worried I won't have that support anymore'. [REDACTED]. [They] had become dependent on my advice at school. It started during a [REDACTED] lesson. I was waiting in the corridor for

students to change – I just said hello to [them]. 2 days later [they] came into my classroom – [REDACTED]. [They] said [they were] having a bad day. Communication became more frequent. [REDACTED]. Fast forward – [they] then made these comments and so I gave my personal contact details – I waited till leavers day. We both used aliases”.

With regard to Pupil B, Witness A explained that as part of the School’s investigation, she also reviewed the emails on Miss Slay’s school email account. These messages revealed that Miss Slay had provided one or more pupils with her personal mobile phone number and had indicated that she had been communicating with these pupils via a personal mobile phone and/or using her personal email account. The panel had sight of these emails in the bundle.

The panel had sight of an email from Miss Slay’s school email account to Pupil B’s school email account dated 23 June 2023 at 14:43, which stated:

“I am actually going to do this – even though it is slightly different. I am going to give you my digits – you can get it from retriever. As I am getting tired of emailing...”

The panel had sight of a further email from Miss Slay’s school email account to Pupil B’s school email account dated 23 June 2023 at 17:56, which stated: “For your eyes only. But I think it’s better than email”. The panel noted that the email contained an attachment which was named “Image.jpeg”. The panel had sight of an image, which was a screenshot taken of a “notes” app, which stated: “Slay’s number”, with a mobile number. Witness A confirmed to the panel that this screenshot had been attached to Miss Slay’s email of 23 June 2023 at 17:56. The panel had sight of an additional email from Miss Slay’s school email account to Pupil B’s school email account dated 23 June 2023 at 18:12, which stated: “Give me yours but via the other method so I know. Because I usually block non identifiable”.

The investigation report stated that Miss Slay was shown the email exchange with Pupil B and asked if she provided Pupil B with her mobile phone number, and: “When asked about this [Miss Slay] initially stated this was not the case, but when shown the email with the attachment she admitted she had shared her own number ...”. The notes of Miss Slay’s disciplinary interview also stated that Miss Slay was asked “Are you encouraging [Pupil B] to use personal email?”, and Miss Slay responded “Yes.”.

As part of the School’s investigation, Witness A also interviewed Pupil B. The panel had sight of these interview notes dated 8 September 2023 in the hearing bundle. The notes were signed by the School’s [REDACTED] and Witness A as [REDACTED]. Pupil B was not present at the hearing to give oral evidence. The panel noted that the interview notes were hearsay evidence which had been produced by the presenting officer. The panel decided to admit the interview notes of Pupil B. In considering relevance, the panel noted

that they contained Pupil B's contemporaneous account which was directly relevant to the allegations. In considering fairness, the panel noted that it could test the evidence to some extent by way of questioning Witness A, who undertook the interview. The panel also noted that the notes of Pupil B's interview were not the sole and decisive evidence in this case, as the panel also had sight of the relevant contemporaneous messages pertaining to each of the allegations. The panel applied some weight to this evidence, given that the interview was conducted in the presence of two staff members which included Witness A. Witness A was also present at the hearing in order to confirm that the notes were a true and accurate record of the interview that took place. The panel still exercised caution, given that it could not test the evidence with Pupil B directly, and given that the panel had determined to proceed with the hearing in Miss Slay's absence.

The panel noted that, during Pupil B's interview at the School, Pupil B initially stated: "No, I never took Miss Slay's number and she didn't have mine. I don't really remember what was in the emails to be honest." However, the interview notes also stated: "Following the other student interviews, [Witness A] and [the [REDACTED]] decided that we felt [Pupil B] was withholding information and [Witness A] went back to ask [Pupil B] to come and chat again." Witness A explained to the panel that, prior to the interview, she had a strong professional relationship with Pupil B as she knew them and their [REDACTED] well. Witness A explained that prior to her interview Pupil B was usually "very friendly" and "cheery". However, upon interviewing Pupil B she could see that their behaviour had "really changed". In particular, Witness A stated that during the interview, Pupil B was "combative", "cold", "defensive of Miss Slay", and had instantly shut the discussion down.

Witness A stated that once the interview had ended, she thought it was "bizarre", but she also thought that Pupil B might have been worried that they would be in trouble at home as a result of the alleged events. As a result, Witness A stated that she decided to call Pupil B in for a further interview, to explain to Pupil B that she had seen the messages sent to them from Miss Slay, and to let Pupil B know that they were not in any trouble. Witness A stated that Pupil B then confirmed that Miss Slay did give them her mobile phone number. According to the interview notes, Pupil B then stated: "Ya Miss Slay did give me her number but I haven't messaged her and I haven't given her my number ...".

The panel also had sight of an email from Miss Slay's school email account to Pupil C's school email account dated 15 July 2022 at 18:55, which stated: "i have sent an email to your other email. Please read the file at 21:37 and for your eyes only ...". The notes of Miss Slay's disciplinary interview stated that Miss Slay was shown this email, and that "[Miss Slay] confirmed that she emailed on a personal email].".

During her disciplinary interview, Miss Slay was also asked: "Have/Who you contacted any of these students via personal email?". In response, Miss Slay stated: "[Pupil A] [Pupil B] [Pupil C] and [Pupil J] (only to wish happy birthday and organise a visit to [REDACTED]). No others.". Miss Slay was also asked: "Have/Who you contacted via

mobile number or social media platform?”. In response, Miss Slay stated: “By mobile – [Pupil A] and [Pupil B].”.

The panel noted that it did not have sight of any text messages between Miss Slay and Pupil B, nor did it have sight of any emails from Miss Slay’s personal email account. Witness A stated to the panel that as part of her investigation, she was only able to view the material that had been provided by Individual C and the emails on Miss Slay’s school email account. Notwithstanding this, the panel found that there was sufficient evidence to demonstrate that Miss Slay did provide her personal mobile phone number and/or personal email address to the pupils listed in Schedule A.

The panel had sight of the School’s Code of Conduct, which stated:

“8.2 Adults must not give their personal contact details such as home/mobile phone number; home or personal e-mail address or social networking details to pupils unless the need to do so is agreed in writing with senior management. If, for example, a pupil attempts to locate an adult’s personal contact details and attempts to contact or correspond with them, the adult should not respond and must report the matter to their Headteacher or line manager in the case of centrally employed staff (or in their absence, a member of the Trust’s core group).”

The panel also had sight of the School’s ICT Acceptable Use Policy, which stated:

“Staff should never contact pupils or parents from their personal mobile device or give their mobile device number to pupils or parents.

Staff should never send to, or accept from, colleagues or pupils, texts or images that could be viewed as inappropriate. No member of staff should ever use their personal device to photograph a pupil(s) or allow themselves to be photographed by a pupil. This guidance should be seen as a safeguard for members of staff and the school. Images for official school business, such as for use on a social media platform, must only be taken on a school-owned device, and must only be taken with the prior permission of the Headteacher and/or DSL. Each school should make such devices available for staff use and monitor their use.”

The panel found that Miss Slay’s conduct was in direct contravention of these policies.

The panel found this allegation proven.

2. Between 2019 and 2023, you:

- a) sent inappropriate and/or over familiar text messages and/or emails and/or letters to one or more of the pupils in Schedule B;**

The panel had sight of the photos of the text messages between Miss Slay and Pupil A, which were taken of Pupil A's phone and provided to the School by Individual C. The panel found that all of these messages were inappropriate and/or over familiar in nature. In particular, there was a text message dated 21 July at 8:37pm from Miss Slay, which stated: "... What is intimacy look or feel like to you? (Be careful with this one) ...". As part of this exchange, Miss Slay also sent a message which detailed her views on intimacy: "Intimacy for me goes beyond the physical impact (sure that is important), but to me emotional intimacy builds a relationship from strength to strength ...". Witness A explained that when she saw these messages she was very concerned, as this is "totally inappropriate" and not what she "would expect between a staff member and a child in any way". The panel found that discussing intimacy with a child was highly inappropriate.

The panel also had sight of text messages in which Miss Slay appeared to give Pupil A the nickname "[REDACTED]". In particular, there was a text message [REDACTED] which stated: "I promise I will be back ready to be your right foot again. I don't know when but soon. I vow to try my hardest to, after all you are my [REDACTED]...", and a message which stated: "My [REDACTED] ... Your heart and mine are somewhat similar".

When asked about these messages during her disciplinary interview, Miss Slay stated:

"That's the nickname she gave herself. She gave me a nickname.

I said our 'hearts are similar' because we had a similar outlook.

Other students called us [REDACTED] because of the way we bickered. Her friends made this up."

The panel also noted that during Pupil B's interview at the School, Pupil B stated that: "[REDACTED] is [Pupil A]". The panel also had sight of emails sent from Miss Slay's school email account to Pupil A's school email account. Within these messages, Miss Slay referred to Pupil A as "[REDACTED]", including:

- An email dated 16 June 2023, at 08:20, which stated: "Room is free now [REDACTED]";
- An email dated 16 June 2023, at 13:40, which stated: "Come [REDACTED]"; and
- An email dated 16 June 2023, at 9:56pm, which stated: "... no wonder why YOU are a [REDACTED]. A silly [REDACTED]."

The panel also had sight of emails from Miss Slay's school email account to Pupil B's school email account. These included the emails dated 23 June 2023 where Miss Slay provided Pupil B with her personal mobile phone number. Within one of these emails, Miss Slay also stated: "Very well done [REDACTED]. I am very very proud of you.". During Pupil B's interview at the School, Pupil B stated: "[REDACTED] was my

nickname". The panel found it highly inappropriate for a teacher to be giving nicknames to any pupil.

The panel also noted that Miss Slay was encouraging secretive and off-system discussions with Pupil B, which the panel found to be highly inappropriate. By way of an example, when providing her personal phone number to Pupil B via email on 23 June 2023, Miss Slay had stated: "For your eyes only".

The panel also had sight of emails from Miss Slay's school email account to Pupil A's school email account, which discussed Pupil A's own [REDACTED]. In particular, there was an email from Miss Slay dated 22 June 2023 at 8:57pm, which stated: "But I also know your heart – which I know that you will not have a solid time (100%) with that lingering at the back of your mind. But in general does [REDACTED]". The panel found these emails to be inappropriate and over-familiar in tone, akin to messages that would be exchanged between friends, as opposed to messages exchanged between a teacher and a pupil.

The panel also had sight of a large volume of emails from Miss Slay's school email account to Pupil C's school email account. The panel noted that there were some messages within which Miss Slay required emotional reassurances from Pupil C and where Miss Slay was encouraging secretive discussions between herself and Pupil C. By way of an example, there was an email from Miss Slay on 9 July 2022 at 19:13, which stated:

"You said to be honest/transparent with you with my feelings (especially when I seem like I am sinking). I can't seem to put my thoughts into an email so I spend sometime writing on the beach. I am trying to be honest so that I don't unintentionally hurt you by pushing you away (even though even [sic] ounce of me have been trying to come up with excuses to).

For your eyes only".

The panel also had sight of an email from Miss Slay's school email account to Pupil C's school email account dated 16 June 2022 at 16:48, in which Miss Slay asked Pupil C to read a speech that she had written [REDACTED]. The panel also had sight of emails within which Miss Slay would attach diary entries for Pupil C to read. During her disciplinary interview, Miss Slay confirmed that the attachments to these emails were "personal diary entries". In particular, the panel had sight of an email dated 9 April 2022 at 21:30, which stated: "I wasn't too sure about whether I was going to share this. But today was a bad day and I feel like my usual 3 people that knows my writing well will understand my words ... For your eyes only". The panel also had sight of the attachment to this email which was a handwritten note dated 9 April 2022. The note referred to Miss Slay's upcoming visit to Nigeria and detailed Miss Slay's emotional state; such as

feelings of “guilt” and “crumpling”. The panel found it to be highly inappropriate for a teacher to be sending such emotional and personal communications to any pupil.

The panel also had sight of an email dated 13 November 2020 at 5:47pm, within which Miss Slay stated: “Just wanted to let you know that I am also mentoring someone else. So you need to share me with this other student. Don’t worry you haven’t been replaced at all. You are still number 1.” The panel also found it inappropriate for a teacher to be demonstrating favouritism towards any pupil.

The panel also had sight of an email from Miss Slay to Pupil C dated 8 July 2022 at 22:01, which stated: “Am ready when you are”. When asked about this during her disciplinary interview, Miss Slay stated: “We arranged to watch TV at the same time – Umbrella Academy. It was just something we were both talking about. We organised to watch at the same time and then discuss. At around 9:10pm. For a few weeks”. The panel found it inappropriate for a teacher to be messaging a pupil during the evening, and particularly for a teacher to be arranging to watch TV at the same time as a pupil.

The panel also had sight of emails from Miss Slay’s school email account to Pupil D’s school email account. In particular, the panel had sight of an email dated [REDACTED] 2022 at 00:01, which stated:

“Hey you,

I haven’t forgotten about you! Happy Birthday!!!! I hope your day goes well!!!”.

Witness A explained to the panel that, in isolation, wishing a pupil a ‘happy birthday’ might not seem inappropriate on the face of it (although it was not standard behaviour, and would not be done via email). However, she explained that the email was sent during the School’s [REDACTED], and it was sent at 00:01, which suggested that Miss Slay had been waiting for it to be Pupil D’s birthday so that she could send the message. As a result, Witness A stated that she found this email to be inappropriate. The panel agreed that this was highly inappropriate, and was something you would expect to occur between friends as opposed to a teacher and a pupil.

The panel also had sight of an email from Miss Slay’s School email account to both Pupil E’s and Pupil C’s email account, dated 8 December 2020 at 17:58. The email stated: “I do appreciate you both coming to apologise, I did – however I am over it, I have went from anger to disappointment and that is the lowest I can get ... I am just done with it putting in so much effort and not being reciprocated with the same”. The panel found that Miss Slay appeared to place an emotional responsibility upon students for her own feelings, which was highly inappropriate.

The panel also had sight of an email from Miss Slay’s school email account to Pupil F’s school email account, dated 17 November 2021 at 11:37. This was a lengthy email in

which Miss Slay provided responses to some questions, and stated: “These were my answers – again for your eyes only”. One of the questions answered by Miss Slay was “How have you been a high tide crashing in to help others previously?”, and she stated: “I feel like I have been so preoccupied with everything the past couple of months that I have not been effective.” The panel found the email to be highly inappropriate, as it discussed Miss Slay’s emotions and also encouraged secretive discussions with Pupil F.

The panel also had sight of emails from Miss Slay’s school email account to Pupil G’s school email account dated 15 June 2021. These included an email from Miss Slay at 08:02am, in which she asked Pupil G to rank each teacher “out of 10 how much you feel you could confide in them when you feel stressed/overwhelmed”. The panel found it inappropriate for a teacher to encourage another pupil to speak about other members of staff in this way. The panel also had sight of an email at 08:14, in which Miss Slay provided song recommendations to Pupil G. The panel found this to be over-familiar in nature, and more akin to an email exchanged with a friend as opposed to between a teacher and a pupil.

The panel had sight of emails from Miss Slay’s school email account to Pupil H’s school email account. In particular, the panel had sight of an email dated 29 September 2022 at 19:42, which stated: “Thank you for checking in. I am quite tired mentally and physically. I am not sure if this makes sense but all I want to do is yank out my heart because I am tired of feeling sadness”. The panel found the email to be over-familiar in nature and for it to be highly inappropriate for a teacher to be confiding in a pupil about their emotional wellbeing in any way. The panel also found that it was inappropriate for a pupil to feel as though they had to be checking in with a teacher about their emotional state.

As part of the School’s investigation, Witness A also interviewed Pupil G and Pupil H. The panel had sight of these interview notes dated 8 September 2023 in the bundle. The notes were signed by the [REDACTED] and Witness A as [REDACTED]. Pupil G and Pupil H were not present at the hearing to give oral evidence. The panel noted that the interview notes were hearsay evidence which had been produced by the presenting officer. The panel decided to admit the interview notes of Pupil G and Pupil H. In considering relevance, the panel noted that they contained the pupils’ contemporaneous accounts which were directly relevant to the allegations. In considering fairness, the panel noted that it could test the evidence to some extent by way of questioning Witness A, who undertook the interviews. The panel also noted that the notes of Pupil G’s and Pupil H’s interviews were not the sole and decisive evidence in this case, as the panel also had sight of the relevant contemporaneous messages pertaining to each of the allegations. The panel applied some weight to this evidence, given that the interviews were conducted in the presence of two staff members which included Witness A. Witness A was also present at the hearing in order to confirm that the notes were true and accurate records of the interviews that took place. The panel still exercised caution given

that it could not test the evidence with Pupil G and Pupil H directly, and given that the panel had determined to proceed with the hearing in Miss Slay's absence.

During Pupil G's interview at the School, Pupil G was asked about their emails with Miss Slay. Pupil G stated: "we started to email during covid ... Miss Slay would send me just like music recommendations [REDACTED]". When asked if Miss Slay sent anything else, Pupil G responded: "She would send like encouragement emails, pictures of hot chocolates over Christmas and pictures of dogs.", and also stated: "Miss Slay would just send email about if she was feeling low, [REDACTED]." When asked how the messages made them feel, Pupil G responded: "I didn't really feel uncomfortable, but it was a lot."

During Pupil H's interview, Pupil H stated: "[REDACTED] Miss Slay picked up on this and became my mentor".

The panel also had sight of emails from Miss Slay's school email account to Pupil I's school email account. In particular, the panel had sight of an email dated 30 April 2022 at 09:27, which stated: "I know you are in a way on a [REDACTED] ...". The panel found it inappropriate for a teacher to make any comments about a pupil's [REDACTED]. The panel also had sight of an email thread, in which Miss Slay and Pupil I appear to discuss Pupil I [REDACTED]. The panel had sight of an email dated 28 May 2022 at 00:43, in which Miss Slay stated: "I think you are making a huge mistake if you let her back in". The panel found these emails to be personal and emotionally-loaded exchanges, which were over-familiar in nature. The panel found it wholly inappropriate for a teacher to be giving relationship advice to any pupil.

Within Witness A's written witness statement, Witness A also stated that she had sight of an email from Miss Slay to Pupil I, which stated:

"I know that you [REDACTED], and that is your choice. But I needed you to realise that teachers are not a punching bag, your actions have an impact on us and this once, you have left a very poor impact. I know that [REDACTED] in a lot of aspects of your world right now... all my efforts until now was to help you cope with that, but as I have said you are doing things to [REDACTED]. It is a real shame and I can't even comprehend the disappointment I am feeling".

The panel did not have sight of this email in the bundle, however, the panel was satisfied from Witness A's evidence that this was an email sent by Miss Slay. Witness A explained that she found this to be "a devastating email to read", [REDACTED]. As a result, it was dangerous for an adult to be emailing them in an emotional way and expressing feelings of disappointment towards them. The panel agreed that it was highly inappropriate to send this email to any pupil, [REDACTED].

The panel also had sight of emails from Miss Slay's school email account to Pupil J's school email account. In particular, the panel had sight of an email dated 3 March 2022

at 18:11, which stated: “Of course you can still confide in me ...”. The panel found it inappropriate for a teacher to invite a pupil to confide in them personally, and to continue a relationship beyond the ordinary classroom contact.

The panel also had sight of multiple letters that were sent by Miss Slay to various pupils. The letters were sent at times when Miss Slay had informed the pupils that she would be travelling to a war zone, as part of what appeared to be her role in the army. In particular, the panel had sight of an email from Miss Slay’s school email account to Pupil C’s school email account dated 21 January 2022 at 19:10. The email stated: “I prewritten you something in case of worst case scenario over the next 6 months ... Please read it at your own time and it is for your eyes only.”. The panel had sight of the attachment to this email, which was a handwritten note signed to Pupil C dated 19 January 2022, signed by Miss Slay. The note stated: “... if I am gone in person ... know that I was doing a brave thing and I will look down from heaven and smile when you succeed and cry when you fall short ... Carry on each day and know that out of this cruel world, I was able to have this chance to mentor you. You, out of the 7.753 billion people in this world.”.

The panel also had sight of multiple emails from Miss Slay’s school email account to Pupil A’s school email account, in which she attached handwritten notes addressed to Pupil A. By way of an example, the panel had sight of a handwritten note sent to Pupil A on 29 May 2023 at 22:03, addressed to “[REDACTED]”, which stated (among other things): “To be honest with you, I wanted to push everyone away because it hurts so much. But [Pupil A], you’ve helped me in recognising that letting the right people in is okay. Thank you for being that person” and “I want nothing more than you finding that ‘partner’, that stable job, that happiness that I know you are longing for”. The note was also signed off with “Much love”.

The panel also had sight of photos which were taken of handwritten notes, which appeared to have been physically provided to Pupil A, as opposed to sent by email. The panel had sight of a production statement of Individual A, [REDACTED], which stated that copies of these letters were provided to Kingsley Napley LLP by Individual C on 11 June 2025. By way of some examples, the letters stated:

- “I want to give you this little nudge to take a leap of faith and truly allow yourself to breathe and to be loved (truly loved without shrugging it off);
- “... even though I annoy you, and you annoy me at times, know that I won’t change any part of this relationship. Know that I truly and deeply care.”;
- “I know we still butt heads at times but it is because I am trying to nudge that inner strength and your authentic self out.”; and
- “Remember we are a team. Slay/[Pupil A], [REDACTED] and of course [REDACTED]. Gosh, we have so many names! At least we are not boring.”.

The panel also noted that in some instances, the handwritten notes had been provided to Pupil A in an envelope which had instructed them not to open the letter until a certain time. In particular, one envelope stated: "To be opened at 21:37pm : 20th June 2023 [no earlier].".

The panel found it to be deeply concerning and wholly inappropriate for a teacher to be sending these types of letters to any pupil, and to be suggesting that they open these letters at certain times, during the evenings. The panel found the content of the letters to be highly inappropriate and over-familiar in nature, and not in any way acceptable for a teacher to be sending to any pupil.

Overall, the panel found that there was significant evidence to demonstrate that Miss Slay had sent inappropriate and/or over familiar text messages and/or emails and/or letters to one or more of the pupils in Schedule B between 2019 and 2023. However, the panel noted that it did not have sight of any text messages, emails or letters which were sent prior to 12 November 2020.

The panel had sight of the School's Code of Conduct, which stated:

"8.1 Communication between pupils and adults, by whatever method, should take place within clear and explicit professional boundaries and with reference to the Bourne Education Trust ICT & Communications Policy. This includes the wider use of technology such as mobile phones, tablets, text messages, emails, instant messages, websites, social media such as Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, chatrooms, forums, blogs, apps such as WhatsApp, gaming sites, digital cameras, videos, webcams and other handheld devices. Adults should not share any personal information with pupils, and they should not request, or respond to, any personal information from the child/young person, other than that which might be appropriate as part of their professional role. They should ensure that all communications are transparent and avoid any communication that could be interpreted as 'grooming behaviour'."

The panel found that Miss Slay's conduct was in direct contravention of this policy.

The panel found this allegation proven.

b) sent emails to one or more of the pupils in Schedule C within which you shared details of your personal life; and/or

The panel had sight of emails from Miss Slay's school email account to Pupil A's school email account discussing her personal life. In particular, the panel had sight of an email thread dated Saturday 27 May 2023, in which Miss Slay was sending emails to Pupil A about an upcoming trip to a war zone, as part of what appeared to be her role in the army. Within this thread, Miss Slay sent an email to Pupil A at 8:53am, which stated:

“Slay is freaking out. Usually I can shake off the anxiousness but I feel like giving up before I have even packed.” In response to this, Pupil A attempted to reassure Miss Slay and stated: “... think of the reason your [sic] doing it and let that continue to be your motivation and how your [sic] doing this for [REDACTED].” In response, Miss Slay stated: “Oh man that made the tears fall even more. My hairdresser thought [REDACTED] and I were done and that why I was crying, and I was like no no no.”

The panel also had sight of handwritten notes which were shared by Miss Slay to Pupil A via email, in which Miss Slay detailed her emotions as a result of her upcoming “war zone” deployment. By way of example, one of the notes stated: “I know that you’ve noticed that I’ve been silent dealing with the paintballing, the injuries and the sleepless nights. To be honest with you, there have been times when I wanted to completely shut away from the world.”

The panel also had sight of an email from Miss Slay to Pupil A dated 20 June 2023, at 21:35, discussing her [REDACTED]. The email stated:

“So when I was filling out the form and sending it through via email. I got an email saying that THE WOMAN left a note for me.

The words, the weight of the words. WHY DID THE [REDACTED] send it to me ... the distaste from her words.”

The notes of Miss Slay’s disciplinary interview stated that: “[AS confirmed [REDACTED]. She confirmed she had shared details about her personal life with the students.]”.

The panel also had sight of emails from Miss Slay’s school email account to Pupil B’s school email account, in which she referred to her upcoming trip to a war zone. In particular, the panel had sight of an email dated 31 March 2023 at 19:44, which stated: “Slay is super stressed now. I am all packed done all my team training and paintball training. Got one more gym training tomorrow then I head off.”

The panel also had sight of emails from Miss Slay’s school email account to Pupil F’s school email account, discussing her own personal life. In particular, the panel had sight of an email dated 4 October 2022 at 18:23, which stated: “Thank you for catching up today. More importantly, thank you for being cautious, delicate and being understanding when I didn’t want to talk about my [REDACTED] much.”.

The panel also had sight of an email dated 17 November 2021 at 11:37, in which Miss Slay provided further details of her personal life. By way of some examples, the email stated:

- “I guess the earliest positive memory of the sea would be the fact that my family would actively come and watch me learn to swim ...”;

- “I guess the greatest acts of kindness would be my parents, [REDACTED]”; and
- “The second would be when I came back from the military and I was able to adjust and I would have flash backs and was stuck in a military fight or flight mode ... One of my friend volunteered to stay with me ...”.

Overall, the panel found there was sufficient evidence to demonstrate that Miss Slay had sent emails to the pupils set out in Schedule C, sharing details of her personal life. In particular, the panel noted that there were emails discussing Miss Slay’s personal relationships, her emotional state, and her personal trips. The panel found that Miss Slay’s conduct was in direct contravention of the School’s Code of Conduct and ICT Acceptable Use Policy.

The panel found this allegation proven.

c) sent emails to one or more of the pupils in Schedule D within which you shared details of other pupil(s) and/or School staff members; and/or

The panel had sight of emails between Miss Slay and pupils, within which Miss Slay shared details of other School staff members. In particular, the panel had sight of an email from Miss Slay’s school email account to Pupil A’s school email account, dated 23 June 2023 at 08:17am, which stated: “It’s done, [REDACTED] admitted she was rude to me. But still not having her in the team next year”. During her disciplinary interview, Miss Slay confirmed that “[REDACTED]” is a code name for another member of staff, and she also agreed that it was inappropriate. During her disciplinary interview, Miss Slay confirmed that she had used codenames to discuss members of staff with pupils.

The panel also had sight of emails between Miss Slay and pupils, within which Miss Slay shared details of other pupils. In particular, the panel also had sight of an email from Miss Slay to Pupil A dated 15 June 2023 at 12:35pm, which stated: “[REDACTED] really annoyed me today”. The panel also had sight of an email from Pupil A on 16 June 2023 at 07:16am, asking “why”. Miss Slay responded at 07:43am, and stated: “Just wouldn’t flipping leave me and just kept on pestering me. Then he was like “you let [Pupil A] sit in your room and I was like yeah usually when I am teaching or during extended day. And I was like why would I ever let you sit with me for an hour and a half”. It was not clear who “[REDACTED]” referred to, but it would appear as though this was a code name for another pupil.

The panel had sight of an email thread between Miss Slay’s school email account and Pupil C’s school email account dated 13 November 2020. Within this thread, Miss Slay informed Pupil C that she was “also mentoring someone else”. In response to this email, Pupil C attempted to guess who this student was by asking questions such as “is it someone in my year”, “in my gang?” and “your form?”. In an email at 06:05pm, Miss Slay

stated: "It's [pupil name redacted]. Well I was kind of already doing it but I am taking a more official role with her kind of like what I am doing with you already".

The panel also had sight of a separate email thread dated 22 September 2022, within which Miss Slay referred to gossip that she had heard regarding Pupil C. In particular, the panel had sight of an email from Pupil C to Miss Slay at 13:38 which stated:

"i don't have energy in me to again have to tell you it's ridiculous for me to say anything about you and i have no need to.

maybe the dynamics have changed because something you said a few days ago is what's been bothering me, like you said in an email , i seemed very very off recently. when i was in your class before your lesson started and we were having a normal conversation and out of nowhere you brought up that you'd been told by someone how [REDACTED] i do this and do that and general gossip about me. i wanted to know who said it as it just makes me feel uncomfortable hearing gossip about myself but then you didnt [sic] even say. i'm not sure if you realised but the fact i said nothing more and just left your class was an indication i wasn't that happy. it has been lingering in my head a lot and made me wonder, why do other people even feel comfortable gossiping about me to you. maybe it's reciprocated gossip and that's why. i didn't want to use my psychological skills to guess who it was i wanted a simple confirmation , not to be confrontational at all but just for my own knowledge."

In response to this email, at 14:12, Miss Slay stated:

"I did say that I would tell you the next day, but you never addressed it nor asked. You said it is reciprocal gossip - which I feel like you are now saying I am involved in it. I do not talk about you. Your name was mentioned because of that [REDACTED]. Then the boys talked about [REDACTED] and they then mentioned about it - i shrugged it off because I just think the tension is between you both and I have nothing to do with it."

The panel also had sight of emails from Miss Slay's school email account to Pupil D's school email account. The panel had sight of an email thread dated 22-25 September 2022 within which Miss Slay and Pupil D appeared to discuss an ongoing tension between Miss Slay and another pupil. In particular, the panel noted the following email from Miss Slay at 05:45pm, which stated:

"You better keep our pinky promise.

I also send [sic] her a long email (even when she didn't respond to my reply.)".

The panel noted there was also an email from Miss Slay at 11:13, which stated: "And she emailed me yesterday but I have send my finally [sic] email to her expressing how i felt".

The panel also had sight of emails from Miss Slay's school email account to Pupil E's school email account. In particular, the panel had sight of an email thread dated 8 January 2021, within which Miss Slay and Pupil E discussed Miss Slay checking in on another pupil (which appeared to be using nicknames for other pupils). The panel noted an email from Miss Slay to Pupil E at 09:11, which stated: "Tell her to check her email! I did a check in email to her ...".

The panel also had sight of emails from Miss Slay's school email account to Pupil H's school email account. In particular, the panel had sight of an email thread dated 28 April 2022, within which Miss Slay and Pupil H discussed drama between pupils. The panel noted the following emails:

- An email from Miss Slay at 5:07pm, which stated: "I have found out so much more today about her lies! Am so infuriated!!!!";
- An email from Pupil H at 17:33, which stated: "what happened? who told you????"; and
- An email from Miss Slay at 17:36, which stated:

"A [REDACTED]. One of her friends!

Said that she has previously done the exact same [REDACTED]. Then I found of that she lied to me about the reason she and [REDACTED]. She said it was something but never mentioned it was because she was being confronted about her talking to someone else when she was [REDACTED].

I just feel like I failed as a mentor

Her friends also find it extremely strange how there are so many various stories.

I obviously told [Pupil I] via email but I just said I am only letting you know because I don't want you to be the person to get hurt."

The panel also had sight of emails from Miss Slay's school email account to Pupil I's school email account. In particular, the panel had sight of an email thread dated Saturday 28 May 2022, within which Miss Slay and Pupil I appeared to discuss drama between Pupil I and another pupil. The panel noted the following emails:

- An email from Miss Slay at 06:41am, which stated: "Forgot to say she emailed me";
- An email from Miss Slay at 09:54am, which stated:

"Did you face time her?

I feel exactly the same. I wish I could be extremely honest without sugar coating how hurt I feel.

I was frustrated when she emailed me the other week, because I feel like all she wanted was attention and she used the “reality got to me” card.”;

- An email from Miss Slay at 12:01pm, which stated:

“I confronted her about my situation with her,

Does it sound rude to you? I want to confront but still be a better person

“There is something I want to confront you about. When everything went south and when everything had change. Have you wonder how hurt I was/am. The reason I ask is, that you seem to not realise it and I have not been able to shake it off nor show to you truly how much you have hurt me and still has (the residual of it still).

I feel like you lack that understanding because you still came to say hi without prior warning (except when you emailed to ask to speak to me). It seems that you are still oblivious as to how your actions have impacted me. In that time never did you reach out and ask me how I was, instead when you were at a low, you reached out because you needed someone. You said you would ‘chase’ if it is worth while, but I feel that the ‘worth’ seem like nothing to you.

I understand that you have been working on yourself, but partly have you even tried to fight for true forgiveness or show acts of service to try and help fix it without having you gaining something?”

I am only sharing this because people often say I am blunt but I want it to be blunt but not hurtful. If that makes sense

Then she told me about how she felt when she was with you with another [REDACTED] around and now this. I am so angry for you.”

Overall, the panel found that there was sufficient evidence to demonstrate that Miss Slay sent emails to pupils set out in Schedule D, which shared details of other pupils and/or School staff members.

The panel found this allegation proven.

d) sent emails and/or text messages and/or letters to one or more pupils in Schedule E within which you fabricated stories about you being in a conflict and/or war zone and/or sustaining injuries

The panel noted that Miss Slay appeared to have fabricated a narrative to pupils which involved her having a role in the army, where she would often take trips to war zones, undertake training and/or be involved in conflict.

In particular, the panel had sight of a large volume of text messages sent from Miss Slay to Pupil A between July-August 2023, during one of Miss Slay’s fabricated trips to a war

zone. The panel had heard from Witness A that it was these messages which prompted Individual C to report the messages to the School, as she was genuinely concerned for Miss Slay's wellbeing.

The panel had sight of the following text messages from Miss Slay:

- A text message on Saturday 15 July at 10:14pm, which stated: "Got told I am flying out Monday arvo now instead so this week is now going to be Monday – Wednesday Evening or Thursday super early in the morning"; and
- A text message on 17 July at 3:25pm, which stated: "Hey, just letting you know I have arrived and reached base."

The panel also had sight of multiple text messages to Pupil A from Miss Slay's mobile phone number, which were stated to be from "Lt. D Blackburn". The messages indicated that Miss Slay had sustained serious injuries during this trip. The text messages also provided regular updates on Miss Slay's condition. In particular, the panel had sight of the following messages:

- A text message on 27 July at 7:58pm, which stated: "Under the advice of my chief and back up plan from Cpt. Slay, I am giving update on Cpt. Slay's condition ... Earlier in the day, Cpt. Slay and several others have been severely wounded. Cpt. Slay sustained two rounds to her abdomen and lost severe amounts of blood ... Cpt. Slay has been in surgery to remove two rounds from her abdomen.";
- A text message on 27 July at 11:24pm, which stated: "Cpt. Slay condition worsened. Her core body temperature is alarmingly low and we have found that she is suffering from the first round. Currently our priority is to get her core temperature back up before taking her back into surgery"; and
- A text message on 28 July at 09:10pm, which stated: "Cpt. Slay has woken up and her vitals and temperature have stabilised ... As Cpt. Slay is awake. I will be passing her belongings including her phone back to her."

The panel noted that, after these text messages, Miss Slay had continued to send text messages to Pupil A as herself. However, the panel had sight of a text message from Miss Slay to Pupil A on 28 July, which stated: "I need to go back in, I don't feel very good and I feel very cold ... I am going to leave my phone to my assigned staff.". Following this text message, the panel noted that numerous further text messages were sent to Pupil A, which were stated to be from "Lt. Danny Blackburn" between 28 July – 1 August. These messages stated:

- "Cpt Slay's body is at a weak stage and it isn't producing heat ... We are also putting her on oxygen";

- “Cpt. Slay went into cardiac arrest and the doctors are currently trying to regain her pulse and ensure her organs are not shutting down ...”;
- “Cpt. Slay left this message for me to pass on to you.
“If things turn for the worst. Please be proud and know that I have tried by best”.”;
- “Cpt. Slay ... went into cardiac arrest due to shock to her body. However they have got Cpt. Slay back now, but her pulse is very weak.”;
- “Cpt. Slay vitals flatlined at 07:30 this morning however doctors were able to revive her”.; and
- “I know I shouldn’t be saying this and will probably be reprimanded for it. However, Cpt. Slay wants to stay and finish the operation. However, I ask that where possible, please can you all talk her out of it”.

The panel noted that, according to the text messages, there also appeared to be a second incident during which Miss Slay was injured. In particular, the panel had sight of a text message to Pupil A dated 1 August at 10:06am, from “Lt. D Blackburn” who referred to himself as “Danny”, which stated: “The situation is now secured, however 3 of our men were injured and due to in close combat, Cpt. Slay got involved when one of the hostiles came from one of our men’s blind spot and stopped the hostile from attacking. Unfortunately during the conflict, Cpt. Slay took a stab to her right rib cage area and sustained heavy bleeding”.

The panel also had sight of further text messages, which were stated to be from “Lt. D Blackburn”, providing updates on Miss Slay’s condition. The panel had sight of the following text message dated 2 August, sent at 12:02am: “She is going to choose to go home. She said she will need her left foot “[REDACTED]”. She won’t say yes until she is reassured that things will be okay and not lonesome. I don’t know what that means”. The panel also had sight of the response from Pupil A, which stated: “[REDACTED] is ready to help and be her right foot”.

The panel also had sight of multiple emails from Miss Slay’s school email account to Pupil B’s school email account within which she provided details of her fabricated trips. In particular, the panel had sight of an email dated 1 April 2023 at 18:00, which stated:

“Team rotation is done, I will be off duty until 21:30before heading back in. Things are really really crappy - it’s the hardest and ruthless intensity I have experience in a long time. Really want to call it and come back.

...

Next rotation will be 04:30 hours (03:30 Uk time). And if you don't hear from me after 30 minutes just email and I will get my CO to reply via my other email. And if it is more than 5 hours unaccounted after that for then... that is our instructed protocol due to the tight schedule."

The panel also had sight of emails sent from Miss Slay's school email account to both Pupil B's and Pupil A's school email accounts, providing further updates during this trip. In particular, the panel had sight of an email sent on 28 May 2023 at 08:55, which stated:

"Am about to head off, boarding in 25 minutes. I will arrive at 15:10 (1:10pm uk time), prebrief then head straight into it at around 2:15pm uk time. A couple of thing,

1. I will get either my CO or myself (if I can't to update every 6 hours.
2. I have told my CO about the code name 'Cakes' so he will use that due to the sensitivity of it all
3. If there is no contact after any 6-hour window, email and my CO will contact when possible

Slay is off"

The panel also had sight of emails sent from Miss Slay's school email account, to both Pupil A's and Pupil B's school email accounts, which appeared to be sent from "Lt. L Franklin". The emails provided updates on the trip and Miss Slay's condition. In particular, the panel had sight of the following email dated 28 May 2023 at 15:52:

"Dear all,

Let me introduce myself, I am Lt. L. Franklin. I am LtCol. Slay's CO.

I am sure LtCol. Slay have briefed you on the logistics of how these next two days work. Firstly, due to current circumstances externally, myself or LtCol. Slay will provide an update within each 6 hours window. If you do not hear from either of us by those windows, please email and I will contact as soon as possible.

Currently, LtCol. Slay and team are about to head to the location of the compound, for the first part. The first part consists of LtCol. Slay and her S.I.C (7 -8 hours rotation). The current condition isn't ideal due to thunderstorms and the heat. Due to the weather condition, the communication signals may cause delays.

Update on LtCol. Slay's current state, her right foot is slightly strained. But other than that, she is okay. The team is just getting NGVs and the required kit before heading out within the next 15 minutes.

I understand LtCol. Slay have briefed you all about emails have to be discarded after due to the sensitive information

Cordially,

Lt. L. Franklin”.

The panel also had sight of further emails sent from Miss Slay’s school email account to both Pupil A’s and Pupil B’s school email account, which were signed off by “Lt. L. Franklin”. The emails referred to injuries that Miss Slay had sustained, and provided updates on her condition. In particular, the panel noted the following emails:

- An email dated 29 May 2023 at 06:47, which stated: “The current update of LtCol. Slay’s condition is that she has sustained two minor injuries due to the ricochets. One to her right shoulder blade region and the other is to her right abdomen.”; and
- An email dated 29 May 2023 at 14:07, which stated: “LtCol. Slay have successfully secured/cleared 3 floors of the building, with two more to go. Things took longer than planned due to LtCol. Slay’s condition from earlier impact and the minor incised injury to her abdomen - the details were not updated under the order of LtCol. Slay’s order. Therefore, I apologise for leaving that part out.”

The panel also had sight of emails from Miss Slay’s school email account to Pupil C’s school email account, which referred to her upcoming trips and provided Pupil C with handwritten notes in case something happened to her during these trips. In particular, the panel had sight of an email dated 21 January 2022 at 19:10, which stated:

“There is one thing I am going to give you, I couldn’t bring myself to say it, and I hope I don’t ever have to say it. However I prewritten you something in case of worst case scenario over the next 6 months or so (Feb, April and July/August). We have been taught to prepare something in case of a worst situation happening.”

The panel also had sight of a typed-up note dated 9 July 2022, which was sent to Pupil C by email, and which stated: “It is less than two weeks till I go and D-Day is drawing ever closer”.

During Pupil B’s interview at the School, Pupil B was asked to comment upon the emails from Miss Slay. Pupil B responded: “Yes, Miss Slay is actually in the Australian army, this is from when she was away.”

During her disciplinary interview, when asked about the messages, Miss Slay stated: “all fabricated”, and “Yes it was all a lie. I lied in 2019 and May 2023. And December last year. 4 times.” Miss Slay was also asked: “What was the purpose of that communication to students? What do you believe the impact of those messages would be on the student?”, to which Miss Slay responded: “I wasn’t really expecting any reaction. I wrote it

without thinking. I felt like a nobody.” Miss Slay also stated that: “I have not been involved in any fighting. That was wrong. I made up the lie to feel that I belong, was a part of the world.”

The panel found that there was significant evidence to demonstrate that Miss Slay had been sending a large volume of text messages, emails and letters to the pupils set out in Schedule E, which contained stories about her being in a conflict and/or war zone and/or sustaining injuries. The panel noted that, by Miss Slay’s own admission, these stories were fabricated.

The panel found this allegation proven.

3. As a result of your conduct at paragraphs 1 and/or 2a and/or 2b and/or 2c and/or 2d, you developed inappropriate relationships with one or more pupil(s) and/or breached the boundaries of a teacher-pupil relationship with one or more pupil(s);

In respect of allegation 1, the panel found that it was a significant breach of boundaries for Miss Slay to have given pupils her personal mobile phone number and/or personal email address. The panel also found that in doing so, Miss Slay was able to develop an inappropriate relationship with the pupils, as it allowed her to communicate with these pupils outside of school time, with the content of those messages going beyond that of a teacher-pupil relationship. The panel found this was demonstrated by the fact that Miss Slay sent inappropriate text messages to Pupil A discussing “intimacy”.

In respect of allegations 2a, 2b and 2c, the panel again found that there had been a significant breach of boundaries. The panel found that Miss Slay sent a number of messages to pupils which were not school-related matters and were highly inappropriate in nature, and which were akin to messages that would be exchanged between friends as opposed to between a teacher and a pupil. In particular, Miss Slay sent messages which referred to details in her own personal life, her own personal relationships, and her own [REDACTED]. The panel found that in some instances, the roles became reversed and the pupils became the responsible adult as they were having to check-in on Miss Slay, reassure her and provide her with emotional support.

The panel also found the content of the handwritten letters sent by Miss Slay to be deeply inappropriate and unprofessional. Further, pupils were instructed not to open the letters until a certain time and were also encouraged to keep the letters a secret. Miss Slay also encouraged the pupils to keep “pinky promises” and to confide in her about personal matters. The panel found that these secret communications and promises facilitated inappropriate relationships which had developed beyond that of teacher-pupil relationships.

The panel also found that Miss Slay would engage in, and would sometimes initiate, gossip about other pupils and other members of staff, using code names. The panel also noted that Miss Slay had used nicknames for certain pupils, such as “[REDACTED]” and “[REDACTED]”, and had also allowed the pupils to use nicknames for her. The panel found these messages to be more akin to those exchanged between friends, as opposed to messages between a teacher and a pupil. The panel also noted that Miss Slay would involve herself within the pupils’ own personal relationships, often offering advice. The panel found that these types of communications further facilitated the inappropriate relationships beyond those of teacher-pupil relationships, and allowed Miss Slay to infiltrate the pupils’ personal lives.

The panel also noted that Miss Slay had arranged to watch a TV show with Pupil C at the same time in the evenings, following which they would discuss the show that they were watching. The panel found that this behaviour was not typical of a teacher-pupil relationship, and was more something that had occurred between friends. The panel also noted that Miss Slay had admitted during her disciplinary interview that this had occurred for a “few weeks”. The panel found that this allowed Miss Slay to further develop an inappropriate relationship with Pupil C during that time period, which infiltrated Pupil C’s home life.

The panel also considered the number of emails that were exchanged between Miss Slay and various pupils. The investigation report prepared by Witness A stated that:

- For Pupil A, between 2022-2023, there were 1,175 email communications (on their school email accounts);
- For Pupil B, between 2021-2023, there were 645 email communications (on their school email accounts); and
- For Pupil C, between 2020-2023, there were 2,547 email communications (on their school email accounts).

The panel found this to be a significant amount of emails within the given time periods. The panel had heard from Witness A that emails were not typically used for teacher-pupil communications, and instead, teachers were supposed to use Microsoft Teams to communicate with pupils about work and other school-related matters, as this would then be visible to other pupils who could also see that information.

The panel also found that Miss Slay had often communicated with pupils at inappropriate times. In particular, the panel noted that there were some messages sent over the weekend, during the school holidays, very late at night and very early in the morning. As an example, the panel noted that Miss Slay had messaged Pupil D to wish them a ‘happy birthday’ at 00:01 during the Christmas holidays. The panel found that it was extremely unusual and inappropriate for a teacher to be messaging pupils outside of the School

day, and at these times. The panel found this to further demonstrate the inappropriate relationship that Miss Slay had developed with pupils, which was far beyond that of a teacher-pupil relationship. The panel also found that Miss Slay's conduct meant that it was more difficult for the pupils not to engage, as Miss Slay was messaging them outside of school times and outside of term times in a way that expected a response from them.

Witness A explained to the panel that the majority of the pupils referred to in these allegations had their [REDACTED]. [REDACTED]:

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

The panel noted that Miss Slay appeared to have given herself the role of "mentoring" certain [REDACTED] pupils. The panel noted that Miss Slay had often referred to "mentoring" pupils, or as the pupils' "mentor", in her emails to them. The panel also noted that Pupil H stated that Miss Slay became their "mentor", during their interview at the School.

During her disciplinary interview, Miss Slay was asked: "When interviewed, three of these students mention that you started to email them and act as a mentor [REDACTED]. Is this accurate?". In response to this, Miss Slay stated: "[REDACTED]. She had come to see me. She considered me a mentor. [REDACTED]". Miss Slay was also asked: "Did each child you act as a mentor for [REDACTED]?". [REDACTED]".

During her oral evidence to the panel, Witness A stated that she was not aware at the time that pupils were being "mentored" by Miss Slay. She stated that that is not a formal arrangement, and that "individual teachers mentoring children is not a set up we operate in any way". Witness A explained to the panel that there was a huge provision of resources at the School to support the pupils, which included a Mental Health Support Team on site who were trained to deal with [REDACTED] pupils.

The panel found that, in taking it upon herself to act as the pupils' unofficial "mentor", Miss Slay fostered an inappropriate relationship which encouraged the pupils to rely on her for emotional support. The panel found that this was particularly the case for the

[REDACTED] pupils, who were more likely to be drawn in to Miss Slay's inappropriate communications.

The panel noted this was demonstrated by some of the pupils' attitudes when they were interviewed as part of the School's investigation. The panel noted that the relationships between Miss Slay and some of the pupils had progressed to a stage where Witness A had noticed a complete contrast to their characters. In particular, Witness A stated that the pupils were defensive of Miss Slay, and that Pupil B was "combative".

The panel noted that some of the pupils themselves had also noticed that boundaries had been breached. In particular, during Pupil G's interview at the School, Pupil G stated: "My own friends thought it was weird how often she spoke to [Pupil H] and [Pupil C]. I think she was trying to help them [REDACTED]", and "She spoke to [Pupil I] a lot and lots of us think that's really weird. [They] even came to school to walk around with her which we thought was weird at the time. I don't think she meant it in a creepy way but me and my friends just thought the boundaries were a bit blurred."

During Pupil H's interview at the School, Pupil H stated: "At times it did feel a bit weird, she felt more like a friend than a teacher. I never felt uncomfortable with what she sent me but she did have a similar thing with [Pupil C]. That was really weird because they would fall out and Miss Slay would get really annoyed. It was weird considering how annoyed she'd get for a teacher falling out with a student".

In respect of allegation 2(d), the panel found that Pupil A, Pupil B and Pupil C were being treated as though they were Miss Slay's next-of-kin by way of receiving the fabricated updates from "Lt. D. Blackburn" and "Lt. L Franklin", and there was an indication that they were expected to be concerned about Miss Slay's wellbeing. The panel noted that Pupil A had been trying to support Miss Slay, and had sent text messages which stated: "you've pushed through this far you can't give up now" and "... well keep me updated when you can just so that i know your [sic] okay slay". The panel found that these messages demonstrated that the professional boundaries had been crossed and that Miss Slay's relationship with Pupil A was more akin to a friendship or a family loved-one as opposed to a teacher-pupil relationship.

The panel noted that Miss Slay had also accepted during her disciplinary interview that professional boundaries had been breached as a result of her conduct. In particular, Miss Slay was asked: "During an interview [Pupil G] and [Pupil H] described the relationship you had with students as not having boundaries, or weird. Do you think that is accurate?" In response, Miss Slay stated: "yes". Miss Slay was also referred to voice notes which were exchanged with Pupil A and Miss Slay stated: "At that stage the professional line was blurred. We both shared our [REDACTED] ... She was venting about her [REDACTED] and I vented about my days".

The panel noted that the School had clear and comprehensive policies which were in place, including a Safeguarding Policy, ICT Acceptable Use Policy and Code of Conduct. The panel noted that Miss Slay was familiar with these policies. The panel had sight of Miss Slay's training record which confirmed that Miss Slay had signed all of these policies. The panel also noted that Miss Slay had undertaken "Child Protection in Education" training in September 2019, with a refresher in February 2020. Witness A explained to the panel that, upon Miss Slay becoming a head of year in May 2023, she also would have completed DSL training. The panel noted from Miss Slay's training record that she had obtained a learning certificate for "Designated Safeguarding Lead" on 8 July 2023. The panel also had sight of this certificate in the hearing bundle, which confirmed that Miss Slay had successfully completed "Designated Safeguarding Lead".

The panel considered that Miss Slay's role as both teacher and DSL meant that she was acutely aware of the need to maintain professional boundaries and a teacher-pupil relationship at all times. The panel had also heard from Witness A how, in her class room, Miss Slay appeared to be rule-driven and stuck to boundaries. Despite this, the panel found that Miss Slay had failed to maintain appropriate teacher-pupil relationships with a number of pupils, and had instead developed inappropriate relationships which were more akin to friendships.

The panel found this allegation proven.

4. As a result of your conduct in paragraph 2d you caused and/or had the potential to cause stress and/or alarm to one or more pupil(s).

The panel noted that the text messages sent to Pupil A from Miss Slay about her fabricated injuries were distressing. In particular, the messages referred to Miss Slay going into "cardiac arrest", sustaining gunshot wounds, losing "severe amounts of blood" and having "flatlined". The panel found that these messages had the potential to cause stress and alarm to pupils.

The panel had sight of evidence which demonstrated that Miss Slay's conduct did in fact cause stress and alarm to Pupil A. In particular, the panel had sight of text messages between Pupil A and Pupil B. As part of the exchange, Pupil A had shared the messages and updates they had received regarding Miss Slay's fabricated injuries to Pupil B. The panel noted that there was a text message from Pupil B which stated: "Enjoy your holiday though I know she wouldn't want you to worry", to which Pupil A responded "im just angry tbh". The panel also noted a message from Pupil A to Pupil B which stated: "you not feeling good?" immediately after this exchange about Miss Slay's condition, to which Pupil B responded: "Not great".

The panel also had sight of text messages between Pupil A and Pupil B on 28 July from 11:36pm onwards, which stated:

- From Pupil A: “are you awake”;
- From Pupil B: “Yeh [sic] I can’t sleep”;
- From Pupil A: “neither i can’t stop myself from looking all over google about ca”;
- From Pupil B: “I can’t really move rn”, “I don’t know what to think”, and “It’s just really dark rn”; and
- From Pupil A: “same i’m trying not to panic n just think she’s already in hospital so at least she’s seen to quickly”.

The panel also had sight of a text message from Pupil A to Miss Slay, which stated: “let’s just say the past few days weren’t good so from a selfish point of view me and [Pupil B] have been a wreck the past few days tbh worrying about you and me and her don’t want to risk it again when we really thought we were going to lose you.”.

The panel had also heard from Witness A as to how the text messages to Pupil A first came to light, as Individual C noticed a change in Pupil A’s behaviour at home which led her to look at Pupil A’s phone.

The panel found there was sufficient evidence to demonstrate that Miss Slay’s conduct did cause stress and alarm to pupils. The panel found that Miss Slay had already laid the groundwork for this given that she had previously established inappropriate relationships with Pupil A, Pupil B and Pupil C, and had left them notes in case something happened to her during her trips.

The panel found this allegation proven.

5. You did not report on CPOMs and/or to the Designated Safeguarding Lead (DSL) and/or to the deputy DSL, the safeguarding concerns referred to in Schedule F.

The panel heard from Witness A as to what staff members should do in the event that they have safeguarding concerns in respect of any pupil. Witness A explained that staff members would be expected to log any concerns via CPOMS, and the School’s culture was to log “everything”. Witness A explained that the School worked with some [REDACTED] students, and as a result, every small piece of information needed to be logged. Witness A was asked whether teachers were expected to log concerns even if they knew that other staff members had also logged those concerns via CPOMS. Witness A explained that it was everyone’s job to report concerns, particularly as in some instances, a pupil could say one thing to one member of staff, and a slightly different thing to another member of staff. Witness A stated that as a result, everything had to be reported as the staff members were “not judge and jury”.

Witness A stated that even if two teachers witnessed an event which gave rise to a safeguarding concern, both teachers would need to separately log this on CPOMS. Witness A stated that Miss Slay would definitely have known that she was required to log all concerns via CPOMS, and that she would have known how to do this. Witness A had also explained to the panel that during the period after the Covid lockdown, the School was hyper-vigilant with regard to safeguarding and logging any concerns via the appropriate channels.

Witness A was also asked whether staff members could refer concerns to other members of staff, such as the DSL or deputy DSL. Witness A explained that the School had a "Wave" which was a team of staff members who were trained in safeguarding and who were experienced in child protection. Witness A stated that a referral could be made directly to the Wave if staff had a safeguarding concern. However, Witness A stated that the expected route would always be to refer via CPOMS and then the School would designate the appropriate support depending on the concern raised and the needs of the pupil. It was not for a class teacher to decide what type of support a particular pupil needed.

As part of the School's investigation, Witness A had identified that Miss Slay was aware of multiple safeguarding concerns that should have been referred via CPOMS.

In respect of concerns regarding Pupil A's [REDACTED], Miss Slay had acknowledged during her disciplinary interview at the School [REDACTED]. Despite this, Witness A confirmed that Miss Slay never logged any concerns regarding Pupil A's [REDACTED] via CPOMS. Witness A also stated that she was [REDACTED] at the time, and Miss Slay never raised any concerns with her, or the [REDACTED]. Witness A had explained to the panel that Pupil A had known [REDACTED], and as such, it was important to log any concerns via CPOMS so that those supporting Pupil A were aware and so that additional support could be given. During her disciplinary interview, Miss Slay was asked if she referred Pupil A to the [REDACTED]. In response to this, Miss Slay stated: "Yes, I remember referring her to Individual B [REDACTED]". During her oral evidence, Witness A explained that Individual B [REDACTED]. Witness A stated that Individual B could not recall any referral being made to her, and there was no record of a referral via CPOMS.

In respect of concerns raised by Pupil B regarding their [REDACTED], Pupil B stated in their interview at the School that [REDACTED]. Despite this, Witness A confirmed that Miss Slay never logged any concerns regarding Pupil B's [REDACTED] via CPOMS. Witness A also stated that she was [REDACTED] at the time, and Miss Slay never raised any concerns with her, or the [REDACTED]. Miss Slay was also asked during her disciplinary interview whether she referred Pupil B to the [REDACTED], made any CPOMS referrals or spoke to Pupil B's [REDACTED]. In response, Miss Slay stated: "No". Witness A had explained to the panel that Pupil B had [REDACTED] which were

known to the School, and as such, it was important to log any concerns via CPOMS so that those supporting Pupil B were aware and so that additional support could be given.

In respect of concerns raised regarding Pupil C's wellbeing, the panel had sight of an email from Miss Slay's school email account to Pupil C's school email account dated 21 January 2022 at 19:10, which stated:

"I know that you have SO much on your plate currently, [REDACTED]. I want you to just remember to take one moment at a time - take one step at a time.

I know that it hasn't been easy, I know. I also know you have been putting on a brave face for the past couple of days now and holding a lot in. I can't imagine the stress you are feeling or the emotions you are feeling, however please continue to write, continue to take one baby step at a time."

However, despite this, Witness A confirmed that Miss Slay never logged any concerns regarding Pupil C's wellbeing via CPOMS. Witness A also stated that she was [REDACTED] at the time, and Miss Slay never raised any concerns with her, or the [REDACTED]. Witness A had stated to the panel that Pupil C was not previously known to be [REDACTED], and so it was important to have logged these initial concerns via CPOMS so that the School could determine what level of support was needed.

In respect of concerns regarding Pupil H's [REDACTED], Pupil H stated during their interview at the School that Miss Slay had picked up that [REDACTED]. Pupil H also stated: "[REDACTED], it would be with Miss Slay". Despite this, Witness A confirmed that Miss Slay never logged any concerns regarding Pupil H's [REDACTED] via CPOMS. Witness A also stated that she was [REDACTED] at the time, and Miss Slay never raised any concerns with her, or the [REDACTED]. [REDACTED]. Therefore, it was important for Miss Slay to log any concerns raised regarding Pupil H's [REDACTED] via CPOMS, so that those supporting Pupil H were aware and could offer additional support where needed. [REDACTED].

In respect of concerns regarding Pupil I's [REDACTED], the panel had sight of an email from Pupil I to Miss Slay dated 25 June 2022, which stated: "[REDACTED] ...". In response to this, Miss Slay stated: "I have been feeling exactly the same to be completely honest". Within Witness A's witness statement, she also stated that she had seen an email from Miss Slay to Pupil I, which stated:

"I know that you are [REDACTED], and that is your choice. But I needed you to realise that teachers are not a punching bag, your actions have an impact on us and this once, you have left a very poor impact. I know that [REDACTED] in a lot of aspects of your world right now... all my efforts until now was to help you cope with that, but as I have said you are doing things to [REDACTED]. It is a real shame and I can't even comprehend the disappointment I am feeling".

The panel found it was explicit from these emails that Pupil I was [REDACTED], and Miss Slay was aware of this. Despite this, Witness A confirmed that Miss Slay never logged any concerns regarding Pupil I's [REDACTED] via CPOMS. Witness A also stated that she was [REDACTED] at the time, and Miss Slay never raised any concerns with her, or the [REDACTED].

In respect of concerns regarding Pupil J's [REDACTED], the panel had sight of an email from Pupil J to Miss Slay dated 3 March 2022, which stated: "[REDACTED]. thank you though honestly, it means a lot i can still confide in you!". Miss Slay's response to this email included: "Of course you can still confide in me". It was clear from this email exchange that Pupil J was [REDACTED], and that Miss Slay was aware of this. Despite this, Witness A confirmed that Miss Slay never logged any concerns regarding Pupil J's [REDACTED] via CPOMS. Witness A also stated that she was [REDACTED] at the time, and Miss Slay never raised any concerns with her, or the [REDACTED].

Overall, the panel found that Miss Slay was aware of all of the safeguarding concerns set out in Schedule F, and despite this, she did not make any referral via CPOMS, to the [REDACTED] or to the [REDACTED].

The panel also had sight of the School's Safeguarding Policy, which stated that: "In all cases, whether working from home or in school, you must report any concerns immediately to your DSL, DDSL or the Trust DSL. If you have access you must also record the incident as quickly as possible on CPOMS." The panel had sight of Miss Slay's training record which showed that Miss Slay had read and signed this policy. Miss Slay was therefore aware of her obligations in respect of reporting safeguarding concerns, and despite this, she failed to do so.

The panel found this allegation proven.

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

Having found all of the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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

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

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Miss Slay, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher’s professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils’ well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach
- 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 Miss Slay, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education (“KCSIE”). The panel considered that Miss Slay was in breach of the following provisions:

- Paragraph 13 (KCISE 2019): “Staff must know the school’s safeguarding systems, including the staff behaviour policy / code of conduct”;
- Paragraphs 35-40 (KCISE 2019): “When concerned about a child’s welfare, staff should act immediately and speak to the DSL or deputy”;
- Paragraphs 48-49 (KSCIE 2019), paragraphs 71-73 (KSCIE 2021) and paragraphs 68-70 (KSCIE 2022): “All concerns, discussions and decisions should be recorded in writing; poor practice includes failing to act, refer or keep proper records”;
- Paragraph 99 (KCSIE 2019): “Safeguarding decisions should take account of the child’s wishes and feelings, and systems should operate with the child’s best interests at heart”;
- Paragraph 45 (KCSIE 2021): “If staff have a mental health concern about a child that is also a safeguarding concern, immediate action should be taken and the DSL or deputy told”; and
- Paragraphs 55-60 (KSCIE 2021) and paragraphs 51-55 (KCSIE 2022): “Staff should act in the child’s best interests, act immediately, follow the child protection policy and speak to the DSL or deputy”.

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

The panel also considered whether Miss Slay's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

The Advice indicates that where behaviours associated with such an offence exist, a panel is likely to conclude that an individual's conduct would amount to unacceptable professional conduct. The panel found that none of these offences were relevant.

The panel noted that the majority of emails which were exchanged between Miss Slay and pupils took place within the education setting, using their school email accounts. However, the panel noted that there were also certain text messages exchanged between Miss Slay and Pupil A relevant to allegations 2(a) and 2(d), which took place outside the education setting. The panel found that Miss Slay's conduct affected the way that she fulfilled her teaching role. In particular, the panel noted that Miss Slay was still in a position of trust as a teacher at the time of sending these text messages, and that she still sent a high volume of inappropriate text messages to a child. The panel also found that Miss Slay's conduct may have led to pupils being exposed to, or influenced by, the behaviour in a harmful way. In particular, the panel noted that the text messages that Miss Slay exchanged with Pupil A outside of the education setting were highly inappropriate, such as referring to "intimacy", and also distressing, as they referred to Miss Slay suffering serious injuries whilst in a conflict. The panel found that this conduct did expose both Pupil A and Pupil B to harm as it caused them stress and worry.

The panel also found the messages that were exchanged within the education setting to be harmful to pupils, given their over-familiar nature. The panel found these messages to be wholly inappropriate and that Miss Slay's conduct allowed her to develop inappropriate relationships with pupils which were more akin to a friendship. The panel noted that Miss Slay's conduct included communicating with [REDACTED], who were placed at risk as a result of Miss Slay's conduct and her failure to report safeguarding concerns. The panel also noted that Miss Slay's conduct took place over at least a couple of years, and involved a significant number of inappropriate messages to multiple children.

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

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Miss Slay was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Miss Slay's actions amounted to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, the panel took into account the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. It considered the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel also took account of the uniquely influential role

that teachers can hold in pupils' lives and the fact that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way that they behave.

In considering the issue of disrepute, the panel also considered whether Miss Slay's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice. As set out above in the panel's findings as to whether Miss Slay was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that none of these offences were relevant.

The panel noted that the majority of emails which were exchanged between Miss Slay and pupils took place within the education setting, using their school email accounts. However, the panel noted that there were also certain text messages exchanged between Miss Slay and Pupil A in respect of allegations 2(a) and 2(d), which took place outside the education setting. The panel considered the findings of misconduct to be serious, and found that the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher.

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

For these reasons, the panel found that Miss Slay's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be made, the panel had to consider whether it would be an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it would be in the public interest to do so. Prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely: the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, the protection of other members of the public, 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 inappropriate relationships with children and multiple failures to report safeguarding concerns relating to one or more pupils.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Miss Slay 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 Miss Slay 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 Miss Slay in the profession. Whilst there was some evidence that Miss Slay had ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Miss Slay in the profession, since her behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.

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

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

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

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- 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; and
- 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).

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.

Miss Slay's actions were deliberate. There was no evidence to suggest that Miss Slay was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation.

The panel noted that during her disciplinary interview, Miss Slay provided details of her personal circumstances and [REDACTED] that she was experiencing at the time of the allegations. In particular, when asked about her giving Pupil A her personal mobile phone number, Miss Slay stated:

"I guess this is around July. [REDACTED]. It goes back to covid. When we were asked to come back in and act normal, I realise I was struggling. I remember my workload increased – I was mentoring 5 people (4 pre- ITTs + 1 SCITT). I did the best I could. I wasn't able to see my family for 3.5 years due to Australia's strict regime. Work was an escape. The lack of immediate support meant I had to manage alone. The only person who knew all about this was [REDACTED]. She understood me as a person. Covid was a difficult time as I had been wanting to go to Australia. Around this time, [REDACTED] said she would be leaving – I pulled her aside and said if you are leaving, please tell me in advance so I can adjust. She did tell me in advance. Then [REDACTED] said she was leaving. These were important colleagues. I felt inadequate about my SCITT monitoring – I had 2 – [REDACTED]. I tried to encourage him to complete the term but he left. I was worried I hadn't done enough. [REDACTED] reassured me. Around this time the other SCITT said he was leaving – he personally phoned me as he said he respected me. I said I was sad he was leaving as he was good with maths. Then I had a [REDACTED] from a [REDACTED]. I felt he wouldn't enjoy EEH. He would send lesson plans at 7am in the morning –I answered emails over the weekends. Then one lesson – he hadn't planned enough – he had sent me the lesson at 8.15am – I said I don't have time – he finished the lesson at 2.15pm and was going to dismiss the students 10 mins early. I said you can't do that. Another time, I checked up on him – [REDACTED] – he just didn't come back. He claimed he hadn't been supported. [REDACTED] confirmed this was rubbish. 2 staff members said, 'who will you scare away next?'"

The panel had also heard from Witness A that the School were aware of some of these issues. In particular, Witness A stated that the School was providing [REDACTED] to Miss Slay. Witness A also explained that, the reference to Miss Slay mentoring a "SCITT" and "pre-ITTs" was to Miss Slay [REDACTED] who may want to be a maths tutor, and had come into the School during the summer to shadow teachers. Witness A explained that Miss Slay was responsible for putting that timetable together, but she had shared

with the [REDACTED] that she had struggled with it, and as a result another staff member took over. Witness A also explained that during Covid when the School started to teach lessons online, Miss Slay was a teacher that the School was worried would [REDACTED] outside of school and outside of her routine. As a result, Witness A explained that Miss Slay was offered additional support and was permitted to go into the School to do lessons or to be in a key worker bubble.

During her disciplinary interview, Miss Slay also provided the following details of her [REDACTED]:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED].

Whilst the panel noted that Miss Slay did struggle as a result of Covid and was isolated from her family, [REDACTED], and that this likely affected Miss Slay's professional judgment, Miss Slay still knew what she was doing and deliberately initiated inappropriate communications and developed inappropriate relationships with several pupils.

The panel did not have sight of any good character evidence or references within the hearing bundle. However, the panel did hear some good character evidence from Witness A. Witness A stated that she knew Miss Slay very well at the School, as she was Head of Year when Miss Slay first started at the School and then became Miss Slay's [REDACTED] when Miss Slay became Head of Year in May 2023. Witness A explained that, following a brief period of struggle with understanding the curriculum and lesson planning (for which she was provided with support), Miss Slay started to "find her feet and build relationships with classes". Witness A stated that Miss Slay "understood where her line was", was "very black and white" and was "very quick to put a name on the board". Prior to the alleged events, Witness A explained that Miss Slay had "really understood rules and boundaries" and she demonstrated "rule orientated behaviour management". Witness A stated that this is why she found the messages sent by Miss Slay to pupils to be "bizarre".

Witness A also explained that Miss Slay had built "positive", and what she thought were "healthy" relationships with her classes, and that she was clearly "a teacher who wanted the best for her pupils". Witness A explained that Miss Slay taught a Year 11 class which was on the boundary of passing their exams, and that Miss Slay put "so much time into making sure that each child had the right materials", and she "really believed in them". As a result, Witness A stated that when she initially viewed the messages sent to pupils by Miss Slay, she had tried to give her "the benefit of the doubt" as she thought Miss Slay was trying to do her best for these pupils. However, Witness A explained that as she reviewed more of the messages, she could "no longer give her the benefit of the doubt" as they were "so clearly inappropriate, unprofessional and manipulative".

In respect of Miss Slay's wider contributions to the School, Witness A explained that Miss Slay ran a maths' club, where students would drop in if needed, and she attended a shadowing programme where she worked alongside an existing [REDACTED] to gain a better appreciation of the role.

Whilst the panel noted that Miss Slay had a previously good history and was a good teacher, the evidence was not strong enough to suggest that she had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both her personal and professional conduct, or that she had contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel did not have sight of any evidence that showed Miss Slay was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings and/or warnings.

The panel considered Miss Slay's level of insight and remorse. The panel noted that Miss Slay fully cooperated with the School's investigation and disciplinary process, and that during her disciplinary interview, she was upfront about her conduct. The panel also noted that Miss Slay expressed remorse during her disciplinary interview. In particular, she stated: "I am sorry for everything I have done. It was not my intention to harm or cause them stress. I wish I had had the courage and capacity to say how I was feeling." However, as Miss Slay had not engaged with these proceedings, the panel did not have sight of any further evidence and was unable to determine Miss Slay's current level of insight and/or remorse. The panel also did not have sight of any evidence to demonstrate any steps that Miss Slay had taken [REDACTED] to learn from her behaviour.

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 Miss Slay 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 Miss Slay. The fact that Miss Slay had developed inappropriate relationships with a number of children, by way of sending highly inappropriate and unprofessional communications, and that she had failed to report multiple safeguarding concerns regarding [REDACTED], 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 considered that, whilst Miss Slay's misconduct was serious and caused harm to pupils, [REDACTED] contributed to her behaviour whereby she found herself in a [REDACTED] and developed an over-reliance upon pupils. The panel found that, having a review period would allow Miss Slay to take some time [REDACTED] to address and learn from her behaviour, and to demonstrate such steps taken to a future panel if she wished to do so. The panel considered the length of time that had passed since the allegations came to light in August 2023, and noted that a shorter review period was appropriate in order to avoid a sanction being overly punitive.

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. The panel recommended a review period of 2 years.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

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

In this case, the panel has found all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Miss Alexandra Slay should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of 2 years.

In particular, the panel has found that Miss Slay is in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher’s professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils’ well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach
- 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 Miss Slay involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE).

The panel has found that the conduct of Miss Slay fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include findings of developing inappropriate relationships with pupils and failing to report safeguarding concerns.

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

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children and safeguard pupils. The panel has observed:

“There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of inappropriate relationships

with children and multiple failures to report safeguarding concerns relating to one or more pupils.”

A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel’s comments on insight and remorse, which the panel has set out as follows:

“The panel considered Miss Slay’s level of insight and remorse. The panel noted that Miss Slay fully cooperated with the School’s investigation and disciplinary process, and that during her disciplinary interview, she was upfront about her conduct. The panel also noted that Miss Slay expressed remorse during her disciplinary interview. In particular, she stated: “I am sorry for everything I have done. It was not my intention to harm or cause them stress. I wish I had had the courage and capacity to say how I was feeling.” However, as Miss Slay had not engaged with these proceedings, the panel did not have sight of any further evidence and was unable to determine Miss Slay’s current level of insight and/or remorse. The panel also did not have sight of any evidence to demonstrate any steps that Miss Slay had taken [REDACTED] to learn from her behaviour.”

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

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel has observed:

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

I am particularly mindful of the finding of communicating with [REDACTED], who were placed at risk as a result of Miss Slay’s conduct and her failure to report safeguarding concerns, in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

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

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, in the absence of a

prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Miss Slay herself. The panel has commented:

“Whilst the panel noted that Miss Slay had a previously good history and was a good teacher, the evidence was not strong enough to suggest that she had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both her personal and professional conduct, or that she had contributed significantly to the education sector.”

A prohibition order would prevent Miss Slay 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 seriousness of the misconduct. The panel has said:

“The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Miss Slay. The fact that Miss Slay had developed inappropriate relationships with a number of children, by way of sending highly inappropriate and unprofessional communications, and that she had failed to report multiple safeguarding concerns regarding [REDACTED], were significant factors in forming that opinion.”

I have also taken account of the panel’s findings that Miss Slay’s actions were deliberate and that there was no evidence to suggest that she was acting under extreme duress. The panel has noted the information that Miss Slay provided, during the school disciplinary interview, about the personal circumstances that she was experiencing at the time of the allegations. The panel has commented:

“Whilst the panel noted that Miss Slay did struggle as a result of Covid and was isolated from her family, [REDACTED], and that this likely affected Miss Slay’s professional judgment, Miss Slay still knew what she was doing and deliberately initiated inappropriate communications and developed inappropriate relationships with several pupils.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the panel’s finding that there was limited evidence as to Miss Slay’s insight into, and remorse for, her actions

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Miss Slay 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 evidence of full insight

and remorse, 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 2-year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments:

“The panel considered that, whilst Miss Slay's misconduct was serious and caused harm to pupils, [REDACTED] contributed to her behaviour whereby she found herself in a [REDACTED] and developed an over-reliance upon pupils. The panel found that, having a review period would allow Miss Slay to take some time [REDACTED] to address and learn from her behaviour, and to demonstrate such steps taken to a future panel if she wished to do so. The panel considered the length of time that had passed since the allegations came to light in August 2023, and noted that a shorter review period was appropriate in order to avoid a sanction being overly punitive.”

I have considered whether a 2-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 I agree with the panel that allowing a 2-year review period is sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are serious nature of the misconduct found as well as the lack of evidence of full insight and remorse and the risk this creates of repetition.

I have decided that a 2-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.

This means that Miss Alexandra Slay 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 21 April 2028, 2 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, Miss Slay remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

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

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D Oatley', written in a cursive style.

Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 13 April 2026

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