



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Samuel Eady: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

April 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	10
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	14

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

Teacher:	Mr Samuel Eady
Teacher ref number:	2063566
Teacher date of birth:	20 January 1995
TRA reference:	24657
Date of determination:	27 April 2026
Former employer:	Vale of York Academy, York

Introduction

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

The panel members were Mrs Melissa West (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Scott Evans (lay panellist) and Mr Terry Hyde (former teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Jermel Anderson of Blake Morgan Solicitors.

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

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 13 April 2026.

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

1. On or around 24 June 2024, he was convicted of intentionally touching a woman aged 16 or over and that touching was sexual when she did not consent, and he did not reasonably believe that she was consenting contrary to the Sexual Offences Act 2003 s3.

It was alleged that he was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that whilst working as a Teacher of Mathematics at Vale of York Academy:

2. Between on or around October 2022 and 7 May 2024, he failed to inform his employer, in accordance with relevant school policies, that there was a criminal investigation into his conduct.
3. His conduct at paragraph 2 above:
 - a. was dishonest;
 - b. lacked integrity.

Mr Eady made full admissions to the allegations as set out in the statement of agreed facts.

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 3 to 5

Section 2: Notice of hearing and response – pages 6 to 15

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts – pages 16 to 19

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 20 to 189

Section 5: Teacher documents – page 190

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the hearing. In addition to the contents within the bundle, all members of the panel confirmed that they had also listened to the recording of Mr Eady's police interview which was provided to them by the TRA.

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

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Samuel Eady on 8 March 2026.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

In advance of the meeting the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Samuel Eady for the allegations to be considered without a hearing. The panel had the ability to direct that the case be considered at a hearing if required in the interests of justice or in the public interest. The panel did not determine that such a direction was necessary or appropriate in this case.

Mr Eady commenced employed at the Vale of York Academy ("The Academy") on 1 September 2021. On 15 October 2022, an incident occurred leading to a police investigation into Mr Eady's conduct. At this point he did not inform The Academy. He was subsequently charged on 24 April 2024. On 7 May 2024, he notified The Academy of the charge, after which he was suspended; The Academy then began its own investigation. Mr Eady attended Bromley Magistrates' Court on 24 June 2024 and entered a plea of guilty to the offence, he resigned from his role at The Academy at the same date. He was then sentenced on 26 July 2024. The Academy continued its disciplinary process, concluding on 1 September 2024, it then referred Mr Eady to the TRA on 4 November 2024.

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:

You have been convicted of a relevant offence at any time that:

- 1. On or around 24 June 2024, you were convicted of intentionally touching a woman aged 16 or over and that touching was sexual when she did not consent and you did not reasonably believe that she was consenting contrary to the Sexual Offences Act 2003 s3.**

The panel was satisfied that it had sight of a certificate of conviction, demonstrating that Mr Eady was convicted on 24 June 2024 of the offence as alleged. It considered that this was conclusive proof of the commission of the offence. Additionally, it noted that the allegation was admitted in full.

The panel accordingly found Allegation 1 proved.

You are guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that whilst working as a Teacher of Mathematics at Vale of York Academy:

- 2. Between on or around October 2022 and 7 May 2024, you failed to inform your employer, in accordance with relevant school policies, that there was a criminal investigation into your conduct.**

The panel noted that Mr Eady had made a full admission to this allegation and confirmed that he had not declared the police investigation to The Academy prior to 7 May 2024. It also was satisfied that it had sight of the record of The Academy's investigation, whereby Mr Eady acknowledged that he should have made a declaration and had chosen not to. Additionally, it had consideration of the school policy, which indicated that employees were obliged to inform The Academy of an arrest or investigation in a timely manner.

The panel accordingly found Allegation 2 proved.

- 3. Your conduct at paragraph 2 above:**

- a. was dishonest;**

When considering the question of dishonesty, the panel was careful to consider the test as found within the paragraph 74 of the decision *Ivey v Genting Casinos* [2017] UKSC 67. It accordingly first explored Mr Eady's knowledge or belief as to facts when considering his decision to not declare the criminal investigation to The Academy. It was considered notable by the panel, that by his own admission, Mr Eady "should have said something earlier", and had failed to do so. It additionally had regard to the fact that within the notes of the school's investigation report that had been provided to it, it had sight of Mr Eady stating that he had not made a prior declaration as if he had done so "that is my job is gone". It accordingly determined that it could draw the inference that Mr Eady's knowledge and belief as to the facts during the relevant period, was that he knew he was being dishonest, and that he had intentionally acted in a dishonest manner to protect his career. The panel then went on to consider the

question of dishonesty when considered by the standards of ordinary decent people. The panel determined that ordinary decent people would consider a situation where a teacher had knowingly deceived his employer as to the fact that he faced a serious criminal investigation, seemingly influenced by the fear of losing his role, would be construed to be dishonest.

The panel therefore found Allegation 3a proved.

b. lacked integrity.

The panel had regard to the decision of *Wingate & Anor v The Solicitors Regulation Authority* [2018] EWCA Civ 366, when considering the question of integrity. It was careful to ensure that it did not impose unrealistically high standards with regard to the expected conduct of Mr Eady, and was careful to approach the question, in the knowledge that he was not expected to be a paragon of virtue. The panel however noted that by its own findings, and by his own admissions, Mr Eady had acted in a dishonest manner to protect his career. It considered that this was indicative of a significant departure from the ethical and professional standards that he was expected to adhere to, and that such a finding, was therefore indicative of a lack of integrity. Teachers are expected to engage in their profession in a transparent and honest manner, and Mr Eady's behaviour was contrary to this expectation.

The panel accordingly found Allegation 3b proved.

Findings as to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and/or conviction of a relevant offence

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 and/or a conviction for a relevant offence.

Unacceptable professional conduct

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

The panel first considered whether the conduct of Mr Eady, in relation to the facts found proved at Allegation 2 and Allegation 3, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

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

- 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 not satisfied that the conduct of Mr Eady, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education (“KCSIE”).

Additionally, the panel was not satisfied that the conduct of Mr Eady, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Working Together to Safeguard Children.

The panel also considered whether Mr Eady’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 the offence of fraud or serious dishonesty was relevant.

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

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mr Eady was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

Conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute

In relation to whether Mr Eady’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 Mr Eady’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 Mr Eady was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found that the offence of fraud and serious dishonesty was relevant.

The panel considered that Mr Eady’s conduct could potentially damage the public’s perception of a teacher. It noted that he was under an obligation to disclose a criminal

investigation and had not done so, and it noted that the potential impact of this dishonesty was aggravated by the nature of the conviction.

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

Conviction of a relevant offence

The panel first considered whether the conduct of Mr Eady in relation to the facts found proved in relation to Allegation 1, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Eady 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
 - not undermining fundamental British values..., the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect

The panel noted that Mr Eady's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting. It considered that members of the public would expect teachers to respect rights and the dignity of others at all times. It also considered that the nature of the offending would draw some concern, though it acknowledged that the offence did not concern a young person or child.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety and/or security of members of the public.

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

The panel also had regard to the fact that Mr Eady was given notification requirements by order of the court for a period of 5 years, which was indicative of the nature of the offence.

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

This was a case concerning an offence involving sexual activity which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel took into account that Mr Eady reported that he was highly intoxicated at the time of the alleged incident and that he had no recollection of it, it however considered that these facts were limited in their ability to mitigate the conduct in the circumstances. It

also acknowledged the fact that Mr Eady had apologised to Person A, the victim of the assault, the day after the incident, that he had been wholly cooperative with the police investigation, and that he had entered a guilty plea at the first opportunity. It however also noted that it had sight of the supplementary statement of Person A, which stated that she had suffered “physical and mental symptoms following the offence” and that she had taken some time to “come to terms” with the assault.

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

Panel’s recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel’s findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct, conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and a conviction of a relevant offence, it was necessary for it 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 and the protection of other members of the public
- the maintenance of public confidence in the profession
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct .

In the light of the panel’s findings against Mr Eady, which involved the dishonest non-disclosure of a police investigation into a serious allegation, there was a strong public interest consideration in relation to all of the above.

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public, given the nature of the conviction that Mr Eady received and also that he had withheld his knowledge of the investigation from The Academy for a significant period of time.

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

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Mr Eady was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

In addition to the public interest considerations set out above, the panel went on to consider whether there was a public interest in retaining Mr Eady in the profession.

The panel decided that there was a limited public interest consideration in retaining Mr Eady in the profession, it noted that no doubt had been cast upon his abilities as an educator and therefore he is likely able to make a valuable contribution to the profession. It however noted that it could only determine that any public interest in retaining him in the profession was minimal, given the limited information that had been provided to it and also, due to the fact that Mr Eady had not spent long within the teaching profession.

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 Mr Eady.

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

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of the Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures;
- sexual misconduct,
- dishonesty and a lack of integrity

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.

In the light of the panel's findings, it considered that it had seen no evidence that Mr Eady's actions were not deliberate. It noted that he had referred to being heavily intoxicated during the incident that led to his conviction, however it did not consider this meant that his actions were accidental.

The panel also saw no evidence that Mr Eady was acting under duress.

The panel noted that Mr Eady did have a previously good history, however it was unable to comment further with regard to his contributions to the education sector, having been provided with limited information in this regard.

The panel also considered that Mr Eady was remorseful and that his remorse was reflected in the fact that he had apologised to Person A the day after the incident. He also appeared remorseful within his communications with the TRA that it had seen, noting that he stated that he "should never work in teaching again" in an email. The panel considered that this was reflective of him having some limited insight.

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

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

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Eady. The nature of the conviction that he received, and his dishonest conduct 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 panel noted that the conviction pertained to an incident of sexual touching, it however did not consider that this was concordant with the characteristic of “serious sexual misconduct” as found within the Advice. Notably, Mr Eady received a community order, which was in the lowest range of potential sentences for the offence which was therefore indicative of his conduct not reaching the very high level of seriousness. It also considered that the context was relevant; whilst the conduct that led to his conviction was inexcusable, it amounted to a single instance of touching, whilst he was intoxicated and outside of the education environment, at a party. It accordingly did not consider that the necessary threshold had been reached.

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.

One of these is:

- fraud or serious dishonesty;

The panel noted that as with its previous findings, Mr Eady’s conduct did amount to fraud or serious dishonesty. It however was sure to consider the question of dishonesty in a nuanced manner. It determined that the dishonesty was neither at the highest end of the spectrum, nor the lowest, and considered it to be a moderate level of dishonesty, because it went on for an extended period of time. It also considered that the fact that Mr Eady subsequently made full and frank admissions after being charged by the police, was further indication that this was a moderate level of dishonesty, rather than being towards the more serious end of the spectrum.

As above, the panel noted that Mr Eady had shown some limited insight into his actions, though it considered that his insight was not yet fully-formed as he did not appear to properly appreciate the impact of his actions. It also again took his remorse and apologetic nature into consideration. In the circumstances, it did not consider that there was a serious risk of repetition in relation to Mr Eady’s conduct, but that further reflection appeared necessary for him to properly recognise the severity of his conduct and its impact upon others.

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 considered that a review period of 5 years was appropriate and proportionate in the circumstances. It noted that whilst Mr Eady had shown some insight, a review period of 5 years would properly reflect the lack of consideration that had been

demonstrated. It additionally considered that a review period of 5 years was proportionate to address the concerns pertaining to Mr Eady's conviction for a sexual offence, and also, his moderate level of dishonesty.

The panel accordingly makes a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order be imposed, with a provision that it may not be reviewed for 5 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, conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and a relevant conviction.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Samuel Eady should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of five years.

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

- 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.
- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - not undermining fundamental British values..., the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect

The panel finds that the conduct of Mr Eady fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of a conviction of a sexual offence, and also that he was subsequently dishonest with his employer.

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, conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, and relevant conviction, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Mr Eady, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, *“The panel noted that Mr Eady’s actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting”* and that *“The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety and/or security of members of the public.”*

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

I have also taken into account the panel’s comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, *“The panel also considered that Mr Eady was remorseful and that his remorse was reflected in the fact that he had apologised to Person A the day after the incident. He also appeared remorseful within his communications with the TRA that it had seen, noting that he stated that he “should never work in teaching again” in an email. The panel considered that this was reflective of him having some limited insight.”*

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

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, *“The panel considered that Mr Eady’s behaviour in committing the offence could affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community.”* I am particularly mindful of the findings of dishonesty and a conviction of a sexual offence 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, conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, and a relevant conviction, in

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

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mr Eady himself. The panel comment *“The panel noted that Mr Eady did have a previously good history, however it was unable to comment further with regard to his contributions to the education sector, having been provided with limited information in this regard.”*

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel's comments concerning the lack of full insight or remorse.

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that Mr Eady was dishonest with his employer by not informing them he was subject of a police investigation.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Eady 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 full remorse or insight, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

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

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

I have considered the panel's comments,

“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 panel noted that the conviction pertained to an incident of sexual touching, it however did not consider that this was concordant with the characteristic of "serious sexual misconduct" as found within the Advice. Notably, Mr Eady received a community order, which was in the lowest range of potential sentences for the offence which was therefore indicative of his conduct not reaching the very high level of seriousness. It also considered that the context was relevant; whilst the conduct that led to his conviction was inexcusable, it amounted to a single instance of touching, whilst he was intoxicated and outside of the education environment, at a party. It accordingly did not consider that the necessary threshold had been reached."

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.

One of these is:

- *fraud or serious dishonesty;"*

The panel has also said that a five-year review period "...was appropriate and proportionate in the circumstances. It noted that whilst Mr Eady had shown some insight, a review period of 5 years would properly reflect the lack of consideration that had been demonstrated. It additionally considered that a review period of 5 years was proportionate to address the concerns pertaining to Mr Eady's conviction for a sexual offence, and also, his moderate level of dishonesty."

I have considered whether a five-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. I am of the view that the factors in this case mean that a five-year review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the seriousness of the conduct, the finding of dishonesty and the lack of full insight and remorse.

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

This means that Mr Samuel Eady is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. He may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 7 May 2034, eight years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If he does apply, a panel will meet

to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Mr Eady remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

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

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "S. Blomfield".

Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield

Date: 29 April 2026

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