



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Timothy Price: Professional conduct panel hearing outcome**

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

**May 2026**

## Contents

Contents	2
Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	15
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	19

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

**Teacher:** Mr Timothy Price

**Teacher ref number:** 1155433

**Teacher date of birth:** 10 November 1988

**TRA reference:** 24432

**Date of determination:** 7 May 2026

**Former employer:** Westfield Primary School, Cottingham

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 5 to 7 May 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Timothy Price.

The panel members were Mrs Joanne Arscott (teacher panellist - in the chair), Mr Peter Ward (lay panellist), and Mrs Hannah Longley (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Nicholas West of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr James Lloyd of Mountford Chambers instructed by Brabners Solicitors.

Mr Price was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

## **Allegations**

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Hearing dated 20 January 2026 as amended at the start of the hearing.

It was alleged that Mr Price was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that, while a teacher at Westfield Primary School ('the School') it was discovered that:

1. On or around 14 November 2014 he submitted an application to work at Archbishop Sentamu Academy within which he claimed that he had worked at Winstanley Community College from September 2014, when he knew that he started work at Winstanley Community College on 27 October 2014.
2. Between November 2014 and 22 April 2015 he claimed to Archbishop Sentamu Academy that he had completed one term of Newly Qualified Teacher induction at Winstanley Community College, when he knew this was not accurate.
3. On a date prior to September 2016 he submitted an application to the School within which he:
  - a) Claimed to have worked at Winstanley Community College from 1 September 2014 to 31 December 2014, when he knew these dates of employment were not accurate.
  - b) Claimed that he left a role at Winstanley Community College due to the end of a fixed term contract, when he knew this was not accurate.
  - c) Claimed that he left a role at Archbishop Sentamu Academy due to the end of a fixed term contract, when he knew he had been dismissed.
  - d) Failed to disclose that he had worked at Dunswell School, when he knew he had worked at Dunswell School.
4. His actions as described at paragraph 1 and/or 2 and/or 3 above were dishonest.

Mr Price denied the facts of the allegations as set out in the response to the Notice of Hearing dated 2 March 2026.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section A: Notice of Hearing– pages 3 to 17

Section B: TRA witness evidence – pages 18 to 86

Section C: TRA documents – pages 87 to 167

Section D: Documents from the teacher – pages 168 to 171

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

- A one page handwritten resignation letter from Mr Price dated 3 October 2014 which was added to the bundle as page 172.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the hearing and the additional document that the panel decided to admit.

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

## **Witnesses**

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

Witness A – [REDACTED]

Witness B – [REDACTED]

Witness C – [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.

On 27 October 2014, Mr Price commenced employment at Winstanley Community College ('Winstanley') as a Newly Qualified Teacher ('NQT'). His employment with Winstanley ended on 30 November 2014.

On or around 14 November 2014, Mr Price submitted an application to Archbishop Sentamu Academy ("ASA") in which he claimed that he had been working at Winstanley since September 2014 and that he had completed one full term of NQT induction at Winstanley.

On 1 January 2015, Mr Price commenced employment at ASA, following an offer of appointment dated 5 December 2014.

On 12 May 2015, Mr Price was dismissed from his post at ASA for gross misconduct.

At a later date, prior to September 2016, Mr Price submitted an application to Westfield Primary School (“the School”), within which he claimed that he had worked at Winstanley from September 2014 to 31 December 2014, and that he had left that role due to the expiry of a fixed-term contract. In the same application, Mr Price also claimed that he had left his employment at ASA due to the end of a fixed-term contract and he failed to disclose that he had worked at Dunswell School.

On 20 September 2024, a referral was made 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. On or around 14 November 2014 you submitted an application to work at Archbishop Sentamu Academy within which you claimed that you had worked at Winstanley Community College from September 2014, when you knew that you started work at Winstanley Community College on 27 October 2014.**

The panel noted that Mr Price denied allegation 1.

The panel had sight of Mr Price’s application form to ASA dated 14 November 2014. On the first page of the application form Mr Price stated that his appointment to Winstanley Community College (‘Winstanley’) was in “Sep 2014” which the panel understood to mean September 2014.

The panel noted a contemporaneous offer of appointment letter from Individual A, [REDACTED], dated 30 September 2014 confirming “Your contract will commence on 27<sup>th</sup> October 2014”. The panel further noted an email from Individual B, [REDACTED], dated 15 April 2015 which stated, “Tim Price started on 27<sup>th</sup> October and left on 30<sup>th</sup> November 2014”.

The panel also considered a contemporaneous document titled “Appointment sheet 2014-2015 – Newly Qualified Teacher” which was signed and dated on behalf of Winstanley on 5 November 2014 and stated that Mr Price started as an NQT at Winstanley on 27 October 2014.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Witness A, [REDACTED]. Witness A confirmed that ASA is one of the schools operated by Heartwood Learning Trust and she [REDACTED] during Mr Price's employment at ASA.

In November 2014, Witness A was asked to be the designated Safer Recruitment trained panel member at a job interview with Mr Price. Mr Price was subsequently offered the role of an NQT of Leisure and Tourism and Geography with effect from 1 January 2015.

In March 2015, during a personnel files audit, Witness A submitted that it was noted that one of Mr Price's references was missing. This was re-requested and the reference provided stated Mr Price had been employed at his previous school, Winstanley, from 27 October 2014, whereas Mr Price had claimed on his application form that his employment with Winstanley commenced in September 2014.

Following preliminary enquiries with Mr Price, ASA conducted a full investigation into the reason for the discrepancy. Mr Price initially provided an explanation by email to Witness A stating, "This should have been wrote as 'Oct 2014'. This was made in error and I apologise for the error when I completed the form. This application was wrote at night after a day at school and the information in the application form is of similar nature to that of other application forms so becomes habitual to write and this is when errors can be made".

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Witness C, [REDACTED]. Witness C was not employed at Winstanley during Mr Price's period of employment but stated that he authorised Winstanley's IT department to check their records to confirm if there were any records relating to Mr Price's employment. Witness C confirmed a record was found of Mr Price being appointed as an NQT from 27 October 2014. During his oral evidence Witness C confirmed that this record was extracted from Winstanley's School Information Management System (SIMS) which was the "school system for recording all staff details" at the time of Mr Price's employment.

The panel considered Mr Price's written representations dated 22 April 2025 from his representative at NASUWT. This stated, "Mr Price has previously submitted information from Teachers Pensions...that provides evidence that he was employed at Winstanley Community College and employer pension contributions were made to the TP scheme from 27/10/14 to 31/11/14. Mr Price is adamant that he worked at the College until December 2014". The panel did not have sight of any documentary evidence regarding the alleged employer pension contributions and therefore did not give any weight to Mr Price's representations.

Based on all of the available evidence, the panel considered, on the balance of probabilities, that Mr Price knew that he started work at Winstanley on 27 October 2014 and the information he included in his application to ASA which claimed that he had

worked at Winstanley from September 2014 was incorrect. The panel therefore found allegation 1 proven.

- 2. Between November 2014 and 22 April 2015 you claimed to Archbishop Sentamu Academy that you had completed one term of Newly Qualified Teacher induction at Winstanley Community College, when you knew this was not accurate.**

The panel noted that Mr Price denied allegation 2.

The panel noted its finding at allegation 1 that Mr Price knew he started working at Winstanley on 27 October 2014. Therefore, it would not have been possible for him to have completed one full term of NQT training by the time he started working for ASA in January 2015.

The panel considered the oral evidence and witness statement of Witness A. Witness A confirmed that, as part of ASA's investigation into Mr Price's conduct, she emailed Individual C, [REDACTED], to query what Mr Price had told her regarding his NQT induction when he joined ASA. Individual C stated, "Said he had done a term, therefore 1<sup>st</sup> assessment".

The panel considered contemporaneous notes from ASA's disciplinary hearing with Mr Price on 8 May 2015 when he was asked questions about his NQT induction. Mr Price was asked, "have you only done half a term and no evidence of assessment" and his response was recorded as "TP confirmed yes".

The panel also considered contemporaneous notes from a meeting dated 20 November 2014 between Mr Price and Individual D, [REDACTED], in which it was agreed that the date for the first of his three NQT assessments would be "13/2/15 (for period 27/10/14 to 13/2/15)".

The panel determined, based on the available evidence, that Mr Price would have known that he had not completed one term of NQT induction at Winstanley, both when he applied to ASA on 14 November 2014 and when he commenced employment with ASA in January 2015. The panel therefore found allegation 2 proven.

- 3. On a date prior to September 2016 you submitted an application to the School within which you:**

- a) Claimed to have worked at Winstanley Community College from 1 September 2014 to 31 December 2014, when you knew these dates of employment were not accurate.**

The panel noted Mr Price denied allegation 3(a).

The panel had sight of Mr Price's application form to the School in which he stated that his employment start date with Winstanley was 1 September 2014. The panel noted its finding at allegation 1 that Mr Price knew he did not start working at Winstanley until 27 October 2014.

The panel noted the East Riding of Yorkshire Council reference request document, which stated that Mr Price's period of employment with Winstanley was from 27 October 2014 to 30 November 2014.

The panel considered Mr Price's written representations dated 22 April 2025 from his representative at NASUWT. Again, the panel determined that it could not give any weight to Mr Price's assertion that Winstanley continued to pay employer pension contributions as there was no documentary evidence to support this and the panel did not have the opportunity to test Mr Price's evidence at the hearing.

Based on the available evidence, the panel was satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that Mr Price's application to the School included a claim that he worked at Winstanley from 1 September 2014 to 31 December 2014, when he knew these dates of employment were not accurate. The panel therefore found allegation 3(a) proven.

**b) Claimed that you left a role at Winstanley Community College due to the end of a fixed term contract, when you knew this was not accurate.**

The panel noted that Mr Price denied allegation 3(b).

The panel noted that on Mr Price's application form to the School he stated that his reason for leaving his employment with Winstanley was "End of Fixed Term contract".

The panel considered contemporaneous notes from a meeting dated 20 November 2014 between Mr Price and Individual D, in which three NQT assessment points were identified on 13 February 2015, 22 May 2015 and 16 October 2015. The panel considered that this evidence suggested that it was intended that Mr Price's employment with Winstanley was not for a fixed term ending in 2014.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Witness C, who asserted that Mr Price would have been employed on a permanent basis and his contract wouldn't have expired in 2014. Witness C explained during his oral evidence that Mr Price was starting out in his career and Winstanley's hope would have been that he would have stayed with the school after he became fully qualified.

The panel also considered a contemporaneous document titled "Appointment sheet 2014-2015 – Newly Qualified Teacher" which was signed and dated on behalf of Winstanley on 5 November 2014 and stated that Mr Price's length of contract was "Permanent".

The panel considered Mr Price's written representations dated 22 April 2025 from his representative at NASUWT, which stated, "As explained at the disciplinary hearing, Mr Price was struggling working in Leicester and decided to return home to East Yorkshire to be closer to family and friends...Mr Price resigned from his position at Winstanley College, which was accepted". The panel considered that Mr Price's own evidence accepted that he knew his employment at Winstanley did not end on expiry of a fixed term contract but because he resigned.

Based on the available evidence, the panel was satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that Mr Price's application to the School claimed that he left his role at Winstanley due to the end of a fixed term contract, when he knew this was not accurate. The panel therefore found allegation 3(b) proven.

**c) Claimed that you left a role at Archbishop Sentamu Academy due to the end of a fixed term, when you knew you had been dismissed.**

The panel noted that Mr Price denied allegation 3(c).

The panel noted Mr Price's application form to the School in which he stated that his reason for leaving his employment with ASA was "End of Fixed Term contract".

The panel noted the oral evidence and written statement of Witness A. Witness A submitted that she obtained Mr Price's personnel file which noted he had been dismissed in May 2015 for misleading ASA by providing the wrong date of his previous employment and saying he had completed a full term of his NQT induction.

The panel considered contemporaneous notes from ASA's disciplinary hearing with Mr Price on 8 May 2015. The hearing concluded by confirming to Mr Price that he had "mislead the Academy on two accounts which were a serious breach of misconduct which constitute gross misconduct therefore you are dismissed without notice". The panel further considered a disciplinary hearing outcome letter from ASA to Mr Price dated 12 May 2015 which confirmed, "the Academy is left with no alternative other than to summarily dismiss you on the ground of gross misconduct" and that his employment terminated with effect from 8 May 2015.

The panel noted a letter from Mr Price to ASA dated 15 May 2015 which stated, "Before I consider appealing against the Academy's decision to be dismissed on the grounds of gross misconduct I need to know how this will affect my future career as a teacher". The panel considered that this document provided contemporaneous evidence that Mr Price knew he had been dismissed from ASA on 8 May 2015.

The panel also noted that Mr Price's application form to the School included a section to provide details of any/all disciplinary action taken against him by any employer and Mr Price had simply recorded "N/A" in the details.

The panel considered Mr Price's written representations dated 22 April 2025 from his representative at NASUWT, which stated, "Mr Price acknowledges that he was dismissed from the Academy and that is how he perceives the contract came to an end". The panel considered that Mr Price therefore accepted that he knew his employment at ASA did not end on expiry of a fixed term contract but ended instead because he was dismissed for gross misconduct.

Based on the available evidence, the panel considered, on the balance of probabilities, that Mr Price's application to the School claimed that he left his role at ASA due to the end of a fixed term, when he knew this was not accurate and he had in fact been dismissed for gross misconduct. The panel therefore found allegation 3(c) proven.

**d) Failed to disclose that you had worked at Dunswell School, when you knew you had worked at Dunswell School.**

The panel noted that Mr Price denied allegation 3(d).

The panel noted that on Mr Price's application form to the School he did not mention Dunswell School ('Dunswell') in the "Employment History" section.

The panel noted a letter from Witness B, [REDACTED], dated 28 March 2025 which stated that Mr Price was employed with Dunswell from 1 January 2014 to 30 October 2014. The panel also had sight of Mr Price's handwritten resignation letter dated 3 October 2014 which stated, "I would like to tender my resignation as P.E. Teacher at Dunswell Academy as soon as possible to undertake a new teaching job".

The panel noted the witness statement and oral evidence of Witness B, who explained that prior to her current role, she was [REDACTED] with the Edukos Trust and Dunswell is one of the five schools it operates. Witness B knew Mr Price from his employment at Dunswell and confirmed Mr Price was employed with Dunswell from 1 January 2014 until 30 October 2014.

The panel considered Mr Price's written representations dated 22 April 2025 from his representative at NASUWT, which stated, "Mr Price confirms that he worked at South Hunsley 4 days a week and at Dunswell for 1 day a week. Mr Price did not apply for a separate role at Dunswell School, it was part of the same appointment process".

The panel had sight of Mr Price's application form to ASA dated 14 November 2014. In the "Previous Employment" section Mr Price included Dunswell, as well as South Hunsley School & Sixth Form College (East Riding LEA). The panel did not therefore accept Mr Price's representation that his roles with South Hunsley and Dunswell were not separate or formed part of the same employment. In any event, the panel considered that Mr Price should have disclosed his work for Dunswell as part of proper Safer Recruitment practices.

Based on the available evidence, the panel considered, on the balance of probabilities, that Mr Price's application to the School did fail to disclose that he had worked at Dunswell, when he knew he had done so. The panel therefore found allegation 3(d) proven.

**4. Your actions as described at paragraph 1 and/or 2 and/or 3 above were dishonest.**

The panel noted that Mr Price denied allegation 4.

The panel considered whether Mr Price had acted dishonestly. In doing so, the panel applied the test set out in *Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd t/a Crockfords*.

The panel first considered Mr Price's actual state of knowledge or belief as to the facts. The panel noted its findings that Mr Price was aware of his own employment history, including the exact dates of his employment at Winstanley, the fact that his employment there commenced on 27 October 2014, and ended with his resignation in November 2014, not because of the expiry of a fixed term contract. The panel further noted that Mr Price was aware that he had not completed a full term of NQT induction at Winstanley, given that his employment spanned only from 27 October 2014 to 30 November 2014.

The panel also noted that Mr Price was aware that his employment at ASA ended by dismissal for gross misconduct in May 2015, following a disciplinary process, and not due to the expiry of a fixed-term contract. The panel further noted that Mr Price was aware that he had been employed at Dunswell, and that this employment was omitted from his subsequent application to the School.

The panel considered that, notwithstanding this knowledge, Mr Price made a number of representations in applications submitted to schools which were inconsistent with the true position. These included inaccurate employment dates, claims he had completed a full term of NQT induction, incorrect reasons for leaving posts, and the complete omission of a period of employment. The panel concluded that Mr Price knew that these representations were not accurate at the time they were made.

Applying the second limb of the Ivey test, the panel considered whether Mr Price's conduct would be regarded as dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people. The panel was satisfied that ordinary decent people would consider it dishonest for a teacher to make knowingly inaccurate statements, or material omissions, about their employment history and induction status when applying for teaching posts. This was particularly important as such information is relied upon by schools in making safeguarding and recruitment decisions.

The panel considered Mr Price's written representations dated 22 April 2025 from his representative at NASUWT, which stated, "Mr Price has not behaved dishonestly in the

application process and believes the explanations above confirm this". However, the panel was not able to attach any weight to this simple assertion which was not supported by any documentary or other evidence.

Accordingly, the panel concluded that Mr Price's conduct, as found proved in relation to allegations 1, 2 and 3, was dishonest.

The panel therefore found allegation 4 proven.

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

Having found 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 Mr Price, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Price in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education July 2015 ("KCSIE").

The panel considered that Mr Price was in breach of the following provisions:

- Part One, paragraph 6 states, "The Teachers' Standards 2012 state that teachers, including headteachers, should safeguard children's wellbeing and maintain public trust in the teaching profession as part of their professional duties"; and
- Part Three, paragraph 50 states, "It is vital that schools and colleges create a culture of safe recruitment and, as part of that, adopt recruitment procedures that help deter, reject or identify people who might abuse children...Governing bodies and proprietors must act reasonably in making decisions about the suitability of the

prospective employee based on checks and evidence...together with references and interview information". The panel considered that Mr Price's conduct as found proven frustrated the School's ability to comply with its Safer Recruitment duties.

The panel also considered whether Mr Price'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 serious dishonesty was relevant.

The panel was concerned that Mr Price's conduct was not limited to an isolated incident but demonstrated a pattern of serious dishonesty over a period of time. The panel was particularly concerned that Mr Price was dismissed for gross misconduct relating to dishonesty in May 2015 but continued to deliberately mislead the School in his application in September 2016 in the same way, namely by providing incorrect dates of employment and inaccurate reasons for leaving employment.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Price 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 Price was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Mr Price'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 Price'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 Price was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found that the offence of serious dishonesty was relevant.

The panel considered that Mr Price's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher. The panel determined that accurate and comprehensive disclosures about previous employment are an intrinsic part of a schools' statutory Safer

Recruitment processes. It allows a school's Designated Safeguarding Lead to interrogate the information provided by applicants and determine whether there are any potential safeguarding issues to consider in order to protect pupils. The panel also considered the public would not consider Mr Price to be an appropriate role model and it would not be appropriate for him to hold a uniquely influential role in pupil's lives by reason of his dishonest conduct.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Price'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 maintenance of public confidence in the profession; declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct within the teaching profession and that prohibition strikes the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest, if they are in conflict.

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Price, which involved him dishonestly making false claims and omissions regarding his teaching employment history and NQT induction experience, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils. The panel considered Mr Price's conduct frustrated a school's ability to comply with its statutory Safer Recruitment obligations which would create wider safeguarding risks affecting the protection of pupils.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Price was 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 Price 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 Price in the profession. The panel was not provided with any evidence pertaining to Mr Price's ability as an educator. In any event, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations as set out above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Price in the profession, since his 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 Mr Price.

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;
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions or purposeful destruction of evidence, especially where these behaviours have been repeated or had serious consequences, or involved the coercion of another person to act in a way contrary to their own interests;
- collusion or concealment including:
  - lying to prevent the identification of wrongdoing;

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors.

Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

There was no evidence that Mr Price's actions were not deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Price was acting under extreme duress. The panel did consider a representation made by Mr Price which was recorded in the notes of a disciplinary hearing with East Riding of Yorkshire Council on 27 June 2024. The notes recorded Mr Price being asked why he stated his in his application to the School that his employment with ASA had ended following the expiry of a fixed term contract when he had actually been dismissed. Mr Price's response stated, "Because it was, I was, as a, I was really struggling, well I was struggling at that time [REDACTED]. I, as being mentioned by the union representative, [REDACTED]". The panel struggled to apportion any weight to Mr Price's representation regarding his health as it had not been provided with any documentary or other medical evidence to substantiate this.

The panel was not provided with any evidence that Mr Price demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel did not accept that the incidents were out of character as they were not isolated or inadvertent. To the contrary, there was evidence of persistent and repeated conduct over a period of time affecting application processes to more than one school.

The panel considered whether there were any mitigating factors, including the level of insight or remorse demonstrated by Mr Price. The panel noted that Mr Price did not accept responsibility for the conduct found proved. The panel found that Mr Price had not demonstrated any insight, as he did not acknowledge any wrongdoing and there was evidence of repeated dishonesty over a period of time. The panel considered this meant that there was a significant risk of future repetition. The panel further noted the absence of remorse or reflection on the potential impact of the conduct on trust in the profession. As a result, the panel concluded that there were no mitigating factors of sufficient weight to reduce the seriousness of the misconduct found proven.

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 Price of prohibition. The panel agreed with the presenting officer's representation that dishonesty is so corrosive of public trust and confidence it must be met with serious consequences.

The panel further agreed with the presenting officer's representation that, in respect of the public interest consideration of declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct,

it was important to mark Mr Price's behaviour as unacceptable, dangerous and incompatible with the integrity and ethical standards of teachers.

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 Price. The serious dishonesty found proved involved Mr Price making false claims and omissions about his teaching employment history and induction experience and this was a significant factor 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.

One of these includes serious dishonesty.

The panel noted that these lists are not intended to be exhaustive and panels should consider each case on its individual merits taking into account all the circumstances involved.

The panel was particularly concerned with Mr Price's response to being challenged about his dishonesty in respect of his application process to the School. Rather than admitting his misconduct, he 'doubled down' on his denial and this is evidenced in contemporaneous documentary evidence from the notes of a disciplinary hearing with East Riding of Yorkshire Council on 27 June 2024. When Mr Price admitted ASA terminated his employment (and it was not on expiry of a fixed term contract as he had initially suggested), he dishonestly suggested it was terminated "from illness" rather than admitting he was dismissed for gross misconduct. The panel considered the absence of any resolution or remediation by Mr Price to recognise and address his behaviour is a significant aggravating feature of this case.

In assessing the risk of repetition, the panel considered that Mr Price's continued denial of the misconduct, concealment of wrongdoing and lack of meaningful reflection

increased the risk that similar behaviour could reoccur in the future. The panel was not satisfied that Mr Price had fully understood why his conduct was unacceptable or incompatible with the standards expected of a teacher. As a result, the panel concluded that the risk of repetition remained.

There was no evidence before the panel to suggest that a review period would serve any purpose. The panel was unable to identify any way in which Mr Price could demonstrate to a future panel that the prohibition order should be set aside, given the lack of any evidence of insight or remorse and his repeated failure to recognise the seriousness of his dishonest behaviour.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended without provisions for a review period.

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Price, involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE).

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of dishonesty. The panel also note that it “...*was concerned that Mr Price’s conduct was not limited to an isolated incident but demonstrated a pattern of serious dishonesty over a period of time.*”

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 Mr Price, 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 safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, “...*Mr Price’s conduct frustrated a school’s ability to comply with its statutory Safer Recruitment obligations which would create wider safeguarding risks affecting the protection of 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 sets out as follows, “*The panel noted that Mr Price did not accept responsibility for the conduct found proved. The panel found that Mr Price had not demonstrated any insight, as he did not acknowledge any wrongdoing and there was evidence of repeated dishonesty over a period of time.*”

The panel has also commented that “The panel further noted the absence of remorse or reflection on the potential impact of the conduct on trust in the profession.”

In my judgement, the lack of evidence of insight or 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 observe, “...*that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Price was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the*

*profession.*” I am particularly mindful of the finding of dishonesty 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 Mr Price himself. The panel comment *“The panel was not provided with any evidence that Mr Price demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel did not accept that the incidents were out of character as they were not isolated or inadvertent. To the contrary, there was evidence of persistent and repeated conduct over a period of time affecting application processes to more than one school.”*

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Price 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 seriousness of the conduct. The panel has said, *“...in respect of the public interest consideration of declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct, it was important to mark Mr Price’s behaviour as unacceptable, dangerous and incompatible with the integrity and ethical standards of teachers.”*

I am also particularly mindful of the panel’s findings that the dishonesty was not a one-off act. The panel say *“Rather than admitting his misconduct, he ‘doubled down’ on his denial...”*

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

I have considered the panel's comments,

*"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.*

*One of these includes serious dishonesty.*

*The panel noted that these lists are not intended to be exhaustive and panels should consider each case on its individual merits taking into account all the circumstances involved."*

The panel has also said that,

*"In assessing the risk of repetition, the panel considered that Mr Price's continued denial of the misconduct, concealment of wrongdoing and lack of meaningful reflection increased the risk that similar behaviour could reoccur in the future. The panel was not satisfied that Mr Price had fully understood why his conduct was unacceptable or incompatible with the standards expected of a teacher. As a result, the panel concluded that the risk of repetition remained."*

In coming to its recommendation, the panel notes *"There was no evidence before the panel to suggest that a review period would serve any purpose. The panel was unable to identify any way in which Mr Price could demonstrate to a future panel that the prohibition order should be set aside, given the lack of any evidence of insight or remorse and his repeated failure to recognise the seriousness of his dishonest behaviour."*

I have considered whether not allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is proportionate to achieving the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, I am of the view that achieving the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession can be met by allowing a review period. In coming to this view I have considered the seriousness of the conduct, including the repeated dishonesty

found proven over a period of nearly two years, that the dishonesty started towards the outset of his teaching career, and the lack of evidence of either insight or remorse.

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

**This means that Mr Timothy Price 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 13 May 2033, seven 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 Price remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

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



**Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield**

**Date: 8 May 2026**

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