



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Ms Ceyhan Unluer: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

May 2026

Contents

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	20
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	24

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

Teacher:	Ms Ceyhan Unluer
Teacher ref number:	2166224
Teacher date of birth:	2 April 1981
TRA reference:	23313
Date of determination:	14 May 2026
Former employer:	Ceyhan Unluer was contracted to work at School A (Willow Bank School, Merseyside), as a supply teacher through an agency, Tradewind Recruitment. Ms Unluer was also contracted to work as a supply teacher at School B (St Margaret Church of England, Warrington), School C (Holy Cross Primary School, St Helens), School D (Redbridge High School, Liverpool), School E (Penketh Primary School, Warrington) and School F (Woolston Brook, Warrington) through an agency, Connex Education.

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 11 to 14 May 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Ms Unluer.

The panel members were Mr Gamel Byles (teacher panellist – in the chair), Ms Aruna Sharma (teacher panellist) and Mr Steven Boocock (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Elizabeth Gilbert of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Harry Perkin of Three Raymond Buildings, instructed by Kingsley Napley,

Ms Unluer was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in private and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 15 December 2025.

It was alleged that Ms Unluer was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst working as a teacher:

1. [REDACTED]
2. From in or around May 2023 and/or in or around November 2023, whilst working as a Supply Teacher at one or more schools, Ms Unluer:
 - a. Did not inform Connex Education agency and/or Tradewind Recruitment about the investigation by LADO and/or the recommendation not to work with children and/or [REDACTED];
 - b. Did not inform Connex Education agency she had been working with Tradewind Recruitment agency.
3. On or around 22 January 2024, Ms Unluer provided incorrect and/or knowingly false information to Tradewind Recruitment that she was not working with children.
4. Ms Unluer's conduct at paragraphs 2(a) and/or 2(b) and/or 3:
 - a. was dishonest; and/or
 - b. lacked integrity

Ms Unluer was not present at the hearing. As such, the facts of the allegations and whether the conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute was treated as not admitted by Ms Unluer.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology and anonymised pupil list – pages 5 to 8

Section 2: Notice of proceedings – pages 9 to 15

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 16 to 41

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 42 to 333

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 334 to 336

The panel also received the following:

- A service bundle containing 103 pages; and
- The CMH decision and CMH bundle.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the hearing.

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

Witnesses

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

- Witness A – [REDACTED];
- Witness B – [REDACTED];
- Witness C – [REDACTED];
- Witness D – [REDACTED]; and
- Witness E – [REDACTED]

Ms Unluer did not attend the hearing and did not give oral evidence.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

Ms Unluer signed an agency worker agreement with Tradewind Recruitment in June 2023. Ms Unluer worked as a supply teacher at Willow Bank School through Tradewind Recruitment from 20 June 2023 until 19 July 2023, and again from 5 September 2023 until 14 November 2023.

On 23 June 2023, Ms Unluer signed an agency worker agreement with Connex Education. Connex Education approached Ms Unluer for work on or around 5 October 2023. Ms Unluer worked as a supply teacher through Connex Education which included the following assignments:

- A 1 day assignment for St Margaret Church of England, during the week commencing 13 November 2023; and
- A 1 day assignment for Holy Cross Primary School, during the week commencing 13 November 2023.
- A 4 day assignment for Redbridge High School during the week commencing 20 November 2023;
- A 1 day assignment for Penketh Primary School during the week commencing 20 November 2023; and
- An assignment for Woolston Brook on or around 28 November 2023.

The agency worker agreement between Ms Unluer and Tradewind Recruitment ceased on 14 November 2023.

The agency worker agreement between Ms Unluer and Connex Education ceased on 30 January 2024.

Ms Unluer was referred to the TRA on 4 March 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:

[REDACTED]

The panel therefore found allegation 1 proven.

2. From in or around May 2023 and/or in or around November 2023, whilst working as a Supply Teacher at one or more schools, you:

- a) Did not inform Connex Education agency and/or Tradewind Recruitment about the investigation by LADO and/or the recommendation not to work with children and/or [REDACTED];**

Ms Unluer was not present at the hearing. As such, the allegation was treated as not admitted.

Witness B stated in her written statement that the Council received a referral on 13 November 2023 regarding Ms Unluer stating “there had been concerns” regarding Ms Unluer [REDACTED].

Witness B stated in her written statement that a “managing allegations meeting” took place on 21 November 2023, following which Ms Unluer was advised by Tradewind Recruitment that “she was not to work with children whilst the investigation process was underway”. Witness B further stated that, in her experience, employers and agencies immediately suspend a staff member and advise them against working with children whilst there is an “open LADO case”.

[REDACTED].

Witness E stated in her written statement that Ms Unluer was “always honest and open” regarding her employment [REDACTED], but Witness E was aware that it was discovered in January 2024 that Ms Unluer had continued to work with an alternative teaching agency and had not informed them about [REDACTED] or LADO investigation. Witness E further stated that Ms Unluer “should have made her agency aware that there was an on-going LADO investigation taking place in relation to her [REDACTED]”.

[REDACTED]

Witness D stated in his written statement that a meeting was held with the LADO in November 2023 whereby the outcome was for Ms Unluer not to work with children during the LADO investigation. However, on 30 January 2024, Witness D stated that Ms Unluer informed him that she “got caught” working in a school against the recommendation of LADO stating that this was a “moral choice” to work over the recommendation. [REDACTED].

Witness C stated in her written statement that candidates are provided with copies of Keeping Children Safe in Education (“KCSIE”) as part of the registration process for Tradewind Recruitment and are asked to confirm “that they have read and understood the document by electronically signing the declaration form”. Witness C further stated that Ms Unluer completed her registration process to work with Tradewind Recruitment as a supply teacher on 16 June 2023 and completed relevant training including in respect of KCSIE.

Witness C stated in her oral evidence that Tradewind Recruitment first became aware of the investigation by the LADO following direct contact from the LADO on 14 November 2023, in which the LADO stated that they had received a referral [REDACTED] regarding a transferable risk case with respect to Ms Unluer. Witness C stated in her written statement that Ms Unluer was working at Willow Bank School at the time of the notification, and she understood that the LADO had also directly contacted Willow Bank School.

Witness C stated in her written statement that Ms Unluer was verbally advised by a consultant at Tradewind Recruitment on 14 November 2023 that she should not return to work as Willow Bank School had terminated her contract.

Witness C further stated in her written statement that, following the notification from the LADO, she contacted Ms Unluer on 15 November 2023 to communicate to her about the LADO referral. The panel considered a copy of an email from Witness C to Ms Unluer on this date, which was included in an exhibit to Witness C written statement, in which Witness C informed Ms Unluer that “LADO received a referral [REDACTED]”. Additionally, Witness C stated that she verbally informed Ms Unluer on 22 November 2023 that she would not be offered any work by Tradewind Recruitment until the LADO process had concluded and that if she were she to apply elsewhere for work, then she would have to disclose the LADO referral.

Witness C stated in her written statement that she attended a meeting with the LADO on 13 December 2023 to review the case and emailed Ms Unluer the same date advising her that the LADO was “unable to conclude the matter” due to Ms Unluer appealing [REDACTED]. The panel considered a copy of the email sent, which was produced as an exhibit to Witness C’s written statement, in which Witness C stated “LADO also advised that if you are looking for work, you should be informing your agencies or any potential employers that you have currently ongoing LADO process and [REDACTED] involvement”. Witness C further stated that on 1 February 2024, Ms Unluer revealed to her that she had been working with another agency from 16 November 2023 to 30 January 2024.

Witness A stated in her written statement that Ms Unluer registered to work with Connex Education in June 2023, and, as part of her registrations, Ms Unluer was required to complete key documentation, including a registration form which includes a request to notify Connex Education if the individual is “subject to any kind of investigation or prosecution relating to a criminal act and/or which could lead to a conviction”. Witness A stated that Ms Unluer was asked by Connex Education to be informed of any change in circumstances throughout their employment period.

Witness A stated in her written statement that, at the time of registering with Connex Education in June 2023, Ms Unluer was not under investigation, and during June 2023 to November 2023 she was not expected to keep Connex Education updated as she did not undertake any work assignments. However, Ms Unluer “should have advised Connex Education of the LADO investigation” before agreeing to undertake any assignments through Connex Education.

Witness A stated that Ms Unluer was cleared for work in July 2023 following the registration process, which also included Right to Work checks, obtaining references and a DBS check. Witness A further stated that Ms Unluer but did not undertake any work through Connex Education until November 2023 but undertook a “number of assignments” thereafter at five different schools.

Witness A stated in her written statement that Connex Education received a call from Woolston Brook on or around 30 January 2024 stating that they had “received an anonymous email” stating that Ms Unluer was “unsuitable to work with children” and that she was “under a LADO investigation” [REDACTED] Witness A further stated that she confirmed by contacting the LADO the following day that there was an ongoing LADO investigation.

Witness A stated in her written statement that she undertook a suitability assessment for Ms Unluer on or around 9 February 2024 and discussed the circumstances with Ms Unluer to understand what had happened. Witness A further stated that Ms Unluer’s reason for not disclosing the LADO investigation to Connex Education was because she had appealed against the decision and she thought that this meant that the investigation would not be carried out, and that disclosing this would not be necessary. The panel considered a copy of the notes from this meeting, which were produced as an exhibit to Witness A’s written statement. The panel noted that Ms Unluer had stated that she thought because she had appealed [REDACTED], that the matter was over and that she “panicked and went into survival mode, hence her lack of judgment regarding informing Connex Education of her situation”. The panel also noted that Ms Unluer explained that [REDACTED] has been “punished” and has “no support from anywhere”.

The panel considered Ms Unluer’s contract of employment with Connex Education, which was produced as an exhibit to Witness A’s written statement. The panel noted that the contract required Ms Unluer to notify Connex Education of “any reason” why she may not be suitable for an assignment, either before or during the course of an assignment. The panel was satisfied on this evidence that there was a contractual requirement for Ms Unluer to keep Connex Education updated regarding any relevant information in her personal circumstances.

The panel considered an email from Ms Unluer to the presenting officer’s instructing firm dated 7 August 2025, in which Ms Unluer stated:

“At the time, I was instructed by LADO (Local Authority Designated Officer) to cease working while an investigation was underway. I accept responsibility for continuing to work during that time, but I did so out of necessity—[REDACTED]. I made a difficult decision to prioritise my family’s basic survival”

The panel was satisfied on the evidence of Witness B, Witness D, Witness E and the contemporaneous documents, [REDACTED] was investigated by the LADO from 13 November 2023, was recommended not to work with children following a LADO meeting in November 2023 [REDACTED]

The panel was further satisfied on the evidence of Witness A, the meeting notes with Ms Unluer and Ms Unluer’s written responses, that information regarding an investigation by the LADO, the recommendation not to work with children, [REDACTED] first came to

Connex Education's attention in or around January 2024. The panel considered that Ms Unluer had adequate opportunity to notify Connex Education of this information throughout the timeframe of her various work assignments from November 2023, and was advised by Tradewind Recruitment in November 2023 to disclose this type of information to a further employer, but did not do so. As a professional and a teacher, the panel considered that Ms Unluer was expected to make her agency aware of these circumstances as they were relevant to her ongoing suitability to teach and safeguarding children.

The panel considered that the circumstances in relation to Tradewind Recruitment was more nuanced as a result of the timeline of events. The panel was satisfied on the evidence of Witness C, that Tradewind Recruitment first became aware of the LADO investigation [REDACTED] on 14 November 2023, following a direct notification from the LADO. As [REDACTED] had been involved with [REDACTED] for some time prior to Ms Unluer's work assignment with Tradewind Recruitment, the panel was satisfied that Ms Unluer had adequate opportunity to disclose this information but did not do so. However, in relation to the investigation by the LADO, the panel was not satisfied on the evidence that Ms Unluer had an opportunity to make the notification herself. The panel considered that the evidence in relation to when Ms Unluer first became aware of the LADO investigation was limited, and it was likely that Tradewind Recruitment became aware of this information in parallel. As such, the panel considered that it was unlikely that Ms Unluer had an opportunity to disclose the LADO investigation to Tradewind Recruitment.

The panel noted that Tradewind Recruitment confirmed to Ms Unluer on 22 November 2023 that she would not be offered any further work as a result of the LADO investigation. The panel was satisfied on the evidence that the recommendation not to work with children [REDACTED] post-dated this confirmation. As such, there was no requirement for Ms Unluer to have notified Tradewind Recruitment of this information.

For the reasons set out above, the panel was satisfied that Ms Unluer did not inform Connex Education about the investigation by LADO, the recommendation not to work with children, [REDACTED]. The panel was also satisfied that Ms Unluer did not inform Tradewind Recruitment about [REDACTED] involvement [REDACTED].

The panel therefore found allegation 2(a) proven.

3. On or around 22 January 2024, you provided incorrect and/or knowingly false information to Tradewind Recruitment that you were not working with children.

Ms Unluer was not present at the hearing. As such, the allegation was treated as not admitted.

Witness C stated in her written statement that she emailed Ms Unluer on 22 January 2024 to confirm whether she was, at that time, working with children or vulnerable adults, and on the same date Ms Unluer responded to confirm that she did not. The panel considered a copy of the email correspondence which was produced as an exhibit to Witness C's written statement. The panel noted that Ms Unluer responded to Witness C's query by stating "no, I just do online adult tutoring Psychology and Turkish".

Witness C further stated in her written statement that she contacted Ms Unluer again on 1 February 2024 "to find out whether she had received the [REDACTED] to which Ms Unluer stated that she had been working with another agency and in a school from 16 November 2023 to 20 January 2024. The panel considered a copy of the email correspondence which was produced as an exhibit to Witness C's written statement. The panel noted that Ms Unluer responded to Witness C the same date and stated the following:

"Just to let you know they found out I worked with an agency I registered before and they suspended it again. [REDACTED] The panel noted that Witness C responded by email the same date to seek clarity regarding Ms Unluer's work with another agency, to which Ms Unluer confirmed she worked between 16 November 2023 and 20 January 2024 and was registered with another agency "[REDACTED] and she stated that she "was not asked any questions".

Witness C stated in her oral evidence that Ms Unluer had denied working in a school on a few other occasions when Witness C questioned her on telephone calls prior to the above mentioned correspondence. The panel noted that this position was supported by Witness C's email correspondence to Ms Unluer on 1 February 2024, in which Witness C stated "I've asked you a few times if you work in schools whilst LADO process was ongoing, and you have told me you didn't. I believe you also told [REDACTED] that you did not work in schools, whilst the process was ongoing".

Witness A stated in her written statement that Ms Unluer undertook the following work assignments through Connex Education:

- A 1 day assignment for St Margaret Church of England, during the week commencing 13 November 2023; and
- A 1 day assignment for Holy Cross Primary School, during the week commencing 13 November 2023.
- A 4 day assignment for Redbridge High School during the week commencing 20 November 2023;
- A 1 day assignment for Penketh Primary School during the week commencing 20 November 2023; and

- An assignment for Woolston Brook on or around 28 November 2023.

The panel was satisfied on the email correspondence and evidence from Witness C, that Ms Unluer informed Witness C on 22 January 2024 that she was not working with children. The panel was also satisfied on Ms Unluer's written response to Witness C and the evidence of Witness A, that Ms Unluer did continue to work with children from November 2023. As such, the panel was satisfied on the evidence that Ms Unluer provided incorrect and knowingly false information to Tradewind Recruitment on 22 January 2024 that she was not working with children.

The panel therefore found allegation 3 proven.

4. Your conduct at paragraphs 2(a) and/or 2(b) and/or 3:

a) was dishonest; and/or

Ms Unluer was not present at the hearing. As such, the allegation was treated as not admitted.

The panel firstly considered whether Ms Unluer was dishonest by her conduct in allegation 2(a) and/or allegation 3. The panel did not consider whether Ms Unluer's conduct at allegation 2(b) was dishonest, as this conduct was found not proven.

The panel considered the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd t/a Crockford* [2017].

In reaching a decision in respect of dishonesty, the panel needed to first ascertain, subjectively, the actual state of Ms Unluer's knowledge or belief as to the facts. Secondly, the panel needed to determine whether Ms Unluer's state of mind was honest or dishonest by the application of the objective standards of the ordinary honest person.

The panel firstly turned its mind to the actual state of Ms Unluer's knowledge or belief as to the facts.

The panel considered the following email from Ms Unluer to the presenting officer's instructing firm on 9 December 2024:

"I do not need to find evidence as I did nothing. All I can say is, I stopped working and listened to LADO when they first asked me to stop and wanted p46 , and I was told the investigation will finalise in 2 weeks but then when I appealed [REDACTED] Lado investigation also delayed and it took nearly 3 months to give a decision, and I was not informed about this delay when I appealed. I am sorry [REDACTED], as I believe in Kohlberg's Universal Ethics, I did nothing wrong. You can not ask someone to wait 3 months to investigate a case without giving any other choice, chance or money. For all of my life, I did the best job I do. I know that I am a good [REDACTED] teacher and doing my job for 20 years. [REDACTED]. I am happy where I am now. If you really think I

deserve my teaching licence to be cancelled, I appreciate and will accept. I you believe I am un guilty, one day I can come back and teach the pupils in your country as well. All the children in the world are same for me. That's all I can say. Thank you for your time."

The panel also considered an email from Ms Unluer to the presenting officer's instructing firm dated 7 August 2025, in which Ms Unluer stated:

"At the time, I was instructed by LADO (Local Authority Designated Officer) to cease working while an investigation was underway. I accept responsibility for continuing to work during that time, but I did so out of necessity—I was a [REDACTED] with no financial support and no alternative means to [REDACTED]. I made a difficult decision to prioritize my family's basic survival"

The panel further considered a meeting note from on or around 9 February 2023, in which Ms Unluer stated that "she had looked into alternative work and found there was little/no work available for her" [REDACTED]. Ms Unluer also "acknowledged that her actions have caused her honesty and integrity to be questioned and apologised for this".

In respect of allegation 2(a), the panel was satisfied that Ms Unluer withheld information from Connex Education, including the LADO investigation, [REDACTED] involvement, [REDACTED] , and the recommendation not to work with children, because she believed she was innocent, that the investigation took a long time and she needed to work to earn money. In weighing up the evidence as to Ms Unluer's knowledge of the facts, the panel considered that Ms Unluer would have known that it was wrong and dishonest to withhold this information from Connex Education because it related to her suitability to work with children, especially in circumstances where she was advised to disclose this information. The panel considered that Ms Unluer took a deliberate decision not to disclose this information as doing so would put her ongoing teaching role at risk.

The panel distinguished between Ms Unluer's conduct towards Connex Education and her conduct towards Tradewind Recruitment in respect of allegation 2(a). In relation to the [REDACTED] involvement information that was not disclosed to Tradewind Recruitment, the panel considered there to be insufficient evidence that Ms Unluer was required to disclose this information. The panel noted that teachers are entitled to a private life and that Tradewind Recruitment did not specifically request this information, nor did the contractual documents or policies specify that [REDACTED] involvement regarding the [REDACTED] needed to be disclosed. As such, the panel did not consider there was sufficient evidence to support that Ms Unluer intentionally withheld or concealed this information from Tradewind Recruitment.

In respect of allegation 3, the panel was satisfied that Ms Unluer knew the information she provided to Tradewind Recruitment regarding her ongoing work with children was incorrect, as she later changed her position in the same email correspondence. The panel was satisfied that Ms Unluer was aware at the time that it was wrong and dishonest

to provide incorrect information to Tradewind Recruitment regarding her ongoing work with children, as she was aware of the recommendation that she should not be working with children and deliberately chose to conceal her ongoing role. The panel considered that Ms Unluer's provision of false information was a calculated and intentional act designed to mislead Tradewind Recruitment and to prevent the discovery that she continued to work with children in breach of the LADO recommendation.

The panel then considered the objective standards of the ordinary honest person and was further satisfied that an ordinary honest person would consider that a teacher deliberately providing false information, as found proven at allegation 3, and withholding relevant information from an employer, as found proven at allegation 2(a), to be dishonest.

The panel determined that Ms Unluer's conduct at allegation 2(a) had a clear intention to withhold relevant information regarding her suitability to teach from her employer so that she could continue in her teaching role, which misled Connex Education and was fundamentally dishonest. Similarly, the panel determined that Ms Unluer's conduct at allegation 3 had a clear intention to prevent Tradewind Recruitment from finding out about the fact that she continued to work with children, which attempted to mislead Tradewind Recruitment and was fundamentally dishonest.

The panel therefore found Ms Unluer's conduct as proven at allegation 2(a) and allegation 3 to be dishonest. The panel therefore found allegation 4(a) proven.

b) lacked integrity.

Ms Unluer was not present at the hearing. As such, the allegation was treated as not admitted.

The panel considered whether Ms Unluer had failed to act with integrity by her conduct at allegation 2(a) and allegation 3. The panel did not consider whether Ms Unluer's conduct at allegation 2(b) lacked integrity, as this conduct was found not proven.

The panel considered the case of *Wingate & Anor v The Solicitors Regulation Authority* [2018]. The panel was mindful of the legal advice it received and that integrity is a more nebulous concept than honesty, for which it is not possible to formulate an all-purpose comprehensive definition but connotes adherence to the ethical standards of one's own profession.

In respect of allegation 2(a), the panel considered that teachers are expected to inform their employer about circumstances which have the potential to impact upon their teaching duties and responsibilities, in particular where there is a transferable risk to children. The panel noted that Ms Unluer could and should have informed Connex Education about the LADO investigation, the recommendation not to work with children,

[REDACTED]. Disclosure of this information would have allowed Connex Education to take appropriate safeguarding steps in response to these circumstances.

The panel considered that there was no explicit requirement for Ms Unluer to disclose that [REDACTED] were involved with [REDACTED] to Tradewind Recruitment, as at the time of Ms Unluer's work assignment through Tradewind Recruitment, [REDACTED] involvement operated through Ms Unluer's ongoing consent and had not yet been escalated to the LADO [REDACTED]. In light of this, the panel considered there was insufficient evidence to support that Ms Unluer intentionally concealed this information. Notwithstanding this position on dishonesty, the panel considered that a teacher acting with integrity is expected to offer this information to their employer as it is relevant to safeguarding, regardless of whether there was an explicit contractual or procedural requirement to do so. The panel considered that, had this information been shared, appropriate support and adequate safeguards could have been put in place. By withholding the information, Ms Unluer prevented her employers from being able to assess any risk and provide any such assistance. The panel considered that this conduct demonstrated a failure to prioritise the interests of the [REDACTED], children at school and the schools at which she was placed above her own personal and financial interests.

In respect of allegation 3, the panel considered that this conduct demonstrated a fundamental failure to act in accordance with the responsibilities and ethical obligations of a teacher. By actively providing false information to an employer regarding her ongoing work with children, particularly in circumstances where Ms Unluer had been advised not to work with children and continued to do so, Ms Unluer not only failed to prioritise the interests of her employers and the schools at which she was placed, but also undermined the safeguarding framework that exists to protect children.

The panel considered a meeting note from on or around 9 February 2023, in which Ms Unluer "acknowledged that her actions have caused her honesty and integrity to be questioned and apologised for this".

The panel considered that Ms Unluer's behaviour at allegation 2(a) and allegation 3 did not adhere to the ethical standards expected of a teacher and was contrary to the manner in which the profession professes to serve the public.

For the reasons set out above, the panel determined that Ms Unluer's conduct at allegation 2(a) and allegation 3 lacked integrity. The panel therefore found allegation 4(b) proven.

The panel found the following particulars of the allegations against you not proved, for these reasons:

2. From in or around May 2023 and/or in or around November 2023, whilst working as a Supply Teacher at one or more schools, you:

b. Did not inform Connex Education agency you had been working with Tradewind Recruitment agency.

Ms Unluer was not present at the hearing. As such, the allegation was treated as not admitted.

Witness A stated in her written statement that Ms Unluer registered with Connex Education in June 2023, following which she was cleared for work in July 2023, but that from the start date of her employment in June 2023 until 16 November 2023, Ms Unluer did not undertake any work with Connex Education.

Witness C stated in her written statement that Ms Unluer undertook a work assignment through Tradewind Recruitment from 20 June 2023 until 19 July 2023 and again from 5 September 2023 until 14 November 2023 at Willow Bank School. The panel noted that these assignments were after Ms Unluer had registered with Connex Education, but before Ms Unluer commenced her first assignment with Connex Education on 16 November 2023.

Witness A stated in her written statement that “agency workers are expected to inform Connex Education of their most recent employment” and that Connex Education is required, by Keeping Children Safe In Education (KCSIE), to ensure the suitability of a candidate before they commence work with children, and the way they go about this is to seek references from a minimum of two former employers of the candidate. Witness A further stated in her written statement that Ms Unluer “should have disclosed that she had commenced employment with Tradewind Recruitment prior to undertaking any assignments with Connex” so that Connex Education “could have obtained reference form Tradewind Recruitment”.

The panel considered copies of the Terms of Engagement and Recruitment Selection and Vetting Policy relevant to Connex Education and Ms Unluer’s engagement, which were exhibited to Witness A written statement. The panel considered that, whilst Ms Unluer was required to provide recent references and up to date details upon registering with Connex Education, none of the documents contained a provision which required Ms Unluer to keep Connex Education updated regarding further work that she may do with other agencies. The panel noted that Witness A stated in her written statement that she was “not aware” of whether Ms Unluer was asked about her employment between June 2023 and October 2023, but that Connex Education’s new policy since this incident now required an agency worker to provide updated references.

Witness A stated in her written evidence that Ms Unluer was not told by Tradewind Recruitment that she must disclose her work with the agency to any future employer because it is the responsibility of future employers to ask for an up to date CV, including an explanation for any gaps in employment.

The panel was satisfied on the evidence that Ms Unluer had not yet commenced work with Tradewind Recruitment at the time she registered with Connex Education. As such, it was not possible for Ms Unluer to have notified Connex Education of this information at that stage.

The panel considered that there was a lack of evidence, such as by way of a contractual provision, to confirm that Ms Unluer was required to disclose information relating to her Tradewind Recruitment appointment to Connex Education following her initial registration. The panel considered that it was commonplace for supply teachers to work for multiple agencies and that this was not information that Ms Unluer was obliged to share, unless Connex Education had specifically asked for or required it. The panel considered that, whilst Ms Unluer did not inform Connex Education of her work with Tradewind Recruitment, it was Connex Education's responsibility to request any updated information ahead of Ms Unluer commencing her work appointment in November 2023, if Connex Education required this.

The panel therefore found allegation 2(b) not proven.

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

Having found a number 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 Ms Unluer, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Ms Unluer 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 satisfied that the conduct of Ms Unluer, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education ("KCSIE").

The panel considered that Ms Unluer was in breach of the following provisions:

- Safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children is everyone's responsibility. Everyone who comes into contact with children has an important role to play.
- School and college staff should be proactive in sharing information as early as possible to help identify, assess and respond to risks or concerns about the safety and welfare of children, whether this is when problems are first emerging, or where a child is already known to local authority children's social care.

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

The panel also considered whether Ms Unluer 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 was relevant.

In respect of allegation 1, the panel was not satisfied that the conduct found proven amounted to unacceptable professional conduct. The panel considered that this conduct was not a significant departure from the standards expected of the profession, given that this was a matter relevant to Ms Unluer's private family life and was not directly relevant to her teaching role or her professional expectations. The panel considered that [REDACTED] was not a matter that would affect the way a teacher would fulfil their teaching role and was unlikely to lead to pupils being exposed to or influenced by the behaviour in a harmful way.

The panel noted that there were multiple elements of conduct contained within allegation 2(a). In respect of Ms Unluer's failure to notify Connex Education of the LADO investigation and the recommendation not to work with children, the panel considered that this was serious and fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession. The panel considered that this information was directly relevant to Ms Unluer's role as a teacher given its relevancy to safeguarding and should have been disclosed to Connex Education. As such, failing to disclose this information was conduct that may have led to pupils to being exposed to behaviour in a harmful way as the transferable risks posed could not be adequately managed by Connex Education. Consequently, the panel determined that this element of allegation 2(a) was unacceptable professional conduct.

Notwithstanding the above, in respect of Ms Unluer's failure to notify Connex Education of the [REDACTED], the panel did not consider that this conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct. Whilst the panel noted that it would have been preferable for Ms Unluer to inform her agency of the challenging circumstances that occurred in her private life, failing to disclose this information was not a serious matter which fell significantly short of the standards expected of a teacher.

The panel did not find allegation 2(b) proven and therefore did not consider unacceptable professional conduct in respect of this allegation.

The panel considered that Ms Unluer's conduct found proven in allegation 3 and allegation 4 were serious and fell significantly short of the standards expected of a teacher, as Ms Unluer intentionally provided false information regarding her status as an active teacher despite the recommendation for her not to continue teaching, which was fundamentally dishonest, lacked integrity and was conduct that may have led pupils to being exposed to behaviour in a harmful way. The panel considered that Ms Unluer was given a clear recommendation not to work with children but completely disregarded this.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Ms Unluer as found proven at allegation 2(a), allegation 3 and allegation 4 amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Ms Unluer was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Ms Unluer'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 Ms Unluer'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 Ms Unluer was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found that none of these offences were relevant.

In respect of allegation 1, the panel considered that Ms Unluer's [REDACTED] was conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered that [REDACTED] intervention, [REDACTED], was designed to safeguard and promote the best interests [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] Ms Unluer acted in a manner that was not in the best interests of a child. The panel considered that this conduct would undermine public confidence in the teaching profession, as members of the public would reasonably expect a teacher to prioritise the welfare of children [REDACTED] The panel further considered that this conduct gave rise to a lack of confidence that Ms Unluer would similarly act in the best interests of children in the classroom. [REDACTED] The panel did not find allegation 2(b) proven and therefore did not consider whether this conduct might bring the profession into disrepute.

In respect of allegation 2(a), allegation 3 and allegation 4, the panel considered that this conduct was also capable of bringing the profession into disrepute. The public would reasonably expect a teacher to disclose information relevant to their suitability to teach, and in particular information relating to safeguarding concerns. Ms Unluer's failure to disclose the LADO investigation and the recommendation not to work with children demonstrated a deliberate intention to conceal the truth. The panel considered that Ms Unluer's conduct in allegation 3 and allegation 4 demonstrated a clear intention to carry on working in the teaching profession despite being advised not to do so, and that Ms Unluer did not place the interests of children first. The panel considered that such conduct would be of significant concern to the public and would damage public confidence in the profession.

The findings of misconduct are serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher.

For these reasons, the panel found that that Ms Unluer's conduct as found proven at allegation 1, allegation 2(a), allegation 3 and allegation 4 could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher.

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 a punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely:

- the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils;
- the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In the light of the panel's findings against Ms Unluer, which involved misconduct resulting in a safeguarding concern, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Unluer 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 Ms Unluer 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 Ms Unluer in the profession. The panel decided that there was a public interest consideration in retaining the teacher in the profession, as she is able to make a valuable contribution to the 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 Ms Unluer.

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; and
- 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.

The panel considered the following statement that Ms Unluer made in an email to the presenting officer's instructing firm on 7 August 2025:

"Several years ago, during an extremely difficult period of my life [REDACTED] I found myself under investigation due to concerns [REDACTED]. I fully understand the necessity

of safeguarding processes, and I have always supported any actions taken to protect children. However, I firmly state that I have never harmed a child, nor have I ever put any child at risk. No court or authority has found me guilty of doing so. [REDACTED]”

[REDACTED] The panel noted that there were contemporaneous documents, such as the LADO referral [REDACTED] document that also supported the difficult personal circumstances that Ms Unluer was experiencing at the relevant time.

In light of the above circumstances, the panel accepted that Ms Unluer was under some duress at the relevant time. Despite this, the panel considered that Ms Unluer’s actions were deliberate, as she intentionally concealed information relevant to her ongoing suitability to teach from her employer when directly questioned.

The panel considered the following statement made by the Ms Unluer in an email to the presenting officer’s instructing firm on 7 August 2025:

“I am an experienced educator with over 20 years of teaching service, including in both Turkey and the UK. Teaching has never been just a profession for me —it is a lifelong vocation driven by a deep commitment to the safety, growth, and development of children.”

Whilst the panel noted the above statement in respect of Ms Unluer’s experience as a teacher, the panel did not have sufficient evidence to support that Ms Unluer had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in her personal and professional conduct or having contributed significantly to the education sector.

No character references were provided in respect of Ms Unluer to demonstrate that the incident was out of character. There was also no evidence of Ms Unluer being previously subject to disciplinary proceedings/warnings.

The panel noted there was some evidence of Ms Unluer taking accountability for her actions as she stated the following in an email on 7 August 2025:

“I accept responsibility for continuing to work during that time, but I did so out of necessity—I was a [REDACTED] with no financial support and no alternative means to [REDACTED]. I made a difficult decision to prioritise my family’s basic survival needs while continuing to fulfill my professional responsibilities. I did not do so to defy authority, but in a moment of vulnerability and under great pressure.”

The panel noted that there was evidence of Ms Unluer having undertaken relevant safeguarding training, and that she had obtained a degree in Psychology. As such, the panel considered that Ms Unluer should have had a good understanding of the requirement to comply with the LADO recommendation due to safeguarding concerns.

The panel considered that there was a risk of Ms Unluer repeating her behaviour, as she did not display full insight into her conduct. Ms Unluer had not demonstrated a meaningful understanding of the implications of her actions as she consistently referred in her written statements to the requirement for her to work and to earn a living as taking priority before the LADO's instructions. The panel considered that Ms Unluer did not fully understand the transferable risk that she posed by continuing to work with children despite the recommendation of the LADO. Ms Unluer had not demonstrated any consideration of the broader consequences of her conduct for the teaching profession and the public's trust in it.

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 Ms Unluer 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 Ms Unluer. Ms Unluer's deliberate concealment of her continuing to work with children, despite the recommendation from the LADO not to, 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. None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel's findings.

The panel considered that Ms Unluer's misconduct occurred during an extremely difficult period of her life, [REDACTED]. Whilst the panel acknowledged that Ms Unluer's actions

were serious and deliberate, and presented a significant safeguarding risk, the panel was of the view that the pressures in Ms Unluer's life at the relevant time should be taken into consideration.

Although there was limited evidence of insight before the panel, it considered that Ms Unluer had the potential to make a positive contribution to the teaching profession if she was to take appropriate steps to learn from her misconduct. As such, the panel considered that these factors weighed in favour of offering a review period.

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 4-year 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 some of the allegations proven and found that some of those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel has found allegation 2b not proven, and further that allegation 1 does not amount to unacceptable professional conduct but does amount to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Ms Ceyhan Unluer should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of four years.

In particular, the panel has found that Ms Unluer 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.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Ms Unluer, 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 Ms Unluer fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of dishonesty on the part of the teacher and also Ms Unluer's failure to disclose the LADO investigation and the recommendation that she does not work with children.

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 Ms Unluer, 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 that the findings in respect of Ms Unluer "*...involved misconduct resulting in a safeguarding concern, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing 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 there was some evidence of Ms Unluer taking accountability for her actions...*"

The panel has also commented that "*...there was evidence of Ms Unluer having undertaken relevant safeguarding training, and that she had obtained a degree in Psychology. As such, the panel considered that Ms Unluer should have had a good understanding of the requirement to comply with the LADO recommendation due to safeguarding concerns.*"

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, "*...that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Unluer were 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 Ms Unluer herself. The panel comment *“In light of the above circumstances, the panel accepted that Ms Unluer was under some duress at the relevant time. Despite this, the panel considered that Ms Unluer’s actions were deliberate, as she intentionally concealed information relevant to her ongoing suitability to teach from her employer when directly questioned.”*

The panel also note that it *“...did not have sufficient evidence to support that Ms Unluer had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in her personal and professional conduct or having contributed significantly to the education sector.*

No character references were provided in respect of Ms Unluer to demonstrate that the incident was out of character. There was also no evidence of Ms Unluer being previously subject to disciplinary proceedings/warnings.”

A prohibition order would prevent Ms Unluer 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 lack of insight. The panel has said, *“The panel considered that there was a risk of Ms Unluer repeating her behaviour, as she did not display full insight into her conduct. Ms Unluer had not demonstrated a meaningful understanding of the implications of her actions as she consistently referred in her written statements to the requirement for her to work and to earn a living as taking priority before the LADO’s instructions. The panel considered that Ms Unluer did not fully understand the transferable risk that she posed by continuing to work with children despite the recommendation of the LADO. Ms Unluer had not demonstrated any consideration of the broader consequences of her conduct for the teaching profession and the public’s trust in it.”*

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel of Ms Unluer's deliberate concealment of her suitability of continuing to work with children despite that recommendation from the LADO.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Ms Unluer 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 four-year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments,

"The panel considered that Ms Unluer's misconduct occurred during an extremely difficult period of her life, [REDACTED]. Whilst the panel acknowledged that Ms Unluer's actions were serious and deliberate, and presented a significant safeguarding risk, the panel was of the view that the pressures in Ms Unluer's life at the relevant time should be taken into consideration.

Although there was limited evidence of insight before the panel, it considered that Ms Unluer had the potential to make a positive contribution to the teaching profession if she was to take appropriate steps to learn from her misconduct. "

The panel has also said that a four-year review period would be appropriate and proportionate in all the circumstances.

I have considered whether a four-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, I am of the view that factors mean that a four-year review period is sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the dishonesty found, and the seriousness of the proven conduct.

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

This means that Ms Ceyhan Unluer 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 2 June 2030, 4 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, Ms Unluer remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Ms Unluer 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 that reads "S. Blomfield". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'S'.

Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield

Date: 15 May 2026

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