



Dr Andrew Moore: 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	11
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	14

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

Teacher: Dr Andrew Moore

Teacher ref number: 06/02051

Teacher date of birth: 25 April 1967

TRA reference: 24824

Date of determination: 20 May 2026

Former employer: Sherborne Girls School, North Dorset

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ('the panel') of the Teaching Regulation Agency ('the TRA') convened on 19 to 20 May 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Dr Andrew Moore.

The panel members were Mrs Cathy Logan (teacher panellist – in the chair), Ms Elizabeth Kitcatt (teacher panellist) and Mr Dara Islam (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mrs Lucy Mosley of Blake Morgan solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Lucy Kinder, Counsel, instructed by Kingsley Napley solicitors.

Dr Moore 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 2 March 2026.

It was alleged that Dr Moore was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that:

Whilst working as the Head of Mathematics at Sherborne Girls School:

1. On or around 8 October 2024, you:

(a) On one or more occasions, attempted to access pornographic websites whilst present on School grounds and/ or whilst connected to the School's Wi-Fi network.

2. On or around 17 October 2024, on one or more occasions, you attempted to access pornographic websites, whilst:

(a) Present on the School's grounds;

(b) Connected to the School's Wi-Fi network; and/ or

(c) On duty at one of the School's boarding houses.

Dr Moore did not admit any of the allegations.

Dr Moore did not admit unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology and list of key people – pages 4 to 6

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 7 to 13

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 14 to 25

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 26 to 324

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 325 to 338

The panel was also provided with a proceeding in absence bundle by the TRA.

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following documents at the hearing:

1. A settlement agreement between Dr Moore and the School;
2. An email from Dr Moore dated 28 April 2026; and
3. Further correspondence between the TRA and Dr Moore dated 7 May 2026.

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

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]; and

Witness B – [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.

The School is an independent day and boarding school for girls aged 11-18.

Dr Moore commenced employment at the School as a Maths Teacher on 1 January 2006. He became Head of Mathematics in September 2024.

On 9 October 2024 the School's IT system flagged that multiple attempts had been made by Dr Moore to access pornographic websites the previous day. The websites had been

blocked by the School's IT system and were not accessed. The School's Director of IT reported this to the Headteacher.

On 17 October 2024 the School's IT system flagged that Dr Moore had attempted to access pornographic websites between 16:00- 17:00. The websites had been blocked by the School's IT system and were not accessed.

On 17 October 2024 the School's IT system flagged that Dr Moore had attempted to access a further pornographic website at 19:57 whilst on duty in one of the girls' boarding houses. The website had been blocked by the School's IT system and was not accessed.

On 31 October 2024 Dr Moore was suspended.

On 4 and 11 November 2024 Dr Moore attended disciplinary meetings.

On 18 November 2024 Dr Moore's employment at the School was terminated.

On 24 November 2024 the [REDACTED] was informed of the allegations by the [REDACTED].

On 2 December 2024 the School referred Dr Moore to the TRA.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

Whilst working as the Head of Mathematics at Sherborne Girls School:

1. On or around 8 October 2024, you:

- (a) On one or more occasions, attempted to access pornographic websites whilst present on School grounds and/ or whilst connected to the School's Wi-Fi network.**

2. On or around 17 October 2024, on one or more occasions, you attempted to access pornographic websites, whilst:

- (a) Present on the School's grounds;**
- (b) Connected to the School's Wi-Fi network; and/ or**
- (c) On duty at one of the School's boarding houses.**

These allegations were all denied by Dr Moore.

As allegations 1 and 2 were closely linked factually and took place just nine days apart, the panel considered them together.

The panel heard oral evidence from Witness A. She explained that on 9 and 18 October 2024 Witness B had submitted Neutral Notification Forms ('NNF') as the School's IT system had flagged that Dr Moore had made multiple attempts to access pornographic websites using the School's wifi on 8 and 17 October 2024. The websites had been blocked by the School's IT system and were not accessed. Witness A explained that she had checked Dr Moore's rota and could see that when he had attempted to access a blocked site on 17 October 2024 at 19:57 he had been on duty in one of the girls' boarding houses.

The panel also heard oral evidence from Witness B. He told the panel that all internet content and traffic at the School that utilises the School's wifi network is recorded and monitored. He explained that each day at around midnight he would receive an automatically generated report that summarised the 'unsavoury' websites which anyone using the network (staff or pupils) had attempted to access the previous day. Witness B stated that should anyone using the network attempt to access a blocked site, they would see a 'splash screen' advising them that the site was blocked and providing a category by way of an explanation for the block, such as drugs, gambling, weapons or sex. If a member of staff had attempted to access a blocked site, Witness B explained that he was required to provide the Headteacher with a NNF. He told the panel that access to the blocked sites had been attempted using the School's wifi network and that as the network was only available in the School building, the access had to have been attempted by Dr Moore whilst he was on the School grounds.

On 9 October 2024 Witness B had received the daily report and was notified that Dr Moore had attempted to access seven websites under the banned category of 'sex'. Witness B had then completed a NNF which he had provided to Witness A. Witness B told the panel that attempts had been made to access the websites through a device that was not issued by the School.

On 18 October 2024 Witness B had received the daily report and was notified that Dr Moore had attempted to access four websites under the banned category of 'sex'. Witness B had then completed a NNF which he had provided to Witness A.

Witness A told the panel that she had invited Dr Moore to her office to discuss the incidents on 18 October 2024. When she told him that the School's IT system had flagged that he had made multiple attempts to access pornographic websites, she stated that he had made full admissions and had been remorseful and embarrassed. Witness A told the panel that at no time had Dr Moore questioned what she had told him, or offered an alternative explanation for his behaviour. The panel was informed that this was an informal meeting and no minutes had been taken.

The panel was presented with an email sent by Dr Moore to Witness A the following day on 19 October 2024, which read:

"I am sending this email to say how devastated I am for letting myself, you and the school down so badly. I feel incredibly stupid and ashamed in equal measure for what has happened and can only ask for your forgiveness. It goes without saying that this will never happen again... I can only apologise unreservedly again for my stupidity and poor judgment."

Witness A explained that when Dr Moore had attended a disciplinary meeting on 4 November 2024, his demeanour had changed and he no longer admitted that he had attempted to access pornographic websites. Instead, Dr Moore stated that he had clicked on a phishing link and a stream of pornographic websites had opened, which he had quickly closed. Following Dr Moore's different account of what had occurred, Witness A adjourned the meeting to allow further technical investigation to take place.

Following the meeting, Witness B had been requested to compile an overview report using the 'Fastvue' software programme, setting out the sites to which access had been attempted, and the browsing time. This report showed that some of the websites had been closed immediately, but some had been accessed for a number of minutes.

At the second disciplinary meeting on 11 November 2024, Dr Moore again denied attempting to access blocked websites. He suggested that malware or the browser cache may have caused the attempts to access pornographic websites, or that his phone may have unlocked itself and made the attempts. Dr Moore had offered to hand in his personal mobile phone to the School for it to be searched. However, Witness A did not consider this would be of assistance, as it had since been wiped and additional software had been installed by Dr Moore. Following Dr Moore's different account of what had occurred, Witness A again adjourned the meeting to allow further technical investigation to take place.

After the second disciplinary meeting, Witness B contacted an account manager at EE who confirmed that it was not possible for a phone to unlock itself and access specific sites. He also contacted a Network Engineer from Opendium, a specialist network, firewall and internet filtering company. They also confirmed that it was not possible for a phone to unlock itself and access specific sites.

A third disciplinary meeting was scheduled to take place, but was cancelled when Dr Moore's legal representative made contact with the School's Human Resources team.

In his written response to the allegations, Dr Moore stated that on 8 October 2024 he had inadvertently attempted to access pornographic websites when he had clicked on a phishing email purporting to be from 'Money Saving Expert'. This had led to several adult

websites opening on his personal mobile device in quick succession, which he had closed quickly.

In relation to the 17 October 2024, the first attempts to access blocked websites were between 17:49- 17:53. Dr Moore stated that at this time he had finished work. The second attempt was at 19:57. Dr Moore explained that at this time he was likely to have just finished supervising a prep class and to have been using his phone. He could not explain how his phone had attempted to access blocked sites during these times, but denied that he had intentionally done so.

The panel also took into account the email provided by Dr Moore dated 28 April 2026. This was read out on his behalf at the hearing by the Legal Advisor.

The panel was satisfied from the evidence presented that Dr Moore's personal mobile phone had been used on a number of occasions on 8 and 17 October 2024 to attempt to access pornographic websites. It was clear that these attempts had been made whilst present on School grounds and connected to the School's wifi network. The panel was also satisfied that in light of the duty rota, Dr Moore had been on duty in one of the girls' boarding houses when activity on his device indicated that he had attempted to access a blocked site on 17 October 2024 at 19:57.

The panel went on to consider whether Dr Moore had intentionally attempted to access the blocked sites. It took into consideration that he had initially admitted attempting to access pornographic websites in his informal meeting with Witness A on 18 October 2024 and in his subsequent email on 19 October 2024. However, he had subsequently denied this and had offered a number of differing accounts in his disciplinary interviews. Dr Moore had offered no evidence to substantiate the different accounts offered.

The panel took into account the evidence provided by Witness B in his role as [REDACTED] and, in particular, the investigations he had undertaken. It noted that independent expert advice had been obtained by the School, and that both an account manager at EE and a Network Engineer from Opendium had confirmed that it was not possible for a phone to unlock itself and access specific sites. There was also no evidence that malware or the browser cache had caused the attempts to access pornographic websites.

The panel considered that had Dr Moore inadvertently attempted to access pornographic websites, he could have raised this with Witness B or another member of staff, but did not do so on either 8 or 17 October 2024. On 8 October 2024, the Fastvue report showed that there had been 44 attempts to access adult sites in a short space of time. On 17 October 2024, the report showed that there had been over 100 attempts to access adult sites over a short period of time. The panel concluded that Dr Moore had intentionally attempted to access those sites. It was not provided with any other credible reason for this to have occurred.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel found allegations 1(a) and 2(a), (b) and (c) proven.

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

Having found all of the allegations proven, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proven 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 Dr Moore, in relation to the facts found proven, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards Guidance for School Leaders, School Staff and Governing Bodies ('the Standards').

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Dr Moore in relation to the facts found proven involved breaches of the Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Dr Moore 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 also considered whether Dr Moore's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

The Advice indicates that where behaviours associated with such an offence exist, a panel is likely to conclude that an individual's conduct would amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel found that none of these offences was relevant.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Dr Moore amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession, and thereby was unacceptable professional conduct.

In making this judgment, the panel drew upon its knowledge and experience of the teaching profession.

The panel would have expected Dr Moore, as an experienced teacher and senior leader, to have recognised the need to use IT and information systems in a way which was

compatible with his professional role and in accordance with the ethos of the School, in particular, whilst on duty and in charge of pupils.

In considering whether Dr Moore'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 Dr Moore'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 Dr Moore was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found that none of these offences were relevant.

The panel's findings of misconduct were serious and it considered that the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on Dr Moore's status as a teacher, and damaging to the public perception of the teaching profession.

The panel therefore found that Dr Moore's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In summary, the panel found that Dr Moore's conduct amounted to both unacceptable professional conduct and 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 and protection of other members of the public
- the maintenance of public confidence in the profession
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct

In light of the panel's findings against Dr Moore, which involved him repeatedly attempting to access pornographic websites whilst on School grounds and using the School's wifi network, there was a strong public interest consideration in relation to all of the considerations referred to above.

The panel considered that there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, especially given that on one occasion Dr Moore had attempted to access pornographic websites whilst on duty and in charge of pupils.

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

The panel determined that there was a strong public interest in ensuring the proper standards of conduct in the profession were upheld. It determined that the conduct found proven against Dr Moore 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 Dr Moore in the profession. It noted that he was an experienced teacher and senior leader, who had recently been promoted to Head of Mathematics. He had been held in high regard by colleagues and had a previously unblemished career in teaching. The panel determined that whilst there was evidence that Dr Moore had good ability as an educator, it considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining him 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 Dr Moore.

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;
- 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.

The panel acknowledged that Dr Moore had a previous good record, having not been made subject to any regulatory findings previously. He had worked at the School for 18 years and had recently been promoted to head of the maths department. The references provided by Dr Moore described him very positively, and Witness A spoke highly of him as a teacher and fellow professional.

The panel however felt that Dr Moore's remorse was limited, and that he had shown an overall lack of insight in respect of the conduct and its significance. Whilst Dr Moore had initially made full admissions, he had clearly rowed back from these at his disciplinary meetings in a way that was deflective and did not engage with the seriousness of the conduct.

Further, the panel was satisfied that Dr Moore's actions were deliberate and there was no suggestion that he was acting under duress.

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 Dr Moore 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 Dr

Moore. The fact that he had made full admissions before recanting them and providing numerous changing accounts 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 decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a review period.

Although the panel considered that Dr Moore had shown a lack of insight in respect of his conduct, it took into account that he had attempted to access pornographic websites but had not actually done so and no pupils were directly harmed by his conduct. Taking into account all the circumstances of the case, including the embarrassment demonstrated by Dr Moore and his lengthy and previously unblemished career in teaching, the panel considered that the risk of repetition was low. Therefore, it determined that a short review period would be sufficient to address the public interest considerations in the case.

The panel determined that the appropriate review period to recommend to the Secretary of State was one of two years.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

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

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

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Dr Andrew Moore should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of two years.

In particular, the panel has found that Dr Moore 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 finds that the conduct of Dr Moore fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding that Dr Moore repeatedly attempted to access pornographic material whilst on school grounds.

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 Dr Moore, 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 said, *“The panel considered that there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, especially given that on one occasion Dr Moore had attempted to access pornographic websites whilst on duty and in charge 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 however felt that Dr Moore’s remorse was limited,*

and that he had shown an overall lack of insight in respect of the conduct and its significance.” In my judgement, the lack of full insight and remorse means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour, and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, *“...that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Dr Moore were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct 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 Dr Moore himself. The panel comment,

“The panel acknowledged that Dr Moore had a previous good record, having not been made subject to any regulatory findings previously. He had worked at the School for 18 years and had recently been promoted to head of the maths department. The references provided by Dr Moore described him very positively, and Witness A spoke highly of him as a teacher and fellow professional.”

A prohibition order would prevent Dr Moore 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 finding that Dr Moore had only demonstrated limited insight and remorse.

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that on one occasion, Dr Moore attempted to access pornographic material whilst in charge of pupils.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Dr Moore 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 two-year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments

“Although the panel considered that Dr Moore had shown a lack of insight in respect of his conduct, it took into account that he had attempted to access pornographic websites but had not actually done so and no pupils were directly harmed by his conduct. Taking into account all the circumstances of the case, including the embarrassment demonstrated by Dr Moore and his lengthy and previously unblemished career in teaching, the panel considered that the risk of repetition was low. Therefore, it determined that a short review period would be sufficient to address the public interest considerations in the case.”

The panel has also said that a two-year review period would be both appropriate and proportionate.

I have considered whether a two-year review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a two-year review period is sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the seriousness of the conduct.

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

This means that Dr Andrew Moore 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 8 June 2028, two 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, Dr Moore remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

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

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "S. Blomfield".

Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield

Date: 28 May 2026

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