



Mr Alexander Webb: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

June 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Witnesses	4
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	7
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	12

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

Teacher: Mr Alexander Webb

Teacher ref number: 1753489

Teacher date of birth: 25 February 1996

TRA reference: 20299

Date of determination: 2 June 2026

Former employer: [REDACTED], Stafford

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ('the panel') of the Teaching Regulation Agency ('the TRA') convened on 2 June 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Alexander Webb.

The panel members were Mrs Patricia Hunt (former teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Peter Whitelock (lay panellist) and Mrs Jane Gotschel (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Abigail Hubert of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Aleksandra Manning-Rees of Five St Andrew's Hill chambers, instructed by Kingsley Napley LLP solicitors.

Mr Alexander Webb 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 proceedings dated 11 February 2026.

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

1. On 5 December 2024, he was convicted of:
 - a. Six counts of sexual activity with a child,
 - b. Three counts of sexual communication with a child,
 - c. Five counts of making indecent photographs of a child.

In Mr Webb's response to the notice of proceedings dated 12 February 2026 he admitted to the facts of allegations 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c). Mr Webb further admitted that those facts amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology, list of key people and anonymised pupil list – pages 3 to 4

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 5 to 12

Section 3: TRA exhibits – pages 13 to 38

Section 4: Teacher documents – pages 39 to 43

The panel also received a bundle of email correspondence in relation to the reporting restrictions for the case.

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 Procedures.

Witnesses

No witnesses were called to give oral evidence at the hearing.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

Mr Webb commenced employment at [REDACTED] ('the School') on 1 September 2018.

On 28 May 2021, a referral was made to the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub ('MASH') alleging that a [REDACTED] pupil at the School was in a sexual relationship with [REDACTED] teacher, Mr Webb. On the same day, Mr Webb was arrested and interviewed by the police.

Mr Webb was interviewed by the police for a second time on 6 February 2023.

On 5 December 2024, Mr Webb pleaded guilty to and was convicted of six counts of sexual activity with a child, three counts of sexual communication with a child and five counts of making indecent photographs of a child.

On 13 February 2025, Mr Webb was sentenced at Stafford Crown Court to a custodial sentence of 5 years and 7 months.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

1. On 5 December 2024, you were convicted of:

- a. Six counts of sexual activity with a child,**
- b. Three counts of sexual communication with a child,**
- c. Five counts of making indecent photographs of a child.**

The panel considered the document Teacher misconduct: The prohibition of teachers, which is referred to as 'the Advice'. Page 8 of the Advice states that where there has been a conviction at any time of a criminal offence, the panel will accept the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction, unless exceptional circumstances apply. The panel did not find that any exceptional circumstances applied in this case.

The panel had been provided with a copy of the certificate of conviction from Stafford Crown Court, which detailed that Mr Webb had been convicted on 5 December 2024 of

six counts of sexual activity with a child, three counts of sexual communication with a child, and five counts of making indecent photographs of a child. The panel noted the certificate of conviction stated that Mr Webb had pleaded guilty to the offences.

In respect of the allegations, Mr Webb was sentenced at Stafford Crown Court on 13 February 2025 to 5 years and 7 months imprisonment to run concurrently. In addition, he was placed on the Sex Offenders Register for life and made subject to a Sexual Harm Prevention Order for 10 years and a Restraining Order for 10 years.

The panel also noted that Mr Webb had admitted the particulars of allegations 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c) as set out in his response to the notice of proceedings dated 12 February 2026. Mr Webb's response further recorded that his admission to the allegations was also shown by entering a guilty plea in the criminal proceedings at the earliest opportunity.

The panel reviewed Mr Webb's admission alongside the evidence before it, including the certificate of conviction and the police report.

Having considered the admitted facts and the supporting evidence, the panel found allegations 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c) proved.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

Having found all of the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to conviction of a relevant offence.

In doing so, the panel had regard to the Advice.

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

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
- 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 noted that Mr Webb's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting, particularly as the police report set out that the allegations involved a sexual relationship with a pupil at the School and also the original communications with the pupil were carried out via their School email accounts.

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

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel noted that the behaviour exhibited by Mr Webb would be regarded as wholly unacceptable by members of the public. Not only did Mr Webb's behaviour fall significantly short of the standards expected of a teacher, but he was also in a position of trust and fundamentally breached that trust. Therefore, the panel considered that Mr Webb's behaviour in committing the offences could affect public confidence in the teaching profession, particularly given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community.

The panel noted that Mr Webb's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed. The Advice states: "*it is likely that a conviction for any offence that led to a term of imprisonment, including any suspended sentence, will be considered "a relevant offence."*"

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

This was a case concerning offences involving sexual activity with a child; sexual communication with a child; and making indecent images of a child, which the Advice states are likely to be considered "relevant offences".

The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Webb's ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding that these convictions were relevant offences was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of a conviction of a relevant offence, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be made, the panel had to consider whether it would be an appropriate and

proportionate measure, and whether it would be in the public interest to do so. Prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely, the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils; the protection of other members of the public; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Webb, which involved sexual activity with a child; sexual communication with a child; and making indecent photographs of a child, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils.

The panel concluded that Mr Webb demonstrated a complete disregard for the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils. The panel further noted that Mr Webb's inclusion on the Sex Offenders Register for life emphasises the seriousness and gravity of his conduct.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Webb was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession. The panel considered that an ordinary member of the public would recognise the seriousness of the conduct found proved, which fell significantly below the high standards and behaviour expected of teachers.

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

In addition to the public interest considerations set out above, the panel went on to consider whether there was a public interest in retaining Mr Webb in the profession. The panel did not see any evidence to attest to Mr Webb's history or ability as a teacher. The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Webb in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, particularly as he sought to exploit his position of trust by engaging in a sexual relationship with a pupil.

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. The panel noted that a teacher's behaviour that seeks to exploit their position of trust

should be viewed very seriously in terms of its potential influence on pupils and be seen as a possible threat to the public interest.

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

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

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of the Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- an abuse of any trust, knowledge, or influence gained through their professional position in order to advance a romantic or sexual relationship with a pupil or former pupil;
- sexual misconduct, e.g. involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature and/or that use or exploit the trust, knowledge or influence derived from the individual's professional position;
- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing, or publishing any indecent photograph or image, or indecent pseudo photograph or image, of a child, or permitting such activity, including one-off incidents;
- failure in their duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk or failing to promote the safety and welfare of the children (as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE); and
- violation of the rights of pupils.

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 found that there was no evidence to suggest that Mr Webb's actions were not deliberate. The conduct took place over a sustained period, with the sexual relationship

with a pupil lasting approximately six months. It was accompanied by a significant volume of communication, including approximately 39,400 messages exchanged with that pupil. In addition, Mr Webb maintained around 5,000 Snapchat contacts, which included pupils from the School. In light of the duration and nature of these interactions, the panel concluded that there was no plausible basis upon which the conduct could be characterised as anything other than deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Webb was acting under extreme duress.

No evidence was submitted to attest to Mr Webb's previous history as a teacher or his ability as a teacher. There was no evidence before the panel which indicated that Mr Webb had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in either his personal or professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel noted that the police report commented that Mr Webb had said during the police interview that he felt a "*deep amount of regret and remorse*" for how his conduct affected his life and the lives of others. The minutes of the School's disciplinary hearing also recorded Mr Webb as expressing remorse and apologising for his actions and for bringing the School into disrepute.

The panel also noted Mr Webb's comment on his response to the notice of proceedings that he entered a guilty plea to the allegations against him at the earliest opportunity. The panel considered that Mr Webb showed some amount of insight into the impact of his actions in his response to the notice of proceedings where he stated that he had to live with his conduct each day and "*even more so I am sure those affected do also*". Within his response to the notice of proceedings, Mr Webb also indicated that he has no intentions or desire to return to teaching.

Whilst the panel took account of the limited references Mr Webb made in respect of the impact on his victims and others, it did not consider them to outweigh the seriousness of the behaviour. The panel was particularly concerned that Mr Webb had pursued a six month long sexual relationship with a pupil who was [REDACTED] when he was a teacher at the School in a position of trust. The panel also noted that the police report also detailed that Mr Webb had set up a Snapchat account which he used to befriend teenage girls to engage in sexualised conversations whilst purporting to be a teenage boy.

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

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings would be sufficient would

unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Webb of prohibition.

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Webb. The serious nature of the offences which included a sexual relationship with a pupil 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. These include serious sexual misconduct e.g. where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons, particularly where the individual has used their professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons; any sexual misconduct involving a child; any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or indecent pseudo photograph or image of a child, including one off incidents. The panel found that each of these behaviours was relevant for this case.

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 relevant in this case.

The panel took into account the nature and seriousness of the conduct when considering whether a review period would be appropriate, together with Mr Webb's comments, which demonstrated some awareness of the impact of his behaviour on the victims and others.

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

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

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

In this case, the panel has found all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to a relevant conviction.

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

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
- 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 findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they involve a conviction for sexual activity with a child, sexual communication with a child and making indecent photographs of a child. The conviction resulted in a lengthy custodial sentence.

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 a relevant conviction, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I

have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Mr Webb, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

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

“In light of the panel’s findings against Mr Webb, which involved sexual activity with a child; sexual communication with a child; and making indecent photographs of a child, 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 has set out as follows:

“The panel noted that the police report commented that Mr Webb had said during the police interview that he felt a *“deep amount of regret and remorse”* for how his conduct affected his life and the lives of others. The minutes of the School’s disciplinary hearing also recorded Mr Webb as expressing remorse and apologising for his actions and for bringing the School into disrepute.

The panel also noted Mr Webb’s comment on his response to the notice of proceedings that he entered a guilty plea to the allegations against him at the earliest opportunity. The panel considered that Mr Webb showed some amount of insight into the impact of his actions in his response to the notice of proceedings where he stated that he had to live with his conduct each day and *“even more so I am sure those affected do also”*. Within his response to the notice of proceedings, Mr Webb also indicated that he has no intentions or desire to return to teaching.”

I have therefore given this element some weight in reaching my decision.

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

“The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel noted that the behaviour exhibited by Mr Webb would be regarded as wholly unacceptable by members of the public. Not only did Mr Webb’s behaviour fall significantly short of the standards expected of a teacher, but he was also in a position of trust and fundamentally breached that trust. Therefore, the panel considered that Mr Webb’s behaviour in committing the offences could affect public confidence in the teaching profession, particularly given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of a conviction for sexual activity with a child 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 a relevant conviction, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mr Webb himself. The panel has commented:

“No evidence was submitted to attest to Mr Webb’s previous history as a teacher or his ability as a teacher. There was no evidence before the panel which indicated that Mr Webb had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in either his personal or professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector.”

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments concerning the serious nature of the offences which included sexual activity with a pupil and which resulted in a lengthy custodial sentence. The panel has said:

“Whilst the panel took account of the limited references Mr Webb made in respect of the impact on his victims and others, it did not consider them to outweigh the seriousness of the behaviour. The panel was particularly concerned that Mr Webb had pursued a six month long sexual relationship with a pupil who was [REDACTED] when he was a teacher at the School in a position of trust. The panel also noted that the police report also detailed that Mr Webb had set up a Snapchat account which he used to befriend teenage girls to engage in sexualised conversations whilst purporting to be a teenage boy.”

The panel has found that Mr Webb’s actions were deliberate and that there was no evidence that he was acting under extreme duress.

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

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended that no provision should be made for a review period.

I have considered the panel's comments:

“The Advice indicates that there are certain types of case where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period. These include serious sexual misconduct e.g. where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons, particularly where the individual has used their professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons; any sexual misconduct involving a child; any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or indecent pseudo photograph or image of a child, including one off incidents. The panel found that each of these behaviours was relevant for this case.”

I have considered whether not allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate response to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the serious nature of the offences of which Mr Webb was convicted and the potential damage to the public's perception of the teaching profession.

I consider therefore that allowing for no review period is necessary to maintain public confidence and is proportionate and in the public interest.

This means that Mr Alexander Webb is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. Furthermore, in view of the seriousness of the allegations found proved against him, I have decided that Mr Webb shall not be entitled to apply for restoration of his eligibility to teach.

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

Mr Alexander Webb 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 black ink, appearing to read 'D. Oatley', with a large, sweeping flourish at the end.

Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 3 June 2026

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