



Mr Leon Osbourne: 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 | 5 |
| Documents | 5 |
| Witnesses | 6 |
| Decision and reasons | 6 |
| Findings of fact | 7 |
| Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State | 29 |
| Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State | 33 |

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

Teacher: Mr Leon Osbourne
Teacher ref number: 2157432
Teacher date of birth: 4 September 1990
TRA reference: 22670
Date of determination: 3 June 2026
Former employer: Octavia House Schools, Essex

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ('the panel') of the Teaching Regulation Agency ('the TRA') convened on 11 to 15 May 2026 and 2 and 3 June 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Leon Osbourne.

The panel members were Mr Carl Lygo (lay panellist – in the chair), Ms Julia Hyde (teacher panellist) and Mrs Bev Williams (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Katie Garcia of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Leah Redden of Browne Jacobson LLP solicitors.

Mr Osbourne was present and was not represented.

Mr Martin Jones was present as independent counsel.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 16 December 2025.

It was alleged that Mr Osbourne was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that, whilst employed as a Teacher at Octavia House Schools between 1 September 2015 until 20 October 2023:

1. He engaged in inappropriate and/or unprofessional behaviour towards:
 - a. Staff member 1, in that he:
 - i. Kissed her hand;
 - ii. Blew kisses to her;
 - iii. Made inappropriate and/or sexualised comments to her;
 - iv. Discussed orgasms with her;
 - v. Told her that he wanted to be 'squeezed' by her, the same way that she 'squeezed' a pupil.
 - b. Staff member 2, in that he:
 - i. Touched her back and/or grabbed her bottom and/or text her to say he wished that he had done it sooner or used words to that effect;
 - ii. Called her 'hot stuff' or used words to that effect;
 - iii. Called her 'sexy beast' or used words to that effect;
 - iv. Pulled her towards him;
 - v. Kissed her neck;
 - vi. Said that he was glad that he could see down her dress or made a comment to this effect.
 - c. Staff member 3, in that he:
 - i. Made comments about her bottom on one or more occasions;
 - ii. Told her that her private area was 'soft';
 - iii. Asked her about her sexual preferences;

- iv. Asked her if she enjoyed performing oral sex;
 - v. Touched her leg;
 - vi. Kissed and/or attempted to kiss her.
- d. Staff member 5, in that he:
- i. Touched and/or brushed her bottom

2. His conduct as may be found proven at allegation 1 was of a sexual nature and/or sexually motivated.

Mr Osbourne did not provide a formal response to the allegations. Upon reading the allegations to Mr Osbourne, he appeared to admit some factual aspects of allegations b i, b ii, b iii, and c i and that some of the allegations could amount to Unacceptable Professional Conduct. The panel proceeded on the basis that the allegations were not admitted, and the Hearing was fully contested.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology and anonymised persons list – pages 5 to 6

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 8 to 32

Section 3: TRA witness statements – pages 34 to 67

Section 4: TRA documents – pages 69 to 120

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 123 to 128

Section 6: Hearing Stage – page 129

In addition, the panel were provided a one-page screenshot of paragraph 8 of the witness statement of Staff Member 2 which was omitted from the bundle provided – page 130

In addition, there were the following additional documents:

WhatsApp messages between Staff Member 5 and Mr Osbourne dated 4 June 2021 - pages 131 to 133.

WhatsApp messages between Staff Member 5 and Mr Osbourne comprising 18 screenshots dating from 1 June 2021 and 23 March 2022 pages - 134 to 151.

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

Staff Member 1 [REDACTED]

Staff Member 2 [REDACTED]

Staff Member 3 [REDACTED]

Staff Member 5 [REDACTED]

Witness A – [REDACTED]

Mr Osbourne also gave 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.

Mr Osbourne commenced employment as a support worker at Octavia House Schools ('the School') in July 2015. He was then appointed as an unqualified teacher on 15 December 2016.

Concerns were raised in October 2023 regarding Mr Osbourne's alleged conduct towards other members of staff at the School. The allegations concerned instances of inappropriate behaviour towards colleagues and alleged sexual harassment.

The School commenced an internal investigation and a disciplinary hearing was held on 20 October 2023.

The matter was referred to the TRA on 18 October 2023.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

The panel found as follows in relation to the allegations against you:

1. You engaged in inappropriate and/or unprofessional behaviour towards:

a. Staff member 1, in that you:

i. Kissed her hand;

The panel considered the written statement of Staff Member 1. Staff Member 1 described an occasion on which she went to high five Mr Osbourne and he “*attempted to kiss*” her hand. She said that she moved her hand away and laughed it off at the time. The panel noted that Staff Member 1 did not say in her statement that Mr Osbourne had kissed her hand.

The panel also considered the School’s investigation notes. In the note of the conversation between Witness A and Teacher 2 on 9 October 2023, Teacher 2 said that Staff Member 1 had reported that she put her hand out to high five Mr Osbourne and he kissed her hand. The panel noted that they were not aware of the identity of the person called “*Teacher 2*” in the investigation meeting notes.

No reference was made in the notes of the investigation meeting on 12 October 2023 between Witness A and Staff Member 1 to Staff Member 1 saying that Mr Osbourne kissed her hand.

The panel considered Staff Member 1’s oral evidence. She said that Mr Osbourne went to kiss her hand and that she “*pulled [her] hand away*”. She said that she did not let him kiss her hand. Later, in response to a panel question, she repeated that he did not kiss her hand and had only gone to do so before she pulled it away. The panel considered that her oral evidence was consistent therefore with her written statement.

The panel also considered Mr Osbourne’s evidence. In his email dated 20 June 2024, he had said that the incident where he attempted to kiss Staff Member 1’s hand was “*completely innocent*”. In the investigation notes dated 12 October 2023, Mr Osbourne stated “*there was an incident with Staff Member 1 whereby a kissed her hand (gestured it), but that was in a joking manner and she spoke to [him] about that, she said she didn’t take it that way and we have been fine*”. The panel noted this allegation was not directly addressed by Mr Osbourne in the disciplinary hearing on 20 October 2023.

Mr Osbourne accepted in evidence that he attempted to kiss Staff Member 1’s hand. He said that the incident was intended as banter and he and Staff Member 1 were friendly,

would generally try to “*throw each other off*” and Staff Member 1 was on the telephone to a parent at the time. He said that he held his hand out and that she placed her hand in his, but he accepted that she did not give verbal consent because she did not know what he was doing.

The panel found that there was a material difference between the allegation as pleaded and the evidence of Staff Member 1 as to what actually happened. Staff Member 1’s own written and oral evidence was that Mr Osbourne attempted to kiss her hand but did not do so because she withdrew it.

The panel was satisfied that the evidence suggested an attempted hand kiss, rather than Mr Osbourne actually kissing Staff Member 1’s hand. The panel concluded therefore that the allegation was not made out as pleaded.

The panel therefore found allegation 1(a)(i) not proved.

ii. Blew kisses to her;

The panel considered the written statement of Staff Member 1 in which she said that when Mr Osbourne would see her, he would look at her in an overly sexualised manner and “*kiss his lips*” at her. She said that this was distressing and had become a normal part of the day. In her written statement she did not use the words “*blowing kisses*”, but she did describe repeated conduct involving kissing his lips and the way he looked at her.

The panel also considered the school investigation notes between Witness A and Staff Member 1 dated 12 October 2023. Staff Member 1 said that Mr Osbourne would do things such as “*blow kisses through the door*”. The panel considered Staff Member 1’s oral evidence. When asked directly by the panel whether he blew kisses at her, she answered, “*Yes often through the fire door.*”

The panel also considered Mr Osbourne’s written and oral evidence.

In his oral evidence, Mr Osbourne denied blowing kisses at Staff Member 1 or kissing his lips at her. He suggested that something may have been mistaken because his moustache tickled his nostrils and he would often touch or move his mouth, and he sometimes clicked his mouth after eating as he was conscious of things being in his teeth.

The panel carefully considered the evidence in front of it, in particular it noted that Mr Osbourne referred to his relationship with Staff Member 1 as “*extremely close*” and that they were “*both flirtatious with one another*”.

Although Staff Member 1's written statement used the phrase "*kiss his lips at me*" rather than "*blew kisses*", the panel considered that this was consistent in substance with her oral account.

The panel noted that Mr Osbourne during his oral evidence denied the allegation and suggested that any such conduct may have been a misunderstanding caused by movements related to his moustache or mouth. The panel was not convinced by that explanation.

The panel found that Staff Member 1's evidence was consistent across the investigation and hearing and took into account Mr Osbourne's own descriptions about their flirtatious relationship. Taking those matters together, the panel considered that Staff Member 1's account was more likely than not to be accurate.

The panel considered that Mr Osbourne's behaviour was inappropriate and unprofessional. Blowing kisses at a colleague was not ordinary workplace interaction and was a form of conduct which crossed professional boundaries.

The panel therefore found allegation 1(a)(ii) proved by the TRA on the balance of probabilities.

iii. Made inappropriate and/or sexualised comments to her;

The panel considered the written statement and oral evidence of Staff Member 1 in which she said that inappropriate comments started happening soon after she started at the School. She described one incident when she was in the "[REDACTED]" while she was getting the ball during basketball with pupils present and Mr Osbourne commented that he loved it when she was bent over like that. She said in her written statement that he would make any situation uncomfortable and turn any comment into something sexual, and gave as an example that, when he helped with something, he would ask what he would get in return.

The panel also considered the school investigation notes between Witness A and Staff Member 1 dated 12 October 2023. Staff Member 1 said that Mr Osbourne made inappropriate comments of a sexual nature. She gave examples including him making comments while she was stretching with a pupil. She also said that he would make sexualised comments in front of children.

The panel considered Staff Member 1's written and oral evidence where she indicated that comments were often made in front of pupils, which limited how she could respond, and that she would usually laugh them off because she felt uncomfortable.

The panel had before it WhatsApp messages between Staff Member 1 and Mr Osbourne which were undated. Both Mr Osbourne and Staff Member 1 acknowledged that these

were messages between them in their evidence. Mr Osbourne had sent Staff Member 1 a WhatsApp message apologising for his actions and saying that he *“clearly went too far in what [he] thought to be humour/banter”* that he would not do it again and thanked her for not taking it further.

The panel also considered Mr Osbourne’s evidence. In the investigation meeting on 12 October 2023, when asked about making inappropriate sexualised comments, he replied *“Yes, but we are laughing and if it came up in a conversation then it is in a banter kind of way.”* In the disciplinary hearing, he said that the interactions with Staff Member 1 were best described as banter and that they had had many *“sexual conversations”*. In his June 2024 email, he said that, with Staff Member 1, conversations about sexual positions had occurred as part of a three-way conversation involving another staff member.

Mr Osbourne denied saying that he *“loved it”* when Staff Member 1 was *“bent over like that”* and denied telling Staff Member 1 to turn around so that he could look at her bottom. In his general evidence, he accepted that he would make jokes with Staff Member 1, sometimes of a flirty nature, although he said they were intended as playful banter and that he had no intention to overstep boundaries.

The panel found that Staff Member 1 was a clear and consistent witness. Her witness statement described a pattern of sexualised comments from Mr Osbourne. The panel also considered it indicative that Mr Osbourne apologised in a WhatsApp message for making her feel uncomfortable and for taking what he thought was banter, too far. The panel did not accept Mr Osbourne’s suggestion that these matters were merely mutual banter. The panel was satisfied that the comments described by Staff Member 1 including without limitation that he *“loved it when [she] was bent over”* and hinting at her to turn around when she was teaching so he could *“look at [her] bum”* occurred.

The panel considered that Mr Osbourne’s behaviour as proven was plainly inappropriate and unprofessional.

The panel therefore found allegation 1(a)(iii) proved.

iv. Discussed orgasms with her;

The panel considered the written and oral evidence of Staff Member 1, that she yawned, saying that she was tired, and Mr Osbourne then commented that he knew what would give her more energy, namely *“a really good orgasm”*. She said that she responded by saying that [REDACTED] did a good job of that, and Mr Osbourne replied by saying, *“don’t ruin it by bringing partners into it”*.

The panel considered the school investigation notes between Witness A and Staff Member 1 on 12 October 2023 where what was recorded was consistent with her live evidence. In Staff Member 1's oral evidence she gave further detail that the incident happened in the "[REDACTED]".

The panel considered Mr Osbourne's email of 20 June 2024. In that email, he did not directly address the orgasm comment alleged by Staff Member 1. He said more generally that, with Staff Member 1, there had been group discussions about sexual positions, including a three-way conversation involving another staff member, and he suggested that those conversations were mutual and contextual.

The panel considered Mr Osbourne's responses at the disciplinary hearing on 20 October 2023. Mr Osbourne said that he and Staff Member 1 had many sexual conversations. When Witness A asked him whether he accepted that talking about orgasms in a school environment was unprofessional, he said that the conversation was "*in the mix of another conversation*".

The panel considered Mr Osbourne's oral evidence before the panel. His evidence was that it was an adult conversation between Staff Member 1 and another and it was not in front of children. In both Mr Osbourne's oral evidence and his email dated 20 June 2024 he referenced [REDACTED] as an explanation for his actions.

The panel found Staff Member 1 to be a clear and consistent witness on this allegation. Mr Osbourne in his oral evidence said it had been an adult conversation about orgasms not one targeted at Staff Member 1. The panel considered that he sought to minimise the conduct by reframing it as general banter or a private adult conversation.

The panel was satisfied that Mr Osbourne discussed orgasms with Staff Member 1. The panel considered that Mr Osbourne's behaviour as found proven was inappropriate and unprofessional. The panel noted he has used overtly sexual language, in the course of the working day and, on Staff Member 1's evidence, in the school environment while pupils were nearby. The panel considered that this behaviour was capable of making a colleague feel uncomfortable and crossed professional boundaries.

The panel therefore found allegation 1(a)(iv) proved.

v. Told her that you wanted to be 'squeezed' by her, the same way that she 'squeezed' a pupil.

The panel considered the written and oral evidence of Staff Member 1 in which she said that there was an occasion when a pupil was becoming dysregulated, and she hugged

the pupil tightly to support them. She said that Mr Osbourne said that he wished she could squeeze him like that.

The panel considered the school investigation notes between Witness A and Staff Member 1 on 12 October 2023 which were consistent with Staff Member 1's evidence. She said that this was one of the "*constant comments*" which pushed her to speak to Teacher 2.

The panel considered Mr Osbourne's evidence. In the disciplinary hearing dated 20 October, he did not address the allegation directly but rather described his relationship with Staff Member 1 as "*close*" and "*best described as banter*".

The panel considered Mr Osbourne's oral evidence in which he denied the allegation. When asked why he had not denied that point when asked about it by the School, he said that he had probably been focused on the bigger allegations at the time, but that he definitely had not done as alleged.

The panel found Staff Member 1 to be a credible and consistent witness. The allegation was consistent with the wider pattern of sexualised comments described by Staff Member 1. The panel considered Mr Osbourne's general comments contained within his email on 20 June 2024 in which he refers to the interactions as always mutual and although "*granted that it's not seen as professional conduct, the truth of the matter is that it happens in the workplace*". The panel found these comments appeared to suggest a culture and mindset on the part of Mr Osbourne.

The panel considered that Mr Osbourne's behaviour in telling a colleague that he wished she could squeeze him in the same way that she was squeezing a pupil was plainly inappropriate and unprofessional.

The panel therefore found allegation 1(a)(v) proved to the balance of probabilities by the TRA.

b. Staff member 2, in that you:

i. Touched her back and/or grabbed her bottom and/or text her to say you wished that you had done it sooner or used words to that effect;

The panel noted Mr Osbourne admitted the facts of this allegation. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the evidence available to it.

The panel considered the school investigation notes. In Staff Member 2's interview with Witness A on 11 October 2023, she said that, on one occasion, she was wearing a crop top and, during the hug, his hand went onto her back. She said that he later hugged her again and "*grabbed my butt*", that she told him "*oi that is not on*", and that he later apologised and said, "*sorry I just got carried away*".

The panel considered Staff Member 2's written statement and oral evidence. In her oral evidence, she said that, on the first occasion, Mr Osbourne's hand went up the back of her top and touched her bra strap. She said that she initially thought that may have been accidental because of the style of her top and her bag. She also described how he "*one time he grabbed [her] bottom*".

The panel were shown messages between Mr Osbourne and Staff Member 2 dated 13 May 2022 and a further message of an unknown date showing a response from Staff Member 2 and a message from Mr Osbourne. In the messages Mr Osbourne said he got "*overexcited*" and described it as "*flirty/banter? Thingy that we have going on (which I'm loving by the way (heart eyes emoji))*" and said "*I'd be lying if I said I didn't want it to not be banter though*". He went on to say "*I wish you'd let me know that butt tapping was all sooner though*", "*a lot of missed opportunities there*" and "*I told u I'm a rebel*". Staff Member 2 said that she had not given him consent to touch her bottom. She also said that his message saying that "*the odd butt tap is fine*" made her feel "*super uncomfortable*".

The panel also considered Mr Osbourne's evidence. In the investigation meeting on 12 October 2023, when asked if he recalled ever grabbing any staff member's bum, he was recorded as admitting something had occurred with a staff member who was no longer at the school, but stated it was consensual. In questioning during the disciplinary hearing on 18 October 2023 when Mr Osbourne was asked whether he recalled grabbing someone's bottom in school and whether he agreed that such behaviour was unprofessional, he answered, "*Yes, I do.*" It was not clear to the panel as to what part of the question he was admitting.

In Mr Osbourne's email dated 20 June 2024, he said he touched Staff Member 2's back/bottom, during a mutual hug and the staff member gave him permission to do so.

In his oral evidence, Mr Osbourne accepted that, during a hug, his thumb may have gone under Staff Member 2's crop top, and he said that was not deliberate. He accepted touching her bottom and said that he had tapped rather than grabbed it. He accepted that he did not have consent to touch her bottom.

The panel found Staff Member 2 to be a clear witness. Her account in the investigation notes, her oral evidence, and the WhatsApp messages were consistent in establishing that Mr Osbourne touched her back during a hug and touching her bottom and then sent messages indicating that he has missed out on opportunities to touch her bum previously.

The panel did not accept Mr Osbourne's evidence that his conduct was part of a mutual hug or was consensual. The panel found that Mr Osbourne's June 2024 email account was inconsistent with the contemporaneous WhatsApp messages. The panel considered

that those messages strongly supported Staff Member 2's account and undermined Mr Osbourne's suggestion that the conduct was consensual. The messages were apologetic in tone stating "*hopefully he didn't blur the lines*" and that he was "*overexcited*" and he "*tapped [her] butt (love heart emoji) a few times!!*" The panel found these messages showed that Mr Osbourne recognised that he had gone too far.

The panel found that Mr Osbourne's reference to "*tapping*" her bum appeared to be a bid to minimise his actions. The panel therefore found that his behaviour was inappropriate and unprofessional.

The panel found allegation 1(b)(i) proven on the balance of probabilities in that he touched Staff Member 2's back, grabbed her bottom and texted her to say he wished that he had done it sooner.

ii. Called her 'hot stuff' or used words to that effect;

iii. Called her 'sexy beast' or used words to that effect;

The panel noted Mr Osbourne admitted the facts of these allegations. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the evidence available to it.

The panel considered Mr Osbourne's email dated 20 June 2024. In that email, he said that his texting Staff Member 2 and calling her "*hot stuff*" and "*sexy beast*" was due to their "*mutual attraction*" and occurred outside school premises. He also said that Staff Member 2 would call him "*good looking*", "*handsome*" and "*babes*" regularly.

The panel considered Staff Member 2's written statement and oral evidence. Staff Member 2 said that Mr Osbourne called her "*hot stuff*" both in person and by text, and she identified the message sent by Mr Osbourne to her on 13 May 2022, which the panel had, as the "*sexy beast*" message. The panel was satisfied that Mr Osbourne had sent this message as the conversation was labelled and both Staff Member 2 and Mr Osbourne confirmed the screenshot was an accurate reflection of the messages between them.

The panel also considered Mr Osbourne's oral evidence. In that evidence, he accepted that he had called Staff Member 2 "*hot stuff*" and "*sexy beast*". He then said that, in his 20 June 2024 email, he had confused Staff Member 2 and Staff Member 3, and he also said that he used such terms with male and female staff generally and not in a sexual way.

The panel did not accept Mr Osbourne's explanation that those terms were frequently used with all staff, male and female, and found it to be inconsistent with his June 2024 email which was a clear written admission that he called Staff Member 2 "*hot stuff*" and "*sexy beast*" because of a "*mutual attraction*". The panel considered that both accounts

were inconsistent with Mr Osbourne's response at the disciplinary hearing dated 18 October 2023 in which he replied generally that he did not remember the occasions regarding Staff Member 2.

The panel found Mr Osbourne's behaviour to be inappropriate and unprofessional.

The panel found allegations 1(b)(ii) and 1(b)(iii) proved.

iv. Pulled her towards you;

v. Kissed her neck;

The panel considered Mr Osbourne's email dated 20 June 2024. In that email, he said that he had "*never kissed Staff Member 2's neck*" and that he did "*not know where that allegation had come from*". In the same email, he also said that Staff Member 2 had told him that she found him attractive and that, if they had not worked together, she would have been intimate with him.

The panel considered the school investigation notes. In her interview with Witness A on 11 October 2023, Staff Member 2 said that, in the bottom staffroom, Mr Osbourne pulled her onto him while he was leaning against the counter and started kissing her neck. She said that she pushed him off and told him that he needed to stop and that he would get into trouble. She also said that the incident made her emotional when speaking about it and that she had not reported it at the time because he was "*highly admired*" in the setting.

The panel considered Staff Member 2's written statement and oral evidence. In her oral evidence, she said that she went into the staffroom to get some resources, that Mr Osbourne said she had not hugged him that day, pulled her into him, and started kissing down her neck. She said that he kissed her neck about three times before she pushed him off and said that he needed to stop. She said that she felt "*disgusting*", "*unsafe*", and "*scared*" to go back into the staffroom afterwards.

The panel also considered Mr Osbourne's responses in the disciplinary documents and in his oral evidence. In the school investigation notes from 18 October 2023, when asked about "*grabbing bums and kissing necks*" he replied asking what timeframe and then went on to say "*I am shocked. I have apologised to whoever for what I have done wrong, however you are talking about things I may have done years ago*".

In the school disciplinary hearing notes from 20 October 2023, Mr Osbourne was recorded as saying that he did not remember the occasion. At the conclusions stage of that same hearing, the School recorded that he "*couldn't remember but admitted [he] might have kissed someone on the neck*". He went on to reply "*would like to ask, if they felt uncomfortable in our relationship and that I made them feel uncomfortable, I do not*

see why they would not say that to me. To me personally, they did say they felt comfortable, I do not see why they would now say the contrary”.

In Mr Osbourne’s email dated 20 June 2024, he said he had “*never kissed her neck*”. In Mr Osbourne’s oral evidence to the panel, he denied kissing Staff Member 2’s neck and said that he would never try to kiss anyone.

The panel found Staff Member 2’s account to be clear and consistent. The panel did not find Mr Osbourne’s denial plausible. Mr Osbourne’s June 2024 email denied the allegation, but that denial appeared inconsistent with the disciplinary hearing recording that he might have kissed someone on the neck, his reference to apologising in the meeting on 18 October and by the consistency and the detail of Staff Member 2’s evidence. The panel noted Mr Osbourne’s general comments in his email dated 20 June 2024 where he referred to the interactions being “*always mutual between [himself] and these ladies*” and the context of “*workplace flirts*” added credibility to the allegation. The panel found Mr Osbourne’s actions in pulling Staff Member 2 towards him and kissing her neck without consent were unprofessional and highly inappropriate.

The panel therefore found allegations 1(b)(iv) and (v) proved.

vi. Said that you were glad that you could see down her dress or made a comment to this effect.

The panel considered Mr Osbourne’s evidence. In the disciplinary hearing on 20 October 2023, Mr Osbourne gave a general response regarding the allegations of Staff member 2 saying he did not remember these occasions. In his email dated 20 June 2024 he said that the dress comment was “*fabricated*” and that he had never seen up Staff Member 2’s dress. He also said that, if she wore a dress, it would generally be “*down to her ankles*”, such that the accusation was not possible. The panel considered that this seemed irrelevant given the allegation in question was looking down her top not up her skirt.

In the school investigation notes, Staff Member 2 said when she was leaning over to get her bag, Mr Osbourne made a comment about looking down her dress and seeing her breasts. She said that he said something like, “*I am glad I can see right down your dress right now*”.

The panel considered Staff Member 2’s written statement and oral evidence. In her oral evidence, she said that, at a staff night out, Mr Osbourne asked her to put his laptop in his bag and, as she did so, said that he was glad he could see right down her dress. She said that she instinctively covered her chest, handed him the laptop, and walked away. She was also clear that she remembered the incident well and said that she could recall exactly which dress she had been wearing when it happened.

The panel noted that in Mr Osbourne's oral evidence, he said he did not have a laptop as only qualified teachers had a laptop. The panel were unable to test this evidence with other witnesses as it had not been raised by Mr Osbourne at the time they gave evidence.

The panel found Staff Member 2's evidence to be clear and consistent. The panel considered that her ability to give detail about the circumstances, including what she was wearing and how she reacted, supported her recollections. The panel was not persuaded by Mr Osbourne's assertion that the allegation was fabricated. Given the nature of the Mr Osbourne's language towards Staff Member 2 which was admitted, for example calling her sexy beast and hot stuff, the panel found this allegation fitted within the nature of his actions towards Staff Member 2 and on the balance of probabilities found allegation 1(b)(vi) proved. The panel found this behaviour to be inappropriate and unprofessional.

c. Staff member 3, in that you:

i. Made comments about her bottom on one or more occasions

The panel noted Mr Osbourne admitted the facts of this allegation. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the evidence available to it.

The panel considered Mr Osbourne's evidence. In Mr Osbourne's email dated 20 June 2024, under the heading for Staff Member 3, Mr Osbourne was recorded as saying that he had no recollection of who this staff member was or of doing the things alleged. He did not admit making comments about her.

In the school investigation notes dated 12 October 2023, Staff Member 3 said Mr Osbourne would make comments about her bottom when she wore certain clothing.

The panel considered Staff Member 3's written statement and oral evidence. In her witness statement, she said that Mr Osbourne would make inappropriate comments about her bottom when she was wearing leggings and that he would tell her that he would love to see what was underneath her shirt. In her oral evidence, she gave a specific example from a visit to [REDACTED]. She said that, when she jumped, her long top rode up slightly and Mr Osbourne said words to the effect of, "*I didn't know you were hiding that under there, nice bum*".

The panel considered Mr Osbourne's oral evidence where he denied making the alleged comment at "[REDACTED]" and said that it did not happen. He suggested that the setting at [REDACTED] made the allegation improbable.

The panel found Staff Member 3's evidence on this allegation to be credible and consistent. The panel also noted the inconsistency between Mr Osbourne's June 2024

email, in which he said he had no recollection of this staff member, and his later oral evidence, admitting the allegation as a whole but then giving a substantive denial of the [REDACTED] allegation. The panel preferred Staff Member 3's account and found that Staff Member 3's account was consistent.

The panel found allegation 1(c)(i) proved in that Mr Osbourne made comments about Staff Member 3's bottom on at least one occasion. The panel found Mr Osbourne's behaviour to be unprofessional and inappropriate.

ii. Told her that her private area was 'soft';

The panel considered Staff Member 3's account in the investigation notes, her witness statement, and her oral evidence. In each, she said that when she was wearing a dress with shorts underneath, Mr Osbourne brushed the front of her, gestured to her private area, and said, "*oh that is soft.*" In her oral evidence, she added that this happened as she was walking into the staff room, that she was wearing a pink floral dress with black shorts underneath, and that the contact was either over the dress or under it over the shorts. She said that she was "*really embarrassed and super uncomfortable*".

The panel considered Mr Osbourne's evidence. In Mr Osbourne's email dated 20 June 2024, he said that he had no recollection of who Staff Member 3 was or of doing the things alleged. He also said that he had never touched another female staff member's private area and that such conduct was outside the boundaries of his flirtatious behaviour so this was never in the realm of something that he would do.

At the disciplinary hearing on 18 October 2023, when this allegation was put to him, Mr Osbourne said that he did not recall it. In his oral evidence to the panel, Mr Osbourne said that he had confused Staff Member 2 and Staff Member 3 in his June 2024 email, and that the references there to mutual attraction and a more intimate dynamic referred to Staff Member 3.

The panel found that the additional detail given by Staff Member 3 in oral evidence supported her evidence noting that her investigation meeting was only 10 minutes long. Staff Member 3 said that she thought Mr Osbourne's action was deliberate because of his comment.

The panel noted Mr Osbourne's comment regarding his boundaries of flirtatious behaviour however considered this in the context of his previously admitted allegations and his comments in his email of 20 June 2024 where he stated that the "*the women that made me aware of any boundaries that were overstepped, I apologised excessively and made sure it never happened again*". It also found that Mr Osbourne's position was

inconsistent, moving from him having no recollection to a clear denial. Taking those matters together, on balance, the panel considered it was more likely than not that the facts alleged had occurred. The panel found that Mr Osbourne's behaviour was inappropriate and unprofessional.

The panel found allegation 1(c)(ii) proved.

iii. Asked her about her sexual preferences;

iv. Asked her if she enjoyed performing oral sex;

The panel considered Staff Member 3's evidence. In the investigation notes dated 12 October 2023, Staff Member 3 stated that there were times in the classroom where Mr Osbourne would ask personal questions like: "*have you ever slept with a black guy*" and "*do you like to give head*". She went on to describe how Mr Osbourne would say things such as "*just let me know if I am making you feel uncomfortable.*"

The panel considered Staff Member 3's witness statement and oral evidence. In her evidence she said that she told Mr Osbourne that she would not answer that question, left the room because he was making her feel uncomfortable and nervous, and that when she returned, he said, "*don't worry, I am not a rapist.*" In her live evidence, she said that the incident happened in July 2022 in the yellow classroom.

The Panel considered Mr Osbourne's evidence. Again, in Mr Osbourne's email dated 20 June 2024, his formal response to any allegations regarding Staff Member 3 was that he had no recollection of the events. Mr Osbourne's response to this allegation is not recorded in the disciplinary hearing on 20 October 2023 other than as a general response to all the allegations regarding Staff Member 3 that he does not have any recollection of these events.

In Mr Osbourne's oral evidence he denied asking whether she had ever slept with a black man and denied asking whether she liked to give head. He also denied saying "*don't worry, I am not a rapist*", although he accepted that it would be inappropriate and unprofessional to ask a colleague such questions.

The panel considered all the evidence before it. The panel found Staff Member 3's evidence to be credible and consistent. The panel found this allegation to be consistent with Mr Osbourne's admissions regarding having "*flirty banter*" and "*workplace flirts*". He himself described himself as a "*flirtatious person, if a member of staff is flirtatious back then of course the conversation can lead to an inappropriate subject*" in his disciplinary

hearing on 20 October 2023. The panel considered therefore that it was more likely than not that this behaviour occurred and that this was a clear example of a pattern of Mr Osbourne overstepping professional boundaries.

The panel concluded that the statements which Staff Member 3 recalled demonstrated that Mr Osbourne had asked her about her sexual preferences and asked her if she enjoyed performing oral sex. The panel concluded that Mr Osbourne's behaviour was inappropriate and unprofessional. The panel therefore found allegation 1(c) (iii) and (iv) proved.

v. Touched her leg;

The panel considered Staff Member 3's written and oral evidence that Mr Osbourne stroked her leg under the table when she was sitting in a colleague's office, and that she jolted when it happened. The panel also considered the School investigation notes from 12 October 2023 in which it is recorded that Staff Member 3 said that "**CC** had noticed and asked what was happening".

In Staff Member 3's oral evidence she said that the incident occurred in July 2022 while assessment data was being discussed, that she was seated at a round table with another therapist present and that Mr Osbourne stroked her upper thigh from around her kneecap upwards and that this was "*not an accidental movement*".

The panel considered Mr Osbourne's evidence. Mr Osbourne's response in his June 2024 email was that he had no recollection of doing the things alleged. In the investigation meetings, there was no separate recorded response by Mr Osbourne to the allegation as the allegations were put to him in broad and non-specific terms. In the disciplinary hearing on 20 October 2023, Mr Osbourne's recorded response was that he did not recall it but this applied to allegations in relation to Staff Member 3 generally. In his oral evidence, he denied touching her leg and said that, given the seating arrangement around the table, he did not see how he could have done so without the other person present noticing. He suggested that he could not recall the meeting and that it would have stuck in his mind if it had happened.

The panel considered all of the evidence before it. The panel found Staff Member 3 to be a credible and consistent witness. The panel considered that her oral evidence added coherent detail as to the setting, what she was wearing, and how she reacted. The panel noted Mr Osbourne's own description of himself as "*naturally handsy*" in the disciplinary hearing on 20 October 2023. The panel considered whether or not it could have been accidental and noted Staff Member's 3 oral evidence that his action of "*stroking from her knee up to the top of her thigh*" was not an accidental movement. The panel found Staff Member 3's consistent account to be proven on the balance of probabilities. The panel

found Mr Osbourne's behaviour to be unprofessional and inappropriate. The panel found allegation 1(c)(v) proved.

vi. Kissed and/or attempted to kiss her.

The panel considered Staff Member 3's written and oral evidence. Staff Member 3 said that there had been a time in the staffroom when Mr Osbourne tried to get close to her and tried to kiss her. She also said that, on a later occasion after a staff event, he walked her to her bedroom and attempted to kiss her.

Staff Member 3 expanded upon this in her evidence. She said that he drove her home with other colleagues following a night out, he walked her to her room, told her to wrap her legs around him, and then tried to kiss her. She said that she told him to go home to his wife.

When giving oral evidence, Staff Member 3 said he would get very close to her face and that she did not know why else he would come that close if not to try to kiss her. The panel considered Mr Osbourne's responses. In the investigation meeting on 12 October 2023, when asked generally about kissing staff members, Mr Osbourne replied, "*I have kissed a staff member but they are not here anymore and it was a long time ago*". In the disciplinary hearing, the allegation relating to Staff Member 3 was summarised as he had tried to kiss her in the staffroom. His response was a general response to the allegations relating to Staff Member 3 saying "*I don't recall this*".

The panel considered Mr Osbourne's email dated 20 June 2024. In that email, under the heading for Staff Member 3, he said that he had no recollection of who this staff member was or of ever doing the things alleged. The panel considered Mr Osbourne's earlier evidence that he had thought Staff Member 2 was Staff Member 3 and the panel noted that in his email he said that Staff Member 2 told him that she found him attractive and if they did not work together, she would have been intimate with him.

In his oral evidence to the panel Mr Osbourne denied trying to kiss Staff Member 3 in the staffroom and said that, although his face may have been close to hers, he did not attempt to kiss her. He also denied trying to kiss her when he dropped her home, and said that she told him, shortly after they got into her room, that they were not going to have sex, to which he responded in effect that he agreed and that she wouldn't be able to consent due to intoxication.

The panel carefully considered all the evidence before it.

The panel found Staff Member 3's evidence on this allegation to be credible and consistent. Her account in the investigation, her witness statement, and her oral evidence

were consistent that Mr Osbourne tried to kiss her, both in the staffroom and when dropping her home. The panel considered that her oral evidence was detailed and clear.

The panel found Mr Osbourne's denial in responses in the investigation meeting and the hearing, to be inconsistent. The panel found that it was more likely than not that Mr Osbourne had attempted to kiss Staff Member 3 and that this was inappropriate and unprofessional behaviour.

The panel, on the balance of probabilities, found allegation 1(c)(vi) proved.

d. Staff member 5, in that you:

i. Touched and/or brushed her bottom

The panel considered the notes of the meeting between Staff Member 5 and Witness A on 18 October 2023. In the meeting Staff Member 5 was recorded as saying that Mr Osbourne informed her that she had something on the back of her top, said that he would get it, and then "swooped" his hand from the middle of her back down to her bottom. She said that, afterwards, he said, "*see now that I've touched your bum how do you feel about that*".

In the school disciplinary hearing on 20 October 2023, Mr Osbourne responded that there was genuinely something on her dress and that he swiped it off, stating that if another body part was touched in that action, that was unintentional. He also said that he had felt comfortable with her and had assumed that she would not see the act in a sexual context.

The panel considered Mr Osbourne's email dated 20 June 2024. In that email, he said that the incident had been misconstrued. He said that he and Staff Member 5 had been speaking in the staff room, that he saw a spider crawling down her left hip, and that he instinctively brushed it off. He denied touching her bottom and said that she would have had to turn around for that to have been possible.

The panel considered Staff Member 5's evidence in her written statement and oral evidence to be consistent. In her oral evidence, Staff Member 5 expanded on her account in that she said that she was wearing a tunic style dress which bell curved out. She said that she was left confused, later upset, and told others about the incident.

The panel also considered the contemporaneous text messages produced by Staff Member 5 and her oral evidence about them. In her oral evidence, Staff Member 5 said that she had provided screenshots of messages sent the day after the incident to a senior member of staff whose full name was not established in the hearing. She accepted in cross examination that those messages did not include the later wording she described

in evidence, namely “*see now that I’ve touched your bum how do you feel about that*”, and that in the messages she appeared to downplay what had happened. She explained, however, that she was shocked, frightened, and worried because the person messaging her was part of management, was close to Mr Osbourne and that this was why she minimised the incident at the time. She said that she had nevertheless told [REDACTED], an employee at the School and friends about it straightaway because she knew it did not feel right.

The panel considered all of the evidence before it. The panel also found Staff Member 5’s reasoning regarding the approach she had taken in relation to the text message which she had sent to the senior staff member to be convincing. The panel did not find Mr Osbourne’s explanation to be persuasive.

The panel found that it was more likely than not that Mr Osbourne brushed or touched Staff Member’s 5 bottom and found that this behaviour was unprofessional and inappropriate in a work setting.

The panel found allegation 1(d) (i) proved.

2. Your conduct as may be found proven at allegation 1 was of a sexual nature and/or sexually motivated.

The panel considered each part of allegation 1 as found proven in turn.

In doing so, the panel’s attention was drawn to the case of *Sait v The General Medical Council* [2018] and section 78 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003.

Staff Member 1

In relation to Staff Member 1, the panel had found proved that Mr Osbourne blew kisses at her, made inappropriate and sexualised comments to her, discussed orgasms with her, and said that he wished she could squeeze him in the same way she was squeezing a pupil.

The panel considered that this conduct was overtly sexual in nature.

The panel also considered the evidence that, in the school disciplinary process, when those allegations were put to Mr Osbourne, he did not deny that sexual subject matter had arisen. Instead, he said that the relationship was based on banter, that they had had many sexual conversations, and that they were both flirtatious with one another.

The panel considered Mr Osbourne's response that [REDACTED] meant that there was no sexual motivation. However, the panel noted the case of Haris, in which it was held that, "*in the absence of a plausible innocent explanation for what he did, the facts spoke for themselves*" and considered that a sexual motive, specifically sexual gratification, was clearly to be implied from the conduct as found proven.

The panel considered that Mr Osbourne's own descriptions of the interactions with Staff Member 1 as workplace flirting and sexual conversations supported a finding that the conduct was of a sexual nature and sexually motivated.

Staff Member 2

In relation to Staff Member 2, the panel had found proved that Mr Osbourne touched her back and bottom, called her "*hot stuff*" and "*sexy beast*", pulled her towards him, kissed her neck, and made a comment that he was glad he could see down her dress.

The panel considered that a reasonable person would regard touching a female colleague's bottom and kissing her neck and commenting he was glad he could see down her dress as conduct which was, by its nature, sexual. The comments "*hot stuff*" and "*sexy beast*" were clearly potentially sexual and, when used in the context in which they were, were found by the panel to be sexual.

The panel then considered whether the conduct towards Staff Member 2 was sexually motivated. The panel attached weight to Mr Osbourne's own descriptions of the relationship in his 20 June 2024 email, in which he said that calling Staff Member 2 "*hot stuff*" and "*sexy beast*" was due to "*mutual attraction*" and that Staff Member 2 had told him that, if they had not worked together, she would have been intimate with him. The panel noted Mr Osbourne's evidence in that in his oral evidence that he accepted that terms such as "*hot stuff*" and "*sexy beast*" could be understood as sexual, although he stated that he said this to both men and women.

The panel also considered the contemporaneous WhatsApp messages, in which Mr Osbourne referred to getting "*overexcited*", "*flirty/banter? Thingy that we have going on (which I'm loving by the way (heart eyes emoji))*", "*I'd be lying if I said I didn't want it to not be banter though*", "*I wish you'd let me know that butt tapping was all sooner though*", "*a lot of missed opportunities there*" and "*I told u I'm a rebel*". The panel considered that those messages showed that he himself understood the interactions as flirtatious and sexually charged. The panel was satisfied that Mr Osbourne's conduct towards Staff Member 2 was sexually motivated, in that it was done in pursuit of sexual gratification and/or a sexual relationship.

Staff Member 3

In relation to Staff Member 3, the panel had found proved that Mr Osbourne made comments about her bottom, told her that her private area was “*soft*”, asked her about her sexual preferences and whether she enjoyed performing oral sex, touched her leg, and kissed and/or attempted to kiss her.

The panel considered that the conduct was clearly of a sexual nature.

The panel then considered whether the conduct towards Staff Member 3 was sexually motivated. The panel considered that there was no plausible innocent explanation for asking a colleague whether she had slept with a black man, whether she liked to perform oral sex, saying that her private area was “*soft*”, or trying to kiss her. The panel was satisfied that the conduct towards Staff Member 3 was sexually motivated, in that it was done in pursuit of sexual gratification and/or a sexual relationship.

Staff Member 5

In relation to Staff Member 5, the panel had found proved that Mr Osbourne touched and/or brushed her bottom and said, “*see now that I’ve touched your bum how do you feel about that?*” The panel considered that there was no plausible innocent explanation for touching a colleague’s bottom as viewed in that context and therefore considered that Mr Osbourne’s actions were because of the circumstances in which they had happened of a sexual nature and done in pursuit of sexual gratification and/or a sexual relationship.

Overall, the panel considered all the evidence before it.

The panel considered Mr Osbourne’s oral evidence about “*flirtatious banter*” and workplace boundaries. He accepted that he had sexual harassment training.

The panel found that Mr Osbourne himself viewed his conduct as flirtatious and, whilst accepting that this did not justify his actions, suggested that such behaviour was common within the School. The panel considered that the proved conduct formed a pattern. It was repeated across different female colleagues and involved similar themes of physical contact, sexualised language, intimate comments, and attempts to test or push boundaries to test the waters of a sexual relationship. The panel noted that it had found that all the conduct which it had found proven under Allegation 1 was sexually motivated conduct of a sexual nature.

The panel found allegation 2 proved.

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

Having found all but one 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 Mr Osbourne in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Osbourne 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
 - at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect
- 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 Mr Osbourne's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

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

The panel found that the offence types of sexual activity and harassment were relevant.

The panel noted that Mr Osbourne's conduct as found proven was not an isolated lapse or a single misconceived remark. It involved a repeated pattern of sexualised comments and inappropriate physical contact towards 4 female colleagues over a long period of time. That pattern included touching colleagues' bottoms, attempting to kiss colleagues, asking sexual questions, making sexualised comments about colleagues' bodies and

clothing, and using terms such as “*hot stuff*” and “*sexy beast*”. The panel considered that the repeated and escalating nature of the conduct was relevant including because it showed a sustained failure to maintain appropriate professional boundaries.

The panel also considered it relevant that some of the conduct occurred in school and on occasion in the presence of pupils. Staff Member 1 described sexualised comments being made in the corridor, in the [REDACTED] and whilst she was teaching, including when she was supporting a dysregulated pupil. That feature increased the seriousness of the conduct because it took place in an educational setting in which Mr Osbourne was expected to model appropriate standards of behaviour and to maintain a safe and professional environment for both colleagues and pupils.

The panel noted that allegation 1(b)(iii) took place outside the education setting. The panel found this conduct affected the way Mr Osbourne fulfilled his teaching role as the allegation involved inappropriate comments made towards fellow teachers.

The panel further considered that Mr Osbourne’s own account reinforced the seriousness of the conduct. He repeatedly described the interactions as “*banter*”, “*workplace flirts*” and based on “*mutual attraction*”. He also accepted that he had overstepped boundaries with women. In the disciplinary process he referred to having “*many sexual conversations*” with Staff Member 1. The panel considered that this showed that Mr Osbourne himself understood the interactions to be flirtatious and sexualised, demonstrating poor judgment and a disregard of professional boundaries, despite his own evidence that he had received sexual harassment training at least yearly.

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

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

In relation to whether Mr Osbourne’s actions amounted to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, the panel took into account the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. It considered the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel also took account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils’ lives and the fact that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way that they behave.

In considering the issue of disrepute, the panel also considered whether Mr Osbourne’s conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice.

As set out above in the panel's findings as to whether Mr Osbourne was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that the offences of sexual activity and harassment were relevant.

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.

Conduct involving repeated sexualised remarks, intrusive questions and unwanted physical touching of colleagues, notably where some incidents occurred at school and in the course of the working day, was in the panel's judgment liable to undermine public confidence in the profession. The panel considered that the public is entitled to expect teachers to model appropriate boundaries and respect for others at all times within the school environment. The conduct found proved involved a pattern of sexualised comments, questioning, attempts to kiss and inappropriate touching directed towards female colleagues. A reasonable member of the public would, in the panel's view, regard such conduct as wholly inconsistent with the standards expected of a teacher.

The panel considered that a reasonable member of the public would view such behaviour as incompatible with the standards of self-restraint and sound judgment expected of a teacher, particularly where some incidents occurred in school and in the course of professional duties.

The panel also took into account the effect of the conduct on colleagues within the School. The evidence accepted by the panel was that members of staff felt uncomfortable, unsafe and, in some cases, unable to speak out because they were new, or perceived Mr Osbourne to hold an important role within the setting. The panel considered that a reasonable member of the public would regard conduct of that nature, which also created that kind of workplace impact, and by a teacher who accepted that he had received repeated sexual harassment training, as conduct capable of damaging public confidence in teachers as trusted professionals and role models.

The panel also considered that the proved conduct would be viewed by a reasonable member of the public as inconsistent with the standards expected of a teacher as a professional role model. The concern was not merely that the conduct was inappropriate between colleagues, but that it demonstrated a disregard for the boundaries, judgment and self-restraint which the public is entitled to expect from a teacher. The fact that the conduct was repeated, directed at several female colleagues, and in some instances took place in school would in the panel's view be capable of diminishing public trust in the profession as a whole.

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

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be made, the panel had to consider whether it would be an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it would be in the public interest to do so. Prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely, the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, the protection of other members of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and the declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct. The panel had in mind that it must determine that prohibition, if imposed, strikes the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest, if they are in conflict.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Osbourne, which involved a repeated pattern of sexualised comments and inappropriate physical contact towards female colleagues, there was a strong public interest consideration in the protection of members of the public. The panel considered that the public has a strong interest in teachers maintaining clear professional boundaries with colleagues and in being protected from conduct of that nature in the workplace.

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, including given the findings that pupils had been present during some instances of inappropriate behaviour. The panel accepted evidence that some sexualised comments were made in circumstances where pupils were present or nearby, including whilst Staff Member 1 was supporting a dysregulated pupil. Even where the conduct was directed at colleagues rather than pupils, the public is entitled to expect teachers to exercise judgment, restraint and professionalism at all times in the school environment. This is particularly relevant when pupils may observe or be affected by what is said or done. The public is entitled to expect that conduct towards colleagues was at an appropriate and professional level.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Osbourne were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession. The conduct found proved involved repeated sexualised behaviour towards 4 female colleagues, some of it taking place on school premises and during the working day.

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 Osbourne was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated. The panel also took into account that Mr Osbourne had received sexual harassment training at least yearly and accepted in his evidence that he had overstepped boundaries with women. In those circumstances, the panel considered that failure to mark the conduct as serious misconduct would risk damaging public confidence both in Mr Osbourne as a teacher and in the profession more widely.

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 Osbourne in the profession. There was no evidence provided pertaining to Mr Osbourne's ability as an educator, and the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Osbourne in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and he sought to exploit his position of trust.

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 Osbourne.

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;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- 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.

- actions or behaviours that promote extremist political or religious views or attitudes, or that undermine fundamental British values of democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty, and mutual respect ...;
- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour;

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors. Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

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

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Osbourne was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation

There was no evidence that Mr Osbourne demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel did not accept that the incident was out of character.

The panel saw no evidence that showed Mr Osbourne was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings or warnings.

The panel noted that Mr Osbourne did not provide any evidence to attest to his abilities as a teacher. The panel noted that no references were provided for the purpose of these proceedings that could attest to his abilities as a teacher. Mr Osbourne stated that he had lost his love for teaching and no longer wished to be a teacher.

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 Osbourne 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 Osbourne. A significant factor was that the misconduct found proved was not limited to one isolated incident or one colleague but involved a repeated pattern of sexualised comments and inappropriate physical conduct towards 4 female colleagues over time. That pattern demonstrated a sustained failure to maintain proper professional boundaries.

The panel also noted that the evidence accepted by the panel showed that Mr Osbourne was viewed within the School as someone on whom colleagues relied, particularly because of his role in supporting staff. The panel further took into account that a number of the women described themselves as new to the School, new to the country, or not confident to speak out at the time, and that this formed part of the context in which the misconduct occurred. The panel considered that those features also increased the seriousness of the conduct, because they meant that Mr Osbourne was operating in circumstances where colleagues were more likely to feel unable to challenge or report his behaviour.

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 and the panel found this offence type to be relevant.

The panel considered that this was a case in which the public interest weighed against the offering of a review period. The misconduct found proved involved a repeated pattern of sexualised comments and inappropriate physical conduct towards different female colleagues. The panel considered that the number and persistence of the proved allegations were features of particular seriousness which weighed in favour of not offering a review period and demonstrated a clear and ingrained set of behaviours which they envisaged would be repeated.

The panel also considered that the misconduct involved an abuse of trust with his colleagues. The evidence accepted by the panel was that Mr Osbourne was viewed by colleagues as someone they relied on for support, and that some of the women were new to the School. The panel found this was capable of amounting to exploitation of his position within the School, even if he did not hold formal managerial authority over those colleagues.

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 Mr Osbourne had demonstrated some limited remorse and insight. The panel accepted that he gave a sincere apology in his oral evidence, said that he was deeply sorry for causing discomfort, and explained that therapy had caused him to reflect on his behaviour and its impact on others. The panel also took into account that Mr Osbourne acknowledged in live evidence that, whereas at the time he would have expected members of staff to tell him if he was overstepping boundaries, he now recognised that this was not appropriate and said that he would maintain professional boundaries in future. The panel further noted Mr Osbourne's evidence that the allegations had a profound and lasting impact on him.

However, the panel did not consider that this amounted to substantive insight. Mr Osbourne continued to characterise himself as someone who brought humour into a stressful environment, described himself as a "*comedian*", and suggested that his behaviour was part of his personality and reflective of the culture at the School. He also maintained that a significant number of the allegations were exaggerated, or fabricated.

The panel considered that, although he had reflected to some extent, he had not fully confronted the seriousness of the pattern of proved misconduct. Further he had not demonstrated insight of his impact on the women concerned, on the School and on the teaching profession as a whole. He had not demonstrated a clear understanding of why such conduct was unacceptable irrespective of whether a colleague objected at the time. For those reasons, the panel concluded that his remorse and insight were only partial.

The panel again considered that the pattern of Mr Osbourne's behaviour towards a number of members of staff demonstrated a significant risk of repetition.

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 some of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring

the profession into disrepute. In this case, the panel has found allegation 1(a)(i) not proven. I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Osbourne 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
 - at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect
- 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 Mr Osbourne fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of a repeated pattern of sexualised comments and inappropriate physical contact towards female colleagues.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself, whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Mr Osbourne, 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, "*There was a strong public interest consideration in*

respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, including given the findings that pupils had been present during some instances of inappropriate behaviour. The panel accepted evidence that some sexualised comments were made in circumstances where pupils were present or nearby, including whilst Staff Member 1 was supporting a dysregulated pupil.” 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 considered that Mr Osbourne had demonstrated some limited remorse and insight. The panel accepted that he gave a sincere apology in his oral evidence, said that he was deeply sorry for causing discomfort, and explained that therapy had caused him to reflect on his behaviour and its impact on others. The panel also took into account that Mr Osbourne acknowledged in live evidence that, whereas at the time he would have expected members of staff to tell him if he was overstepping boundaries, he now recognised that this was not appropriate and said that he would maintain professional boundaries in future. The panel further noted Mr Osbourne’s evidence that the allegations had a profound and lasting impact on him.”

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, *“Conduct involving repeated sexualised remarks, intrusive questions and unwanted physical touching of colleagues, notably where some incidents occurred at school and in the course of the working day, was in the panel’s judgment liable to undermine public confidence in the profession.”*

I am particularly mindful of the finding that the proven conduct amounted to *“...a repeated pattern of sexualised comments and inappropriate physical contact towards 4 female colleagues over a long period of time”* in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

I have had to consider that the public has a high expectation of professional standards of all teachers and that the public might regard a failure to impose a prohibition order as a failure to uphold those high standards. In weighing these considerations, I have had to consider the matter from the point of view of an *“ordinary intelligent and well-informed citizen.”*

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, in the absence of a

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

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mr Osbourne himself. The panel comment. *“The panel noted that Mr Osbourne did not provide any evidence to attest to his abilities as a teacher. The panel noted that no references were provided for the purpose of these proceedings that could attest to his abilities as a teacher. Mr Osbourne stated that he had lost his love for teaching and no longer wished to be a teacher.”*

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments concerning the lack of insight or remorse. The panel has found that Mr Osbourne has not demonstrated *“substantive insight”*, and that,

“The panel considered that, although he had reflected to some extent, he had not fully confronted the seriousness of the pattern of proved misconduct. Further he had not demonstrated insight of his impact on the women concerned, on the School and on the teaching profession as a whole. He had not demonstrated a clear understanding of why such conduct was unacceptable irrespective of whether a colleague objected at the time. For those reasons, the panel concluded that his remorse and insight were only partial.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that the proven incidents were not an isolated lapse, but a repeated pattern which occurred over a long period of time, including some instances which occurred in school and on occasion, in the presence of pupils.

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

I have considered the panel's comments, "*The panel again considered that the pattern of Mr Osbourne's behaviour towards a number of members of staff demonstrated a significant risk of repetition.*"

I have considered whether not allowing a 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 review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the seriousness of the proven conduct, its repeated nature, and the lack of full insight or remorse.

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



Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield

Date: 8 June 2026

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