



Mr John Taylor: Professional conduct panel hearing 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	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	11
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	15

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

Teacher: John Taylor

TRA reference: 24394

Date of determination: 24 June 2026

Former employer: City of London Academy, Islington, London

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on the 22 to 24 June 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr John Taylor.

The panel members were Mrs Julie Wells (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Shabana Robertson, (lay panellist) and Mr Steve Boocock (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr John Lucarotti of Blake Morgan LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Cher Lyne Peh of Browne Jacobson solicitors.

Mr Taylor was present and was represented by Mr Andrew Faux of Counsel.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of hearing dated 25 February 2026.

It was alleged that Mr Taylor was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that, whilst employed as Joint Head of Sixth Form at City of London Academy Islington:

1. He failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with one or more pupils by:
 - a. Retaining one or more personal telephone numbers belonging to Pupil A and/or Pupil B;
 - b. Messaging and/or having personal conversations with Pupil A and/or Pupil B;
 - c. Sending a picture of himself to Pupil B;
 - d. Engaging in inappropriate and/or unprofessional behaviour by sending one or more inappropriate messages, namely those to the effect of:
 - i. “added you on snap. Probably shouldn’t but ... [smile symbol]” to Pupil A;
 - ii. “hope you don’t mind me checking in. I liked getting your photos but deleted them by accident” to Pupil A;
 - iii. “would be lovely to see you again” to Pupil B;
 - iv. “Yes you are a lovely person [smile emoticon]” to Pupil B;
 - v. “really”, when Pupil B responded “thank you” to your comment at (iv) above;
 - vi. “I like beautiful things [heart emoticon]” to Pupil B
 - vii. “It’d be an incredible person in an incredible city” to Pupil B
 - viii. “You’re a star” to Pupil B
 - ix. “Do you have a bf [smile symbol]” to Pupil B

Mr Taylor admitted all of the factual allegations as amended (see below).

Mr Taylor did not admit that the allegations amounted unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

[REDACTED]

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Notice of Hearing and response – pages 7 to 19

Section 2: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 21 to 49

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 52 to 313

Section 4: Teacher documents – pages 316 to 398

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

The panel confirmed that it had read the hearing bundle in advance and had also considered the additional document admitted following Mr Taylor's application and the anonymisation schedule.

Witnesses

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

Witness A – [REDACTED].

The panel also heard oral evidence from Mr Taylor.

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 Taylor was employed by the City of London Academy, Islington, ("the School") from September 2023 to August 2024. The events giving rise to the TRA allegations occurred in the summer immediately before he began that employment.

In July 2023, Mr Taylor was engaged by [REDACTED], an organisation providing English language learning experiences in London for groups of French children aged between 14

and 16. As part of that role, he was required to hold the mobile telephone numbers of those in his group. Mr Taylor worked with two groups over two separate fortnights in July.

After his role with [REDACTED] had ended, and at some point in August 2023, Mr Taylor had separate WhatsApp conversations with two female [REDACTED] students who had been in his July groups. Concerns about the existence and nature of those conversations were raised with [REDACTED] in October 2023 and shared with the School in November 2023.

The School investigated the matter, which was ultimately referred to the TRA in September 2024.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

Before considering the individual particulars, the panel considered whether the activities undertaken by Mr Taylor for [REDACTED] were teacher related. It was satisfied that they were. The role involved supporting English language learning activities for children aged 14 to 16, required Mr Taylor to supervise and interact with those students in an educational setting, and gave him access to their personal contact details for that purpose. Although the activities took place outside a conventional school classroom, the panel considered that they were educational in nature and sufficiently connected to Mr Taylor's professional role as a teacher for the usual expectations around professional boundaries to apply.

The panel found the following particulars of the allegation against Mr Taylor proved, for these reasons:

1. You failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with one or more pupils by:

a. Retaining one or more personal telephone numbers belonging to Pupil A and/or Pupil B;

The panel noted that Mr Taylor admitted this allegation.

It was not disputed that he retained the telephone numbers on his personal phone after July 2023, when he no longer needed them. Mr Taylor said that he had not retained them deliberately but accepted with hindsight that he should have deleted the numbers.

The panel considered that retaining the students' personal telephone numbers after the educational activity had ended breached appropriate professional boundaries because there was no continuing professional reason for Mr Taylor to keep them. Given his recent

teacher-related contact with the students, the panel considered that he should have ensured any personal contact details were deleted once they were no longer required.

The panel found this allegation proved.

b. Messaging and/or having personal conversations with Pupil A and/or Pupil B;

The panel noted that Mr Taylor admitted this allegation.

The screenshots of the WhatsApp messages before the panel showed that he had engaged in personal messaging conversations with both Pupil A and Pupil B on separate occasions.

The panel considered that messaging and having personal conversations with the students breached appropriate professional boundaries. The communications were not necessary for any continuing educational purpose and created an informal, personal channel of contact. Given Mr Taylor's recent teacher-related role, the panel considered that he should have avoided any private communication that could blur the distinction between an appropriate professional relationship and a personal one.

The panel found this allegation proved.

c. Sending a picture of yourself to Pupil B;

The panel noted that Mr Taylor admitted this allegation.

The panel had evidence of the photograph he sent, which showed him holding what appeared to be an alcoholic drink in front of his face.

The panel considered that sending a personal photograph to Pupil B breached appropriate professional boundaries because it had no legitimate educational purpose and introduced an unnecessary personal element into the communication. The panel considered that, given Mr Taylor's recent teacher-related contact with Pupil B, he should have avoided sending any image of himself which could encourage or maintain a personal connection outside an appropriate professional context.

The panel found this allegation proved.

d. Engaging in inappropriate and/or unprofessional behaviour by sending one or more inappropriate messages, namely those to the effect of:

i. "added you on snap. Probably shouldn't but ... [smile symbol]" to Pupil A;

- ii. **“hope you don’t mind me checking in. I liked getting your photos but deleted them by accident” to Pupil A;**
- iii. **“would be lovely to see you again” to Pupil B;**
- iv. **“Yes you are a lovely person [smile emoticon]” to Pupil B;**
- v. **“really”, when Pupil B responded “thank you” to your comment at (iv) above;**
- vi. **“I like beautiful things [heart emoticon]” to Pupil B**
- vii. **“It’d be an incredible person in an incredible city” to Pupil B**
- viii. **“You’re a star” to Pupil B**
- ix. **“Do you have a bf [smile symbol]” to Pupil B**

The panel noted that Mr Taylor admitted sending all of the above messages and that they were inappropriate and unprofessional.

The panel considered that the messages were inappropriate and unprofessional because they went beyond any legitimate educational or welfare-related purpose. They created an unnecessary personal connection with students with whom Mr Taylor had recently ceased to have contact with, in his teacher-related role. This occurred in circumstances where particular caution was required given their age and the position of trust associated with that role.

The panel considered the messages cumulatively and in context. The use of private messaging, the reference to adding Pupil A on Snapchat, references to photographs, the expression of a wish to see Pupil B again, the use of a heart symbol, personal comments about her and the question about whether she had a boyfriend, cumulatively crossed the professional boundaries expected of a teacher. The panel did not consider the communications to be isolated administrative exchanges; rather, they formed part of a pattern of personal communication with these two students.

The panel also considered that Mr Taylor ought to have recognised the risk inherent in communicating with the students in this way. The wording “Probably shouldn’t” in allegation 1(d)(i) suggested an awareness that the contact was questionable, and his safeguarding experience meant that he should have understood the importance of keeping communications with students appropriate, transparent and limited to proper professional purposes. The panel was satisfied that the professional context had not ended merely because the educational activity had concluded, as the contact arose directly from Mr Taylor’s teacher-related role and involved students with whom he had recently worked.

The panel found this allegation proved.

In summary, the panel found all factual allegations proved against Mr Taylor.

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

Having found all 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 Taylor, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Taylor 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

The panel also considered whether Mr Taylor’s conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

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

The panel found that none of these offences was relevant.

The panel noted that the conduct occurred shortly after Mr Taylor had worked with both students while undertaking educational activities with them. Although those activities did not take place in a classroom, the panel considered them to be teaching-related, given the nature of Mr Taylor’s contact with the students involved.

The panel also noted that, although the allegations concerned two separate students on two separate occasions, the underlying concern was the same: Mr Taylor had engaged with them in an unnecessary, inappropriate and unprofessional manner. The panel was particularly concerned by his suggestion that Pupil A connect with him on Snapchat and by his question to Pupil B about whether she had a boyfriend. The panel did not find Mr Taylor’s explanations for sending those messages to two separate female students

persuasive, although it noted that, in his evidence, Mr Taylor recognised that these exchanges were wholly inappropriate and unprofessional.

The panel further noted that Mr Taylor had clear and extensive safeguarding experience and knowledge. He had identified areas where [REDACTED] could improve its safeguarding arrangements, including the need for further action in relation to mobile phone use. He also drafted a risk assessment for educational visits for [REDACTED]. This included a provision that 'Staff are trained not to contact students outside of the WhatsApp group.'

In these circumstances, the panel could not characterise Mr Taylor's behaviour as a momentary lapse of judgement. Rather, it viewed the conduct as reflecting a series of concerning misjudgements which, taken together, amounted to serious misconduct and fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

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

In relation to whether Mr Taylor'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 Taylor'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 Taylor was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that none of these offences were relevant.

The panel noted that the advice is not intended to be exhaustive and there may be other behaviours that panels consider to be "conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute".

The panel considered the findings of misconduct to be serious. Mr Taylor's conduct involved a significant failure to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with students with whom he had recently had contact in an educational context. Teachers occupy a position of trust and influence, and the public is entitled to expect them to exercise sound judgment when communicating with students connected to their professional role. By retaining personal telephone numbers and engaging in personal

and inappropriate messaging with two female students, Mr Taylor acted in a way that was inconsistent with those expectations.

The panel further considered that public confidence in the profession could be undermined if conduct of this nature were not treated as capable of damaging the reputation of teachers generally. The messages were not confined to an isolated exchange, but included a number of personal comments and questions which crossed appropriate professional boundaries on more than one occasion. In the panel's view, an informed member of the public would be concerned that a teacher had behaved in this way towards students shortly after undertaking educational activities with them.

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

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

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

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

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

- the maintenance of public confidence in the profession
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Taylor, which involved breaches of professional boundaries in respect of the retention of students' telephone numbers and inappropriate messages sent to them, the panel considered that the maintenance of public confidence in the profession could be weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Taylor were not treated with seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

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

Given that there was no evidence before the panel of any harm caused by Mr Taylor's actions, and having noted from the bundle of documents that the consensus of relevant professionals appeared to be that there were no safeguarding issues present. Further, given that the concerns were more about breaches of professional standards than anything else, the panel did not consider that the first public interest consideration (safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils) was engaged.

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 Taylor in the profession. The panel decided that there was a public interest consideration in retaining the teacher in the profession, since no doubt had been cast upon his abilities as an educator and the evidence before it was that he is able to make a valuable contribution to the profession.

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the behaviour, noting that the Advice states that the expectation of both the public and pupils is that members of the teaching profession maintain an exemplary level of integrity and ethical standards at all times.

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

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 panel regarded the departure from the Teachers' Standards as serious, because Mr Taylor used private channels to communicate inappropriately with pupils with whom he had recently worked in an educational context. However, it was at the less serious end of that category: the exchanges were short-lived (occurring over a few hours on one day on each occasion), took place after the activity had ended, and did not involve physical contact, sexual communication, grooming, actual harm or identified wider safeguarding concerns.

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

The behaviour also amounted to an abuse of position or trust, given the pupils' age, the recent teacher-related relationship and Mr Taylor's safeguarding experience. That abuse of trust was at the lower end, however, because it was not accompanied by deliberate exploitation, coercion, concealment or predatory conduct, and was confined to inappropriate messaging rather than conduct of a more intrusive kind.

The panel noted that paragraph 41 of the Advice also identifies the need for ‘appropriate weight and seriousness’ to be attached to online behaviours, including the use of mobile phones. The panel considered that the weight and seriousness of the behaviour was less pronounced because the online contact was limited in duration, arose after the educational activity had ended, and was not accompanied by physical contact, sexual communication, grooming, actual harm or wider safeguarding concerns.

In assessing seriousness, the panel noted that the conduct followed Mr Taylor’s brief involvement in an unconventional learning environment with limited formal safeguards. However, in the panel’s view that did not reduce its seriousness, because Mr Taylor’s safeguarding experience meant he should have recognised and maintained appropriate professional boundaries.

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order may 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 evidence that Mr Taylor acted deliberately, although his actions appeared to have been impulsive rather than planned.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Taylor was acting under extreme duress, however the panel noted the various personal, financial and medical stressors referenced by Mr Taylor in oral evidence.

Mr Taylor did have a previously good history, and had demonstrated high standards in his professional conduct and had contributed significantly to the education sector for over twenty years. The panel accepted that the incident was out of character.

The panel noted the evidence from Mr Taylor’s current employer, a boys’ preparatory school in Central London, where Mr Taylor has worked as head of English since September 2024. This was in the form of witness statements provided by [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) and [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) of the school. [REDACTED] further attended to give evidence in support of Mr Taylor at the prohibition stage. This evidence was given as both employer and [REDACTED].

The panel noted the following evidence from the headmaster in particular:

‘Increasingly, John has become a much-valued member of our teaching team. In my [REDACTED] I have appointed a number of Heads of English and John has arguably been the strongest member of staff in this role.’

‘Pastorally, John has continued to show mature and professional judgment in all his interactions with the pupils. It would be a huge loss, if having proved himself so impressively, John was to leave the profession.’

'He shows impressive professionalism in all he undertakes, displaying not only academic acumen, but also emotional intelligence. He shows excellent judgement and notable common sense.'

The panel also had regard to Mr Taylor's own evidence, both in terms of the statement that he had provided for the TRA proceedings and his oral evidence before the panel.

The panel noted that Mr Taylor was an experienced teacher who had held senior roles in several schools, demonstrating that he had been trusted in educational settings.

The panel considered that Mr Taylor's oral evidence showed substantial insight and acceptance of responsibility. He acknowledged that his conduct was inappropriate, described it as 'stupid', and appeared genuinely remorseful. It was clear to the panel that Mr Taylor had reflected considerably on his conduct through the duration of the TRA proceedings and that his insight had developed accordingly through the process. In light of that evidence, the panel considered the risk of repetition to be low.

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, a recommendation of no prohibition order would be both a proportionate and an appropriate response. Given that the nature and severity of the behaviour were at the less serious end of the possible spectrum and, having considered the mitigating factors that were present, the panel determined that a recommendation for a prohibition order would not be appropriate in this case. The panel considered that the publication of the adverse findings it had made was sufficient to send an appropriate message as to the standards of behaviour that are not acceptable, and the publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession.

In making this recommendation, the panel recognised that retaining students' mobile telephone numbers and sending inappropriate messages were serious breaches of professional boundaries, and that such conduct could ordinarily justify a prohibition order. However, it identified three factors which meant that, in the particular circumstances of this case, prohibition would not be proportionate:

- the conduct was contained, short-lived and out of character, and there was no evidence before the panel that it had caused any harm to those affected by it;
- Mr Taylor had demonstrated a high standard of teaching throughout his career and there were no wider concerns about his conduct, as reflected in the strong written and oral evidence from his current school; and

- the risk of repetition was low, given the insight and remorse he demonstrated in his oral evidence.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

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

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

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr John Taylor should not be the subject of a prohibition order. The panel has recommended that the findings of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute should be published and that such an action is proportionate and in the public interest.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Taylor 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

The panel has found that the conduct of Mr Taylor fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

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 Taylor, 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:

“Given that there was no evidence before the panel of any harm caused by Mr Taylor’s actions, and having noted from the bundle of documents that the consensus of relevant professionals appeared to be that there were no safeguarding issues present. Further, given that the concerns were more about breaches of professional standards than anything else, the panel did not consider that the first public interest consideration (safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils) was engaged.”

I have also taken into account the panel’s comments on insight and remorse, which the panel has set out as follows:

“The panel considered that Mr Taylor’s oral evidence showed substantial insight and acceptance of responsibility. He acknowledged that his conduct was inappropriate, described it as ‘stupid’, and appeared genuinely remorseful. It was clear to the panel that Mr Taylor had reflected considerably on his conduct through the duration of the TRA proceedings and that his insight had developed accordingly through the process. In light of that evidence, the panel considered the risk of repetition to be low.”

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 further considered that public confidence in the profession could be undermined if conduct of this nature were not treated as capable of damaging the reputation of teachers generally. The messages were not confined to an isolated exchange, but included a number of personal comments and questions which crossed appropriate professional boundaries on more than one occasion. In the panel’s view, an informed member of the public would be concerned that a teacher had behaved in this way towards students shortly after undertaking educational activities with them.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of sending inappropriate messages to pupils 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 Taylor himself. The panel has commented:

“Mr Taylor did have a previously good history and had demonstrated high standards in his professional conduct and had contributed significantly to the education sector for over twenty years. The panel accepted that the incident was out of character.”

The panel has also noted positive evidence from Mr Taylor’s current employer who attested to his “*mature and professional judgment in all his interactions with the pupils.*”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Taylor 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 level of seriousness of Mr Taylor’s behaviour. The panel has observed that “retaining students’ mobile telephone numbers and sending inappropriate messages were serious breaches of professional boundaries, and that such conduct could ordinarily justify a prohibition order.” The panel has also noted that “Mr Taylor acted deliberately, although his actions appeared to have been impulsive rather than planned” and that there was no evidence to suggest Mr Taylor was acting under extreme duress. The panel has concluded that:

“The behaviour also amounted to an abuse of position or trust, given the pupils’ age, the recent teacher-related relationship and Mr Taylor’s safeguarding experience. That abuse of trust was at the lower end, however, because it was not accompanied by deliberate exploitation, coercion, concealment or predatory conduct, and was confined to inappropriate messaging rather than conduct of a more intrusive kind.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments on the mitigating factors in this case, which it has concluded mean that a prohibition order would not be appropriate:

- “the conduct was contained, short-lived and out of character, and there was no evidence before the panel that it had caused any harm to those affected by it;
- Mr Taylor had demonstrated a high standard of teaching throughout his career and there were no wider concerns about his conduct, as reflected in the strong written and oral evidence from his current school; and
- the risk of repetition was low, given the insight and remorse he demonstrated in his oral evidence.”

In this case, I have agreed with the panel’s assessment of the level of seriousness and the mitigating factors. For these reasons, I have concluded that a prohibition order is not proportionate or in the public interest. I consider that the publication of the findings made would be sufficient to send an appropriate message to the teacher as to the standards of behaviour that were not acceptable and that the publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Oatley', with a large, sweeping loop at the end.

Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 26 June 2026

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