



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Joseph Marriott: Professional conduct panel outcome**

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

**June 2026**

## Contents

|                                                          |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Introduction                                             | 3  |
| Allegations                                              | 4  |
| Summary of evidence                                      | 4  |
| Documents                                                | 4  |
| Witnesses                                                | 5  |
| Decision and reasons                                     | 5  |
| Findings of fact                                         | 6  |
| Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State         | 20 |
| Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State | 24 |

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

**Teacher:** Mr Joseph Marriott

**Teacher ref number:** 1837652

**Teacher date of birth:** 6 October 1992

**TRA reference:** 24682

**Date of determination:** 25 June 2026,

**Former employer:** Eckington School, Derbyshire

## **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 15 June 2026 to 25 June 2026 at Cheylesmore House, 5 Quinton Road, Coventry, CV1 2WT, to consider the case of Mr Marriott.

The panel members were Ms Nicola Anderson (teacher panellist – in the chair), Ms Wendy Baxter (teacher panellist) and Mr Tony Coyne (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Lucy Bishop of Eversheds Sutherland solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Ceri Widdett of Exchange Chambers instructed by Brabners LLP.

Mr Marriott was present and was represented by Mr Andrew Faux of The Reflective Practice.

The hearing took place in public in public save that portions of the hearing were heard in private and was recorded.

## Allegations

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

It was alleged that Mr Marriott was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst working as a teacher at Eckington School (“the School”):

1. In or around June [REDACTED], he provided his mobile telephone number and/or personal contact details to Person A, who was known to him as a current Pupil of the School.
2. In or around July [REDACTED], he entered into a sexual and/or romantic relationship with Person A, who was known to him as a former student of the School.
3. On 19 September 2024, in a disciplinary investigation meeting held by the School, he was dishonest in that he stated:
  - a) There was no contact between him and Person A between June [REDACTED] and January 2024;
  - b) The relationship between him and Person A transitioned from professional to a friendship in or around January 2024 when Person A invited him to see a performance; and
  - c) That he entered into a sexual relationship with Person A in March 2024.

Mr Marriott admitted allegations 1, 2, 3a, 3b and 3c.

Mr Marriott denied that the conduct referred to at allegations 1 and 3 amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. Mr Marriott denied allegation 2 amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute on the basis that he considers that the regulatory case is an unlawful interference with his private life.

## Summary of evidence

### Documents

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

Section A: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 3 to 21

Section B: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 22 to 109

Section C: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 110 to 157

Section D: Teacher documents – pages 158 to 167

The panel was also provided with an anonymity key.

As part of Mr Marriott's representative's submissions regarding the regulatory case being an unlawful interference with Mr Marriott's private life, he provided the following documents to the panel:

- A note containing submissions regarding the case of Beckwith v Solicitors Regulation Authority;
- The judgment for the case of Beckwith v Solicitors Regulation Authority
- The General Teaching Council for Scotland Code of Professionalism and Conduct dated November 2024.

[REDACTED].

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the hearing, [REDACTED], and the additional documents provided by Mr Marriott's representative.

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

## **Witnesses**

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

Witness A – [REDACTED] during the School's investigation;

Witness B – [REDACTED]; and

Witness C – [REDACTED] during the Police's investigation into Mr Marriott.

Mr Marriott also gave oral evidence and called the following witnesses:

Person A - [REDACTED].

## **Decision and reasons**

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

Mr Marriott had been employed at the School, initially as Teacher of Music, from September 2019.

Mr Marriott became SENCO in 2022.

In July 2024 the School received an anonymous telephone call alleging that Person A was in a relationship with Mr Marriott and that it had started whilst she was still at the School.

The School commenced an investigation into the anonymous report and made a report to the LADO and the police.

Mr Marriott was interviewed under caution on 7 July 2024.

The police decided that no further action would be taken and this was reported to the School at a safeguarding meeting with the LADO and the School on 19 July 2024.

On 19 September 2024, Mr Marriott attended a disciplinary investigation meeting.

Mr Marriott resigned from his role at the School shortly after the disciplinary investigation meeting on 19 September 2024.

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

The panel was mindful that the burden of proof lay with the TRA to show that it was more probable than not that the alleged incidents occurred.

The panel confined its deliberations to the allegations in question and did not consider any issues not forming part of the allegations.

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

### **Whilst working as a teacher at Eckington School (the School):**

**1. In or around June [REDACTED], you provided your mobile telephone number and/or personal contact details to Person A, who was known to you as a current Pupil of the School:**

The panel noted that Mr Marriott admitted this allegation.

The panel noted that during Witness C's investigation, he reviewed messages between Person A and Mr Marriott. This was confirmed by Witness C in his oral evidence. In his witness statement, he also stated, while discussing the interview which took place on 7 July 2024:

*"During this interview, [Mr Marriott] voluntarily provided the PIN to his mobile phone which I manually reviewed with his permission.*

*My review of the chat indicated that the relationship developed once Person A turned 18 and had left school."*

Whilst the messages themselves were not provided to the panel, in the note of the police interview contained in the bundle, dated 7 July 2024, the following was recorded:

*"Witness C: In terms of moving forward in time, at what point did you and [Person A] exchange telephone numbers?*

*Marriott: That was when she left school.*

*Witness C: Okay so describe to me in as much detail as you can how that situation unfolded.*

*Marriott: So at this point Person A was [REDACTED] so asked for my mobile number to be able to you know invite me to go and see them.*

*Witness C: And how did Person A go about asking for your mobile number?*

*Marriott: She asked me in person.*

*Witness C: And where was that, where were you when that interaction took place?*

*Marriott: So that was in school."*

The panel noted that during Witness C's oral evidence, he confirmed that records of interview could not be guaranteed to be 100% accurate, given that the note taker would listen to the audio tape recording and type the note up after the interview. It was therefore possible that the record of interview contained inaccuracies. The panel also recognised that there were instances within the record of interview in which it was noted that the contents of the discussion were "inaudible". The panel also noted that the notetaker was not presented to it as a witness, and therefore could not be cross-examined on the accuracy of its contents.

However, the panel noted that Mr Marriott did not dispute the contents of the interview record. It also noted that Witness C and Mr Marriott both confirmed the accuracy of the interview record during their oral evidence.

The panel heard from Mr Marriott that Person A asked for his mobile telephone number in person on the last day of school.

Mr Marriott accepted during his oral evidence that in providing his mobile telephone number to Person A, he acted in breach of the School's Code of Conduct policy. Mr Marriott also confirmed during his oral evidence that it was this policy which he had admitted to breaching in the School's Investigation Meeting dated 19 September 2024. The minutes stated:

*"[Director of HR]: Does [Mr Marriot] understand how he has breached this policy?"*

*[Mr Marriott]: Yes"*

The panel also heard from Person A that she asked for Mr Marriott's mobile telephone number on the day of her last exam, her last day in School. Person A stated that she sought Mr Marriott's mobile telephone number so that she could invite him to her [REDACTED].

The panel found that, on the basis of the notes of Mr Marriott's police interview, together with the oral evidence from Mr Marrott and Person A, it was more probable than not that Mr Marriott provided his mobile telephone number to Person A on the day of Person A's last exam. On the balance of probabilities, the panel found that this was in June [REDACTED].

Mr Marriott confirmed during his oral evidence that at the time he provided his mobile telephone number to Person A, that he knew her to be a current pupil. Mr Marriott told the panel that he understood pupils came off the roll at some point in June.

The panel noted that it had not been provided with any evidence that Mr Marriott had provided Person A with any other personal contact details, other than his mobile telephone number. However, given the "and/or" wording contained with the allegation, it was sufficient for the panel to find that Mr Marriott had provided his mobile telephone number.

On balance, the panel found this allegation proven.

## **2. In or around July [REDACTED], you entered into a sexual and/or romantic relationship with Person A, who was known to you as a former student of the School:**

The panel noted that Mr Marriott accepted that he had entered into a romantic relationship with Person A in late July [REDACTED]. Until the second day of the hearing, Mr Marriott had maintained that he entered into a romantic relationship with Person A in August [REDACTED].

The panel also noted that the presenting officer confirmed during closing submissions that there was no evidence that Mr Marriott entered into a sexual relationship in or around July [REDACTED]. This aligned with the oral evidence the panel heard and the evidence available in the bundle.

The panel therefore confined its deliberations to whether Mr Marriott entered into a romantic relationship with Person A, who was known to him as a former student of the School, in or around July [REDACTED].

Witness C confirmed in his witness statement that Person A's parents became aware of the romantic relationship between Person A and Mr Marriott in August [REDACTED]. He confirmed orally that he had no reason to doubt this date. Witness C also referred to evidence he had obtained from [REDACTED] of Mr Marriott's who said that he was introduced to Person A over the summer of [REDACTED]. This was also confirmed by Witness C during the oral hearing. The panel exercised caution with regards to the weight it attached to the hearsay evidence reported by Witness C, considering the extent to which it was corroborated by other evidence available to the panel.

The panel noted that there was some confusion as to the exact month in which the relationship with Person A became romantic. The panel had not been provided with any messages to identify when the romantic exchange of messages began. Mr Marriott also confirmed during his oral evidence that he did not look back at his messages to see when this date was. Mr Marriott was unsure whether he still had access to the historic messages as he had changed phones in the period between [REDACTED] and the date of the hearing.

In Witness C's statement he referred to when the romantic relationship started, based on his review of the messages:

*"This timeline the messages portrayed backed up the timeline both Mr Marriott and Person A disclosed during interview, which was that the romantic relationship started in July [REDACTED]."*

Witness C also confirmed during his oral evidence that the initial messages he reviewed in July related to [REDACTED] and while he could not recall explicitly the dates the messages changed to a more romantic nature he agreed that this was around July [REDACTED].

Mr Marriott confirmed during his oral evidence that the messages turned to romantic messages towards the end of July [REDACTED]. Person A also confirmed during her oral evidence that the romantic relationship started through messaging in around late July or early August.

The panel noted that the wording “in or around July [REDACTED]” would cover a chronology in which the romantic relationship was entered into in August [REDACTED]. The panel considered that, based on the evidence available, it was more likely than not that the romantic relationship had commenced in July [REDACTED], taking into account that the allegation was wide enough to encompass August [REDACTED] in any event.

The panel considered Mr Marriott’s oral evidence in which he confirmed that he thought Person A was a former student in July [REDACTED]. When asked by the panel where that belief came from, Mr Marriott stated it was due to the fact she would have already sat her last exam and have been taken off the School roll.

Mr Marriott did state that he did not check at the time with anyone at the School whether his belief was accurate. Mr Marriott also confirmed that he did not consider whether his belief would be impacted by Person A having to return to the School to obtain her [REDACTED].

The panel noted that, on a number of occasions during Mr Marriott’s police interview, he referred to Person A as no longer being at the School, or having left the School at the point the messages started.

The panel noted that it had not been provided with any policies from the School which confirmed when a student became a “former student”.

The panel was provided with some context as to the belief within the School as to when a student becomes a “former student”. The panel was provided with an email from Witness A’s [REDACTED] that Person A’s “official leaving date” was 22 July [REDACTED].

The panel heard oral evidence from Witness B that he considered students became former students at the point that they collected their A-Level or BTEC results. Witness A confirmed on a number of occasions during his oral evidence that he considered that students came off roll, and therefore became “former students” on the last Friday in June. In considering these conflicting views, the panel found that it was not unreasonable, in the context of this particular School, for Mr Marriott to hold the view that Person A had become a “former student” in July [REDACTED].

On the balance of probabilities, the panel considered that Mr Marriott did consider Person A a “former student” in or around July [REDACTED] when the romantic relationship between the two began.

On balance, the panel found this allegation proven.

**3. On 19 September 2024, in a disciplinary investigation meeting held by the School, you were dishonest in that you stated:**

**a. There was no contact between you and Person A between June [REDACTED] and January 2024;**

**b. The relationship between you and Person A transitioned from professional to a friendship in or around January 2024 when Person A invited you to see a performance; and**

**c. That you entered into a sexual relationship with Person A in March 2024.**

The panel noted that Mr Marriott admitted this allegation.

The panel also noted that it had been provided with a note of the disciplinary investigation meeting held by the School on 19 September 2024. In those minutes, it stated:

*“Witness A: Are you in a relationship with Pupil A?”*

*Mr Marriott: Happened considerably later from when she left school.*

*[[REDACTED]]: For clarity, asked Mr Marriott if he was in a relationship with Pupil A?*

*Mr Marriott: Asked [[REDACTED]] to define a relationship.*

*[[REDACTED]]: Sexual relationship.*

*Mr Marriott: Yes recently.*

*[[REDACTED]]: When exactly?*

*Mr Marriott: Within the last couple of months.*

*[[REDACTED]]: More specific?*

*Mr Marriott: March 2024.”*

...

*“Witness A: When did Pupil A make contact?”*

*Mr Marriott: January 24”*

...

*“Witness A: Asked [Mr Marriott] to clarify exactly when the relationship with the student transitioned from professional to personal/friendship?*

*Mr Marriott: advised when Pupil A made contact a few years later to invite me to her [REDACTED].*

*[[REDACTED]]: Asked [Mr Marriott] to clarify when Pupil A left school there was a gap and Pupil A contacted [Mr Marriott] in Jan 24 to invite him to [REDACTED]?*

*Mr Marriott: confirmed yes there was a gap”*

...

*“[[REDACTED]]: Clarified Pupil A left school [REDACTED] and contacted [sic] was made in Jan 24.*

*Mr Marriott: Yes”*

The panel noted that while the minute taker was not put forward as a witness to be cross-examined, Mr Marriott did not dispute the accuracy of the minutes. He also verified some of the contents when asked during the hearing. For example, when asked why Mr Marriott said that there had been a “gap” between Pupil A leaving the School and then contacting him in January 2024 to invite him to a [REDACTED], Mr Marriott confirmed that this was as a result of poor advice [REDACTED].

The panel found that Mr Marriott had said the following at that meeting:

- That there was no contact between him and Person A between June [REDACTED] and January 2024;
- That the relationship between Mr Marriott and Person A transitioned from professional to a friendship in or around January 2024 when Person A invited him to see a performance; and
- That Mr Marriott entered into a sexual relationship with Person A in March 2024.

Given the evidence, the panel found that Mr Marriott said the statements contained in allegations 3a. and 3b. and determined that these were false.

With respect to whether the statement referred to in allegation 3c. was false, the panel noted that there was nothing in the record of interview between the police and Mr Marriott in which he admitted to being in a sexual relationship with Person A before March 2024. The panel also noted the fact that there would be very little evidence in respect of when a sexual relationship began, and that the presenting officer accepted that the evidence pointed to a romantic relationship, rather than sexual when it first commenced.

Witness A was asked by Mr Marriott’s representative whether he had any doubt that a sexual relationship had started before August [REDACTED], to which he responded that he “felt the police had no evidence to suggest” that there was a “sexual relationship” which took place “before August” [REDACTED].

The panel also noted that Mr Marriott provided the police with access to his mobile phone. While the panel was not provided with the messages which were reviewed by the police, Witness C confirmed in his statement that:

*“The relevant messages started in July [REDACTED] and as time goes on the messages became more in line with what you’d expect from a developing relationship.”*

Mr Marriott confirmed during his oral evidence that his relationship with Person A became a sexual relationship “later in August” after conversations had taken place between himself and Person A’s family.

Despite there being limited evidence as to when the sexual relationship commenced between Mr Marriott and Pupil A, the panel accepted that it had more likely than not developed into a sexual relationship before March 2024, and this was admitted by Mr Marriott in these proceedings. Mr Marriott’s statement in this regard had therefore, also been false.

The panel then went on to consider whether, in stating the above, Mr Marriott had been dishonest.

The panel considered Mr Marriott’s attempt to justify the statements he had made. He stated that he was told by “[REDACTED], that his relationship with Person A was none of the School’s business. Mr Marriott also referred to the police’s decision to take no further action in respect of the relationship. He also noted that [REDACTED] had no concerns and that they saw the relationship “for what it is”.

However, rather than attending the disciplinary investigation meeting and advising the attendees that the relationship was none of their business, Mr Marriott provided them with a fabricated version of events.

The panel considered Mr Marriott’s actual state of knowledge or belief as to the facts at the time he attended the disciplinary investigation meeting. The panel noted that Mr Marriott had attended an interview with the police, following his arrest, on 7 July 2024, over two months before the school’s disciplinary investigation meeting. As referred to above, Witness C and Mr Marriott both confirmed the accuracy of the interview record during their oral evidence. Mr Marriott also confirmed during his oral evidence that what he had told the police was the truth and what he said in the disciplinary investigation meeting was a lie.

In the record of interview with the police, Mr Marriott stated:

*“A relationship started after Person A had left Eckington School and she was 18 years old.”*

During that interview Mr Marriott also confirmed that there was a change in dynamics in the relationship between him and Person A and that “[REDACTED], *she’d left school at that point.*”

The panel noted that Person A left the School in [REDACTED], so she would have been [REDACTED] in [REDACTED], not 2024, and that Mr Marriott would have known this.

The panel was provided with the minutes of a LADO meeting on 19 July 2024. During this meeting, Witness C provided an update on the investigation into Mr Marriot and that the “*relationship began when [Person A] left the [REDACTED].*” Witness A was in attendance at this meeting, and was also in attendance at the disciplinary investigation meeting. Witness A was therefore aware of the version of events Mr Marriot had told the police as part of their investigation. Witness A did not disclose this to Mr Marriott during the disciplinary investigation meeting. Therefore, the chronology of the relationship put forward by Mr Marriot during the disciplinary investigation meeting was his own independent account.

The panel noted that Mr Marriott’s representative apologised on Mr Marriott’s behalf in respect of the dishonesty. Mr Marriott also told the panel that at the time of the disciplinary investigation meeting, he was in a difficult situation and he felt the relationship with the Trust had broken down.

Submissions were made by Mr Marriott’s representative that in making false statements, Mr Marriott was foolish and did so in an “unthinking”, “erratic” and “human” way. Mr Marriott’s representative told the panel that the knowledge of those questioning him at the disciplinary investigation meeting was important, given that they already knew about the account that Mr Marriott had provided to the police. He submitted that the dishonesty was “not as bad as the presenting officer submitted”.

He also told the panel that there may have been a “temporary lapse” in Mr Marriott’s behaviour in being dishonest during the disciplinary investigation meeting and that, given the knowledge state of those interviewing him, Mr Marriott’s dishonesty was “not that consequential”. Mr Marriott’s representative also told the panel that the dishonesty was “excusable” in the circumstances.

The panel disagreed with these submissions. It found that Mr Marriott had lied for personal gain. In oral evidence Mr Marriott told the panel that by lying he hoped that the School’s disciplinary investigation would “stop”.

The panel considered that there were alternative responses available to Mr Marriott, other than giving a false account of his relationship with Person A, given that he maintained that he did not breach any boundaries nor do anything wrong. Mr Marriott also told the panel that he did not think it was any of the School’s business, given the relationship was being conducted in his private life. The panel noted that it was open for

Mr Marriott to say that due to the police concluding that no crime had been committed, that the School should not be concerned with the relationship. However, he chose not to do so and instead provided a false version of events.

The panel therefore found that Mr Marriott knew he was being dishonest, having given an accurate version of events to the police in July 2024 and then fabricating a version of events to tell during the disciplinary investigation meeting.

The panel also found that an ordinary honest person would find Mr Marriott's state of mind to be dishonest.

On balance, the panel found this allegation proven.

### **Findings as to unacceptable professional conduct / 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 considered whether the conduct of Mr Marriott, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

In respect of allegation 1, the panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Marriott was in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
  - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach...

The panel noted that Mr Marriott, in providing Person A with his personal mobile telephone number, did not have regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being. The panel also noted that Mr Marriott was not observing proper boundaries appropriate to a

teacher's professional position in providing his personal mobile telephone number to Person A.

In addition, the panel noted that Mr Marriott's action in providing his personal mobile telephone number to Person A was in breach of the School's Code of Conduct.

As such, he did not have proper and professional regard for the policies of the school in which he taught.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Marriott, in relation to allegation 1, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education ("KCSIE") and Working Together to Safeguard Children in that Mr Marriott was in breach of his duties to safeguard children and his failure to follow the School's policies. The panel appreciated that while KCSIE and Working Together to Safeguard Children are not explicit, Mr Marriott did breach the School's Code of Conduct which is in place to safeguard students.

The panel also considered whether Mr Marriott's conduct in respect of allegation 1 displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

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

The panel found that none of these offences was relevant.

In respect of allegation 1, the panel considered that in sharing his personal mobile telephone number with Person A on the [REDACTED], Mr Marriott did not display misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standard of behaviour expected of a teacher.

The panel appreciated that in exchanging his personal mobile telephone number with Person A, Mr Marriott blurred the lines in the relationship between the two. However, the panel considered this in the context of the timing of the request from Person A, namely the [REDACTED].

The panel noted that while Mr Marriott's actions in providing the mobile telephone number fell short of the standard of behaviour expected of a teacher, it did not find that the behaviour fell significantly short.

The panel also considered the allegation in light of the context of the small cohort that Person A was in. The panel recognised that it was inevitable that Mr Marriott may have a closer relationship with a smaller class of students than a teacher with a bigger class. The panel noted that it had heard evidence that Person A's [REDACTED] provided her form class with their personal email address towards the end of their time in sixth form.

The panel did not find unacceptable professional conduct with respect to allegation 1.

In respect of allegation 2, the panel noted that the TRA envisages that panels may consider relationships between teachers and their former students by virtue of paragraph 39 of the Advice. This reads:

*“It is likely that a panel will consider a teacher’s behaviour to be incompatible with being a teacher, if there is evidence of one or more of the following factors:*

*...an abuse of any trust, knowledge, or influence gained through their professional position in order to advance a romantic or sexual relationship with a pupil or former pupil”*

However, the panel was not satisfied, based on the evidence before it, that Mr Marriott had abused any trust, knowledge or influence gained through his position as a teacher in order to advance a romantic or sexual relationship with Person A.

The panel also noted that the School’s Code of Conduct did not contain any provisions in relation to relationships with former students.

The panel also considered whether Mr Marriott’s conduct in respect of allegation 2 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 were relevant.

The panel noted that allegation 2 took place outside the education setting. The panel did not consider Mr Marriott’s conduct in entering into a relationship with a former pupil to have affected the way he fulfilled his teaching role, given the lack of evidence that the relationship started before Person A became a former pupil. The panel noted that Mr Marriott and Person A maintained privacy in respect of their relationship until June 2024 and that the relationship started when Mr Marriott knew her as a former pupil. As such, the panel found that this would not have led to pupils being exposed to, or influenced by, the behaviour in a harmful way.

Therefore, in relation to allegation 2, the panel was not satisfied that Mr Marriott’s conduct in entering into a relationship with a former pupil amounted to unacceptable professional conduct. This was in the context of this particular case, where there was no evidence of the relationship commencing before Person A left the School. The panel also noted that there was no clear guidance on when it may be considered appropriate for a teacher to engage in a romantic relationship with a former pupil. The panel was not

satisfied that there had been a breach of the Teachers' Standards in respect of its findings in allegation 2.

In respect of allegation 3, the panel considered it inappropriate for Mr Marriott to be dishonest as part of an investigation of this nature.

The panel found that Mr Marriott had been dishonest for his own personal gain, in order to try and "stop" the School's investigation. He stated that he intended to resign and wanted a "clean break".

The panel found that Mr Marriott did not consider the ramifications of his dishonesty. The panel also noted that Mr Marriott maintained that he did not do anything wrong in entering into a relationship with Person A, and therefore could and should have told the truth, or at the very least, told the School that he disputed whether they were entitled to investigate matters relating to his private life.

The panel noted that by virtue of his dishonesty, Mr Marriott was in breach of the Teachers' Standards by failing to demonstrate consistently high standards of personal and professional conduct. Mr Marriott also failed to have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the School, namely in respect of engaging with the School's disciplinary procedures.

The panel also considered whether Mr Marriott's conduct in respect of allegation 3 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 were relevant.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Marriott amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession in respect of allegation 3.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mr Marriott was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct in respect of allegation 3 only.

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

In respect of allegation 1, the panel noted that despite the timing of the provision of the personal mobile telephone number, Mr Marriott had acted in breach of the School's Code of Conduct. This was the case even if other staff shared their personal contact details with sixth form students. The panel considered that this was conduct that could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher, given that it blurred professional boundaries.

In respect of allegation 2, the panel noted that Mr Marriott had sought to conceal his relationship with Person A, demonstrating that he recognised that his actions could have a negative impact on the public's perception of him as a teacher, therefore bringing the profession into disrepute.

The panel noted that members of the public would likely have a negative view of a relationship which commenced shortly after Person A left school.

However, given that this conduct occurred outside of the education setting, the panel was required to consider whether the conduct displayed was of a serious nature. Only if it was conduct of a serious nature could it constitute conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. There was no evidence that Mr Marriott had abused any trust, knowledge or influence gained through his position as a teacher in order to advance a romantic or sexual relationship with Person A. Furthermore, the panel recognised that there was no breach of the School's Code of Conduct. The panel was not satisfied that there had been a breach of the Teachers' Standards. The panel noted that there was no clear guidance on when it may be considered appropriate for a teacher to engage in a romantic relationship with a former pupil. In those circumstances, the panel did not consider that the conduct displayed could be said to be of a serious nature and therefore did not constitute conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In respect of allegation 3, the panel found that Mr Marriott's dishonesty could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher, therefore bringing the profession into disrepute. The panel was concerned that Mr Marriott had acted dishonestly for his own personal gain, thereby showing a disregard for the School's investigation process.

The panel considered that Mr Marriott's conduct with respect to allegation 3 could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Marriott's actions with respect to allegation 3 constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In conclusion, the panel found unacceptable professional conduct with respect to allegation 3 only, and found that Mr Marriott was guilty of conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in respect of allegation 1 and 3.

## **Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State**

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

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

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

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given that Mr Marriott provided dishonest answers in an investigation of safeguarding allegations, casting doubt on his respect for proper safeguarding processes.

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Marriott, which involved breaching the School's Code of Conduct and dishonesty, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Marriott was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

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

In addition to the public interest considerations set out above, the panel went on to consider whether there was a public interest in retaining Mr Marriott in the profession. Whilst there is evidence that Mr Marriott had ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining

Mr Marriott in the profession, since he was dishonest in a disciplinary investigation process which related to the safeguarding of pupils and thereby fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher. The panel noted that this dishonesty was found to have been for Mr Marriott's own gain.

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 Marriott.

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;
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions...

The panel also noted Mr Marriott's deliberate decision-making in being dishonest during the School's disciplinary investigation meeting. They considered Mr Marriott's motivation and noted that this was for personal gain, in order to "stop" the School's disciplinary investigation.

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

The panel noted that there was limited evidence of mitigating factors.

There was evidence that Mr Marriott's actions were deliberate. Mr Marriott had told an accurate version of events to the police and then, a few months later, had chosen to tell a fabricated version to the School.

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

There was no evidence that Mr Marriott had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both his personal and professional conduct or that he contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel noted the following in Person A's statement:

*"I respected [Mr Marriott] because I thought he was a wonderful teacher, with a world of patience and a genuine care for those he taught."*

However, this represented the only evidence of Mr Marriott's character or teaching practice presented to the panel. No other character statements or references were provided to the panel. The panel noted that this did not sufficiently demonstrate that Mr Marriott had demonstrated exceptionally high standards while working at the School.

The panel noted that Mr Marriott had admitted the alleged facts, and the panel took this into account in Mr Marriott's favour.

The panel noted that it only had evidence of one incident of Mr Marriott having lied. However, the panel considered that this dishonesty occurred in a serious context and noted that it was as a result of the police's investigation that the School became aware of Mr Marriott's dishonesty, not from Mr Marriott himself. The panel took into account that Mr Marriott had admitted dishonesty and that this demonstrated some insight. However, the panel also noted the change in Mr Marriott's evidence, on day 2 of the hearing, to confirm that the romantic relationship with Person A commenced in July 2022. Prior to this point, Mr Marriott had maintained that the romantic relationship commenced in August 2022. The panel was concerned that in the lead up to and at the beginning of the hearing, Mr Marriott had continued to "bend" the truth in his own interests, and thereby remained concerned that this demonstrated that his level of insight was limited. Furthermore, the panel was concerned by representations made on behalf of Mr Marriott that, given the knowledge state of those interviewing him, Mr Marriott's dishonesty was "not that consequential". Mr Marriott's representative also acknowledged that the panel had no indication that Mr Marriott understood the seriousness of his dishonesty.

Mr Marriott did not demonstrate to the panel that he appreciated the risks in providing his number to a current student, which was conduct that could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher, given that it blurred professional boundaries. The panel came to this conclusion given Mr Marriott's attempts to justify his action in providing his number to Person A by referring to other examples where teachers had exchanged personal contact details with pupils, rather than addressing the risks that were involved in doing so. Mr Marriott also accepted during the hearing that in providing his number to Person A he breached the School's Code of Conduct, but did not consider this to be a breach of the safeguarding policy.

The panel noted that Mr Marriott did apologise on one occasion while addressing the reasons for following advice from his [REDACTED] in advance of the School's disciplinary investigation meeting. Mr Marriott also told the panel that he had made the "wrong decision" in following the advice. However, the panel noted that these were the only examples of Mr Marriott showing remorse for his actions.

The panel also noted that Mr Marriott's representative made submissions on his behalf that he was "foolish" in being dishonest. However, the panel noted this submission in the context of a subsequent submission that the dishonesty was "not that consequential", suggesting that Mr Marriott still does not appreciate the severity of the dishonesty in the context of a serious disciplinary investigation process.

The panel therefore 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 Marriott 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 Marriott. The extent of Mr Marriott's dishonesty in a serious disciplinary investigation process was a significant factor in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate for it to decide to recommend a review period of the order. The panel was mindful that the Advice states that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances, in any given case, that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 2 years.

The Advice indicates that there are certain types of case where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period.

None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel's findings.

The Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate. The panel noted that one of the cases included "fraud or serious dishonesty". Whilst the panel considered Mr Marriott's dishonesty to be misconduct of a serious nature given that honesty is a fundamental tenet of the profession, the panel noted that Mr Marriott did not attempt to conceal the existence of the relationship with Person A in its entirety but was only dishonest about when the relationship commenced.

None of the listed characteristics were therefore engaged by the panel's findings.

The panel noted the limited level of insight Mr Marriott had into his dishonesty and his limited remorse.

However, the panel considered that the risk of repetition was low given Mr Marriott explained his dishonesty was as a result of the breakdown of relationship between himself and the Trust. He also explained that the School's disciplinary investigation meeting felt intimidating and hostile. Mr Marriott said during the hearing that he could talk openly to the panel, compared to the attendees at the disciplinary investigation meeting. The panel also noted that Mr Marriott accepted that it was wrong to provide his personal telephone number to Person A. The panel also noted that it was not provided with any evidence that Mr Marriott had provided his personal telephone number to any other student other than Person A. The panel also heard evidence from various witnesses from the School that the safeguarding culture at the School was poor, and while this does not justify Mr Marriott's actions, it does suggest that Mr Marriott's judgement may have been impacted by this.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a 2 year review period.

## **Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State**

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

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

In this case, the panel has found all of the allegations proven, but also that some of the proven allegations do not amount to unacceptable professional conduct or conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute. I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

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

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by

- treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
- having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach...

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Marriott, involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE) and involved breaches of Working Together to Safeguard Children.

The panel finds that the conduct of Mr Marriott fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of dishonesty during a safeguarding investigation, and the panel's finding that the dishonesty had been for Mr Marriott's own gain. In particular, the panel has stated that *"There was evidence that Mr Marriott's actions were deliberate. Mr Marriott had told an accurate version of events to the police and then, a few months later, had chosen to tell a fabricated version to the School."*

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 Marriott, 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, given that Mr Marriott provided dishonest answers in an investigation of safeguarding allegations, casting doubt on his respect for proper safeguarding processes."* 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 took into account that Mr Marriott had admitted*

*dishonesty and that this demonstrated some insight. However, the panel also noted the change in Mr Marriott's evidence, on day 2 of the hearing, to confirm that the romantic relationship with Person A commenced in July [REDACTED]. Prior to this point, Mr Marriott had maintained that the romantic relationship commenced in August [REDACTED]. The panel was concerned that in the lead up to and at the beginning of the hearing, Mr Marriott had continued to "bend" the truth in his own interests, and thereby remained concerned that this demonstrated that his level of insight was limited."*

The panel has also commented,

*"Furthermore, the panel was concerned by representations made on behalf of Mr Marriott that, given the knowledge state of those interviewing him, Mr Marriott's dishonesty was "not that consequential". Mr Marriott's representative also acknowledged that the panel had no indication that Mr Marriott understood the seriousness of his dishonesty.*

*Mr Marriott did not demonstrate to the panel that he appreciated the risks in providing his number to a current student, which was conduct that could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher, given that it blurred professional boundaries. The panel came to this conclusion given Mr Marriott's attempts to justify his action in providing his number to Person A by referring to other examples where teachers had exchanged personal contact details with pupils, rather than addressing the risks that were involved in doing so."*

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, "...*public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Marriott was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.*"

I am particularly mindful of the finding of dishonesty in this case, which the panel has found was for Mr Marriott's own gain, 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 Marriott himself. The panel comment *"There was no evidence that Mr Marriott had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both his personal and professional conduct or that he contributed significantly to the education sector."*

However, I note that the panel has recorded the evidence of Person A that, in their view, Mr Marriott was,

*"...a wonderful teacher, with a world of patience and a genuine care for those he taught."*

However, the panel also noted, *"...this represented the only evidence of Mr Marriott's character or teaching practice presented to the panel. No other character statements or references were provided to the panel. The panel noted that this did not sufficiently demonstrate that Mr Marriott had demonstrated exceptionally high standards while working at the School."*

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Marriott 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 said, *"The panel noted that Mr Marriott did apologise on one occasion while addressing the reasons for following advice from his [REDACTED] in advance of the School's disciplinary investigation meeting. Mr Marriott also told the panel that he had made the "wrong decision" in following the advice. However, the panel noted that these were the only examples of Mr Marriott showing remorse for his actions."*

Further, *"The panel also noted that Mr Marriott's representative made submissions on his behalf that he was "foolish" in being dishonest. However, the panel noted this submission in the context of a subsequent submission that the dishonesty was "not that consequential", suggesting that Mr Marriott still does not appreciate the severity of the dishonesty in the context of a serious disciplinary investigation process."*

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that Mr Marriott was dishonest and the panel's finding that he did so for his own gain to stop the School's disciplinary investigation.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Marriott has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, that is not backed up by full remorse or insight, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended a two-year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments about the seriousness of the conduct. The panel has said that it *"...considered that this dishonesty occurred in a serious context"*. However, the panel later record *"Whilst the panel considered Mr Marriott's dishonesty to be misconduct of a serious nature given that honesty is a fundamental tenet of the profession, the panel noted that Mr Marriott did not attempt to conceal the existence of the relationship with Person A in its entirety but was only dishonest about when the relationship commenced"* and therefore that panel has found that this matter did not amount to fraud or serious dishonesty as described in the Advice.

The panel comment that *"...the risk of repetition was low given Mr Marriott explained his dishonesty was as a result of the breakdown of relationship between himself and the Trust. He also explained that the School's disciplinary investigation meeting felt intimidating and hostile. Mr Marriott said during the hearing that he could talk openly to the panel, compared to the attendees at the disciplinary investigation meeting."*

Despite this, I am also mindful of the panel's earlier finding that *"The panel was concerned that in the lead up to and at the beginning of the hearing, Mr Marriott had continued to "bend" the truth in his own interests"*, which lead to the panel's finding of *"...the limited level of insight Mr Marriott had into his dishonesty and his limited remorse."*

I have considered whether a two-year review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that a two-year review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In my view, the circumstances of this case weigh in favour of a longer review period.

These elements are the seriousness of the conduct, including the dishonesty found, and the panel's findings of the limited nature of Mr Marriott's insight and remorse.

I consider therefore that a four-year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession, and to allow Mr Marriott further time to reflect on the seriousness of the conduct and the need to safeguard pupil well-being.

**This means that Mr Joseph Marriott is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England.** He may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 26 June 2030, four years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If he does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Mr Marriott remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

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

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'S. Blomfield'.

**Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield**

**Date: 26 June 2026**

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