



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Miss Natalie Surr: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

July 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	13
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	17

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

Teacher: Miss Natalie Surr

Teacher ref number: 1551493

Teacher date of birth: 31 December 1981

TRA reference: 24602

Date of determination: 06 July 2026

Former employer: Shirebrook Academy, Mansfield

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 6 July 2026 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Miss Natalie Surr.

The panel members were Mr Paul Hawkins (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Emma Garrett (lay panellist) and Mrs Yvonne Weston (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Harry Taylor of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP Solicitors.

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Miss Surr that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Miss Surr provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer Ms Jessica Etherington of Kingsley Napley LLP solicitors or Miss Surr.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 23 June 2026.

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

Whilst working as the Lead Teacher of Computing at the Shirebrook Academy (“the Academy”):

1. From on or around July 2023, she did not inform the Academy that she was in a relationship with Person A, a registered sex offender.
2. On or around 23 January 2024, when specifically asked about Person A, she did not inform Colleague A and/or Colleague B that Person A was a registered sex offender.
3. Between on or around 21 to 23 September 2023, she asked and/or arranged for Pupil A to undertake some gardening and/or clearing up of dog faeces in the garden at her home.
4. On or around 25 September 2023, whilst in the Academy she paid Pupil A around ten pounds for undertaking some gardening and/or clearing up of dog faeces in the garden at her home.
5. Her conduct at paragraph 3 and/or 4 indicate that she may have exposed Pupil A to a risk of harm.
6. Her conduct at paragraph 3 and/or 4 was inappropriate in that she knew or ought to have known that Pupil A was vulnerable.
7. Her conduct at paragraph 1 and/or 2 was:
 - a) Dishonest; and/or
 - b) Lacked integrity.

Miss Surr admitted both the facts alleged and unacceptable conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology and List of Key People – pages 6 to 8

Section 2: Notice of Referral and Response – pages 10 to 27

Section 3: Notice of Hearing and Response – pages 29 to 47

Section 4: Statement of Agreed Facts – pages 49 to 53

Section 5: Teaching Regulation Agency Documents – pages 55 to 742

Section 6: Teacher’s Representations – pages 744 to 790

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

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

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Miss Surr on 15 June 2026.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

In advance of the meeting the TRA agreed to a request from Miss Surr for the allegations to be considered without a hearing. The panel had the ability to direct that the case be considered at a hearing if required in the interests of justice or in the public interest. The panel did not determine that such a direction was necessary or appropriate in this case.

Miss Surr began employment at the Shirebrook Academy (“the Academy”) on 1 September 2016. On 1 September 2022 Miss Surr began her role as Lead Teacher of Computing at the Academy. By a date before July 2023 Miss Surr had entered into a personal relationship with Person A. Person A was a registered sex offender.

In or around July 2023 Person A disclosed to Miss Surr that he was a registered sex offender. Subsequently, Person A's [REDACTED] met with Miss Surr to explain Person A's circumstances, in accordance with the requirements of Person A's terms of probation.

On or around 21 September 2023 Miss Surr asked Pupil A whether they knew anybody that would be willing to tidy up the garden at her home. Pupil A volunteered herself and carried out the work on or around 23 September 2023, including picking up dog faeces that was found in the garden. On 25 September 2023 Miss Surr gave Pupil A ten pounds whilst on the Academy premises, as payment for her services. The Academy was notified of this on approximately October 2023 and carried out a disciplinary investigation which concluded on 14 December 2023.

On 12 January 2024 the Academy received an email from a member of the public, raising concerns about Miss Surr being in a relationship with a registered sex offender. The Academy met with Miss Surr on 23 January 2024 and asked whether Miss Surr knew Person A. Miss Surr confirmed she did and that he was her partner, although she did not disclose her knowledge that he was a registered sex offender.

The Academy subsequently investigated the above and discovered that Miss Surr had known about Person A's circumstances since around July 2023. Following the Academy's disciplinary process, Miss Surr's employment with the Academy ended on 18 July 2024.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

Whilst working as the Lead Teacher of Computing at the Shirebrook Academy ("the Academy"):

- 1. From on or around July 2023, you did not inform the Academy that you were in a relationship with Person A, a registered sex offender.**

Miss Surr admitted this allegation.

Miss Surr's account is that in around July 2023, she was notified that Person A, a person who she was in a relationship with, was a registered sex offender. The panel had regard to evidence provided by [REDACTED] ("Person B"), [REDACTED], which confirmed that they had tried to persuade Miss Surr to notify the Academy of her relationship with Person A. Person B's written account was that Miss Surr had argued against needing to do this and had refused.

It was clear from the evidence, and admitted by Miss Surr, that the Academy was not made aware of Miss Surr's relationship to Person A (and importantly that Person A was a registered sex offender) until it received an email from a member of the public on 12 January 2024. The email began by expressing concern that Miss Surr was knowingly in a relationship with a registered sex offender. Upon receipt of this email, the Academy began an internal investigation, during which they interviewed Miss Surr, on 3 June 2024.

On 3 June 2024, during the interview, Miss Surr confirmed that she had been in a relationship with Person A for approximately one year and had known they were a registered sex offender since July 2023. Miss Surr continued to state that she had not disclosed the relationship to the Academy because she had not been sure whether the relationship was going to continue or not. She stated that she had researched online and had believed she did not need to inform her employer unless she and Person A were living together, which she stated they were not.

There was also a meeting between Miss Surr and [REDACTED] ("Person C/Colleague B") in January 2024 to discuss the third party concern they had received. It is also clear from the evidence available that Miss Surr did not disclose to the Academy at that point that she was aware of Person A being a registered sex offender.

The panel was satisfied that Miss Surr had had multiple opportunities to notify the Academy that she was in a relationship with a registered sex offender and she failed to do so.

For the reasons above, this allegation is proved.

2. On or around 23 January 2024, when specifically asked about Person A, you did not inform Colleague A and/or Colleague B that Person A was a registered sex offender.

Miss Surr admitted this allegation.

The panel had particular regard to the evidence relating to a meeting Miss Surr attended with Person C/Colleague B and Colleague A ([REDACTED]) on 23 January 2024. The panel was provided with a file note of that meeting. Miss Surr was asked whether she knew Person A and she responded "yes". Miss Surr was then asked "do you feel comfortable telling me about him?", to which Miss Surr responded "he is my partner". Miss Surr did not divulge any further information.

This is consistent with the account given by Colleague A in the Academy's investigation interview on 5 June 2024 and Person C's written evidence prepared for these proceedings.

Again, Miss Surr had several opportunities to disclose her situation to the Academy and chose not to do so. The witness accounts provided to the panel described that Miss Surr

was not forthcoming with this information and during the Academy's investigation in June 2024, Colleague A described Miss Surr's position as like "getting blood from a stone".

For the reasons above, this allegation is proved.

3. Between on or around 21 to 23 September 2023, you asked and/or arranged for Pupil A to undertake some gardening and/or clearing up of dog faeces in the garden at your home.

Miss Surr admitted this allegation.

The panel was provided with evidence of the Academy's internal disciplinary investigation into this allegation, which took place in around October 2023. The panel was mindful that the Academy's finding of misconduct was not determinative in relation to these proceedings.

Miss Surr had consistently admitted this allegation, albeit her position has always been that she did not seek Pupil A out deliberately. The panel accepted Miss Surr's account [REDACTED]. Miss Surr had vacated the property and needed to tidy it up towards the end of her rental period. She asked Pupil A whether she knew anyone that could help and Pupil A recommended [REDACTED]. Pupil A then volunteered to do the work herself. Miss Surr agreed to this. On that basis, the panel concluded that Miss Surr had arranged for Pupil A to undertake some gardening at her home.

The panel accepted that Miss Surr may not have asked Pupil A to pick up dog faeces from the garden as well. However, the panel accepted the account given by Pupil A at the time, and the fact that Miss Surr did not strongly disagree with Pupil A's account, that Pupil A did end up picking up dog faeces in their efforts to tidy up the garden.

For the reasons above, this allegation is proved.

4. On or around 25 September 2023, whilst in the Academy you paid Pupil A around ten pounds for undertaking some gardening and/or clearing up of dog faeces in the garden at your home.

Miss Surr admitted this allegation.

Miss Surr confirmed in her account at the time that she had needed to ask a colleague to change a twenty pound note for two ten pound notes, so that she could pay Pupil A. This was corroborated in the accounts that Pupil A and Pupil C gave to the School in October 2023.

For the reason above, this allegation is proved.

5. Your conduct at paragraph 3 and/or 4 indicate that you may have exposed Pupil A to a risk of harm.

Miss Surr admitted this allegation.

The panel found that there were two aspects to this allegation, whereby Pupil A may have been exposed to a risk of harm.

The first is that Pupil A tidied up Miss Surr's garden, at her vacated house, with no other adult present. The panel found that risks associated with gardening existed, in addition to the risks associated with handling dog faeces. It is not clear from the evidence whether Miss Surr had a plan in place to assist Pupil A in the event that a risk or injury materialised. Miss Surr's evidence is that she had already vacated the house and was tidying it up prior to returning the keys to her landlord. It is therefore likely that there were no other persons at the property at the time. Pupil A's [REDACTED] was interviewed by the Academy on 19 October 2023. In her account she recalled that it was raining heavily on the day Pupil A tidied Miss Surr's garden. She also explained to the Academy that Pupil A would spend money on [REDACTED]. The panel was provided with no evidence to indicate that Miss Surr had tried to safeguard Pupil A in respect of what she would spend the money on.

The second is in relation to Miss Surr's relationship with Person A. Miss Surr has consistently alleged that there would have been no interaction between Person A and Pupil A because nobody was at the house and Person A was not aware that Pupil A was there gardening. The panel found this rationale indicative of Miss Surr's lack of appreciation for the potential risk to Pupil A. Miss Surr was in a relationship with Person A at the time. He was a registered sex offender. Miss Surr had deliberately concealed that fact from the Academy. She had arranged for Pupil A to visit her home and tidy her garden with no adult supervision present. There was no evidence available to the panel to confirm what Person A's specific whereabouts were on the day in question, but the panel found that it was possible Person A could have visited the property. This would have put Pupil A at potential risk of harm.

For the reasons above, this allegation is proved.

6. Your conduct at paragraph 3 and/or 4 was inappropriate in that you knew or ought to have known that Pupil A was vulnerable.

Miss Surr admitted this allegation.

The panel had regard to Person C's written evidence. Person C stated that Pupil A was known amongst staff as having safeguarding vulnerabilities [REDACTED]. Witness C confirmed that Miss Surr would have been aware of Pupil A being deemed vulnerable but

would not necessarily have known the details of each specific safeguarding concern raised.

On balance, the panel concluded that Miss Surr was likely to be aware, or ought reasonably to have been aware, that Pupil A was a vulnerable student. With that in mind, the panel also found that it was inappropriate for Miss Surr to have allowed Pupil A to tidy her garden and/or pay her for those services.

For the reasons above, this allegation is proved.

7. Your conduct at paragraph 1 and/or 2 was:

a) Dishonest; and/or

b) Lacked integrity.

Miss Surr admitted this allegation.

The panel first considered Miss Surr's knowledge or belief as to the facts. Miss Surr discovered in July 2023 that her partner, Person A, was a registered sex offender. She chose not to disclose this to the Academy until the Academy received a third party complaint about it and Miss Surr was investigated. Even then, she failed to disclose the full extent of her knowledge of Person A's situation when she was initially asked about him by the Academy in January 2024. It was not until around June 2024 when Miss Surr admitted she had known that Person A was a registered sex offender for almost a year. The evidence indicates that Miss Surr disclosed this when prompted, during an investigation into her conduct, rather than the information being provided voluntarily by her of her own volition.

The panel then considered whether Miss Surr's actions were contrary to what would objectively be expected of an ordinary honest person. The panel concluded that they were. The panel had in mind that dishonesty is not the only explanation for such conduct and that there can be other explanations, such as mistake or carelessness. However, in this case, it was evident that Miss Surr was not mistaken. There may have been a time early on in her relationship with Person A when she considered that she did not need to disclose the situation to the Academy but the panel found that this no longer continued to be plausible once the Academy began investigating. By the investigation process that was undertaken in January 2024, Miss Surr's actions could no longer be considered mistaken or careless. The panel found that at that point Miss Surr's actions were dishonest or, at the very least, lacked integrity.

For the reasons above, this allegation is proved.

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 Miss Surr, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Miss Surr 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, and maintain high standards...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Miss Surr, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education (“KCSIE”).

The panel considered that Miss Surr was in breach of the following provisions:

Paragraph 31 - All staff should have awareness of issues that could put safeguarding of children at harm.

The panel was not satisfied that the conduct of Miss Surr, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Working Together to Safeguard Children.

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

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

The panel found that the offence of serious dishonesty was relevant.

The panel noted that in relation to allegation 3, specifically Pupil A tidying up Miss Surr's garden at her home, this took place away from Academy premises. However, the activity was initiated by Miss Surr approaching Pupil A and Miss Surr's opportunity to do so arose because of her relationship with her as a teacher at the Academy; therefore, inside the education setting. Further, Miss Surr subsequently exchanged money with Pupil A whilst on Academy premises, confirming the panel's view that the allegations took place in the education setting.

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

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Miss Surr was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Miss Surr'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 Miss Surr'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 Miss Surr was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that the offence of serious dishonesty was relevant.

The findings of misconduct are serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher.

The panel considered that Miss Surr's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher.

For these reasons, the panel found that Miss Surr'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 safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, the protection of other members of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession, declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

The panel found that Miss Surr had deliberately concealed the fact that her partner, Person A, was a registered sex offender and, separately, that she had inappropriately arranged for a student to visit her home and tidy her garden for payment.

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of Miss Surr having arranged for Pupil A to visit her vacated home unattended and carry out work in the garden. Pupil A had been considered a vulnerable child by the Academy [REDACTED], a fact which Miss Surr ought reasonably to have known. This was especially concerning given that Miss Surr's partner was a registered sex offender.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Miss Surr were 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 Miss Surr 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 Miss Surr in the profession. The panel was provided with limited evidence to demonstrate Miss Surr's abilities as an educator and/or her ability to make a valuable contribution to the profession.

Whilst there is some evidence that Miss Surr had ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Miss Surr in the profession, since her behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and she sought to exploit her position of trust.

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the behaviour, noting that the Advice states that the expectation of both the public and pupils, is that members of the teaching profession maintain a high 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 Miss Surr.

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

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- failure to act on evidence that indicated a child's welfare may have been at risk e.g. failed to notify the designated safeguarding lead and/or make a referral to children's social care, the police or other relevant agencies when abuse, neglect and/or harmful cultural practices were identified;
- failure in their duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk or failing to promote the safety and welfare of the children (as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE);
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions or purposeful destruction of evidence, especially where these behaviours have been repeated or had serious consequences, or involved the coercion of another person to act in a way contrary to their own interests;

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

There was evidence that Miss Surr's actions were deliberate. Miss Surr had admitted to choosing not to tell the Academy about Person A, as well as having actively arranged and paid for Pupil A to tidy the garden at her vacated house.

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

Miss Surr had been subject to disciplinary action in Autumn 2023 in relation to Pupil A gardening at her vacated house. Other than that, the panel was not provided with evidence to confirm whether Miss Surr did or did not have a previously good history, having demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both her personal and professional conduct and having contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel was therefore unable to make a finding as to whether this behaviour was out of character.

Miss Surr provided six character references. Whilst they all gave positive feedback about Miss Surr's character, none of them addressed the allegations specifically. The references describe Miss Surr as being supportive of others, compassionate and reliable. [REDACTED] ("Person D") also described Miss Surr in their written statement as being "instrumental" in implementing the School's IT and acceptable use policy. The panel accepted these statements as evidence of Miss Surr's character.

Miss Surr also provided a brief statement for consideration at these proceedings. In that statement she stated that she had accepted responsibility for her actions and understood the seriousness of the proceedings. In another document provided by Miss Surr to the TRA for these proceedings, entitled "statement of reflection", Miss Surr states:

"I fully accept that I made serious mistakes in failing to disclose my relationship to the school. I recognise now that I should have been completely honest and transparent from the outset... I deeply regret not doing so.

... I am ashamed of my actions and truly sorry that I did not act with the level of integrity that my role as a teacher demands. I understand that my choices fell below the professional standards expected of me.

I also acknowledge that asking a student to carry out garden work for me, and giving them money during school hours, reflected extremely poor judgement...

... I have taken full responsibility for my actions and have reflected deeply on the implications . I am truly sorry for anyone affected by my decisions and for any distress I may have caused...

...If faced with this situation again, I would act immediately, informing the school and seeking appropriate professional advice without hesitation."

Miss Surr's statement of reflection demonstrated, to some degree, Miss Surr's level of insight and remorse.

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

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings would be sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Miss Surr 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 Miss Surr. The length of time that Miss Surr chose to conceal the fact that she was in a relationship with a registered sex offender and her lack of appreciation for the potential risk of harm created by allowing Pupil A to tidy her garden without a supervising adult, whilst Miss Surr was in a relationship with a registered sex offender (a fact which she had at that point still been concealing) were significant factors in forming that opinion. Most notably, the degree of dishonesty Miss Surr had demonstrated was serious in the panel's view. 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.

One of these includes serious dishonesty.

The seriousness of the dishonesty involved, as explained above, was a key consideration for the panel in determining the length of any review period.

The panel recognised that Miss Surr had demonstrated some level of insight and remorse but it remained concerned that she had not confirmed whether she remained in the relationship with Person A. The panel also noted, as outlined above, that Miss Surr had remained adamant that there was no risk of Pupil A coming into contact with Person

A whilst she was gardening at Miss Surr's vacated house, unaccompanied. The panel was not provided with any evidence to support this assertion from Miss Surr and it was therefore unable to rule this possibility out. Similarly, Miss Surr's lack of appreciation for the possible risks were a competing factor to the mitigation she had offered. Based on the available evidence the panel could not, with any certainty, rule out the risk of repetition.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a review period of 3 years.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

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

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

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Miss Natalie Surr should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of three years.

In particular, the panel has found that Miss Surr 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, and maintain high standards...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Miss Surr involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE).

The panel finds that the conduct of Miss Surr fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of dishonesty, and the exposure to the potential for harm to Pupil A.

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 Miss Surr, 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 the serious findings of Miss Surr having arranged for Pupil A to visit her vacated home unattended and carry out work in the garden. Pupil A had been considered a vulnerable child by the Academy [REDACTED], a fact which Miss Surr ought reasonably to have known. This was especially concerning given that Miss Surr’s partner was a registered sex offender.”*

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, *“Miss Surr also provided a brief statement for consideration at these proceedings. In that statement she stated that she had accepted responsibility for her actions and understood the seriousness of the proceedings.”*

The panel has also commented that Miss Surr provided a further document entitled *“statement of reflection”*. The panel notes, *“Miss Surr’s statement of reflection demonstrated, to some degree, Miss Surr’s level of insight and remorse.”*

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, “...*that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Miss Surr were 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 and the potential for exposing Pupil A to a risk of harm, 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 Miss Surr herself. The panel comment “*Miss Surr had been subject to disciplinary action in Autumn 2023 in relation to Pupil A gardening at her vacated house. Other than that, the panel was not provided with evidence to confirm whether Miss Surr did or did not have a previously good history, having demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both her personal and professional conduct and having contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel was therefore unable to make a finding as to whether this behaviour was out of character.*”

The panel also record that it considered six character references in relation to Miss Surr. The panel state, “*Whilst they all gave positive feedback about Miss Surr’s character, none of them addressed the allegations specifically. The references describe Miss Surr as being supportive of others, compassionate and reliable. [REDACTED] (“Person D”) also described Miss Surr in their written statement as being “instrumental” in implementing the School’s IT and acceptable use policy. The panel accepted these statements as evidence of Miss Surr’s character.*”

A prohibition order would prevent Miss Surr from teaching. A prohibition order would also clearly deprive the public of her 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. The panel has said,

“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 Miss Surr. The length of time that Miss Surr chose to conceal the fact that she was in a relationship with a registered sex offender and her lack of appreciation for the potential risk of harm created by allowing Pupil A to tidy her garden without a supervising adult, whilst Miss Surr was in a relationship with a registered sex offender (a fact which she had at that point still been concealing) were significant factors in forming that opinion. Most notably, the degree of dishonesty Miss Surr had demonstrated was serious in the panel's view."

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that Miss Surr acted dishonestly, and created a potential risk of harm to Pupil A.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Miss Surr 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 three-year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments,

"The panel recognised that Miss Surr had demonstrated some level of insight and remorse but it remained concerned that she had not confirmed whether she remained in the relationship with Person A. The panel also noted, as outlined above, that Miss Surr had remained adamant that there was no risk of Pupil A coming into contact with Person A whilst she was gardening at Miss Surr's vacated house, unaccompanied. The panel was not provided with any evidence to support this assertion from Miss Surr and it was therefore unable to rule this possibility out. Similarly, Miss Surr's lack of appreciation for the possible risks were a competing factor to the mitigation she had offered. Based on the available evidence the panel could not, with any certainty, rule out the risk of repetition."

The panel has also identified that

"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."

One of these includes serious dishonesty.

The seriousness of the dishonesty involved, as explained above, was a key consideration for the panel in determining the length of any review period.”

I have considered whether a three-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 three-year review period is sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the dishonesty found, and the risk of harm Pupil A was exposed to.

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

This means that Miss Natalie Surr is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children’s home in England. She may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 10 July 2029, three years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If she does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Miss Surr remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Miss Surr has a right of appeal to the High Court within 28 days from the date she is given notice of this order.



Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield

Date: 7 July 2026

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