



Mr Sharif Youssef: Professional conduct panel 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
Witnesses	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: Mr Sharif Youssef

Teacher ref number: 1251250

Teacher date of birth: 11 October 1981

TRA reference: 23203

Date of determination: 9 July 2026

Former employer: Passmores Academy, Essex

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 6 to 9 July 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Sharif Youssef.

The panel members were Ms Aruna Sharma (teacher panellist – in the chair), Ms Elizabeth Kitcatt (teacher panellist) and Mr Duncan Tilley (lay panellist).

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

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr John Greany instructed by Kingsley Napley LLP solicitors.

Mr Youssef was present on day 1 of the hearing and was not represented. He did not attend the other days of the hearing.

The hearing took place 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 hearing dated 15 December 2025.

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

1. In or around May 2022, he submitted an application form to Herts and Essex School containing inaccurate information in relation to his employment history in that he omitted reference to his employment at Birchwood School between 1 August 2015 to 31 August 2016.
2. In or around November 2022:
 - a) when asked whether his CV was accurate and/or up to date he said it was, when he knew that was not correct;
 - b) he confirmed that he was not in employment and/or his last place of employment was Boswells School, when he knew that was not correct.
3. On or around 6 December 2022, he submitted an application form to Passmores Academy containing inaccurate information in relation to his employment history in that he omitted reference to his employment at Herts and Essex School between 1 September 2022 and 8 December 2022;
4. In or around October 2023, he provided a CV to Uniform Education which contained incorrect information about his employment history, namely:
 - a) his start date at Passmores Academy was 1 September 2023, when this was not the case;
 - b) his end date at Herts and Essex School was 31 November 2022, when this was not the case.
5. His conduct at paragraphs 1 and/or 2 and/or 3 and/or 4 was;
 - a) Dishonest;
 - b) Lacked integrity;
 - c) Misleading

Mr Youssef admitted allegations 1, 3 and 4. He admitted allegation 5(a) in respect of allegation 3 and allegations 5(b) and (c) in respect of allegations 1, 3 and 4.

Mr Youssef admitted that his conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and 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, list of key people – pages 8 to 10

Section 2: Notice of hearing and response – pages 11 to 31

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 32 to 53

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency exhibits – pages 54 to 310

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 311 to 386

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”).

Witnesses

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

Witness A – [REDACTED]

Witness B – [REDACTED]

Witness C – [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 Youssef worked as a teacher in a number of schools between 2015 and 2023. The TRA investigation related to the information he had provided in respect of applications he had made for teaching jobs in 2022 and 2023, and specifically the extent to which he had disclosed which schools he had previously worked for and when.

Mr Youssef worked at the following schools:

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| ▪ Helena Romanes School | 2013 – 15 |
| ▪ Birchwood School | 2015 – 16 |
| ▪ Multinational School (outside of UK) | 2016 – 19 |
| ▪ St Margaret’s School | 2020 |

- | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| ▪ Boswells School | 2020 – 22 |
| ▪ Herts and Essex School | September - December 2022 |
| ▪ Passmores Academy | January 2023 - January 2024 |

There are four occasions whereby Mr Youssef is said to have provided incorrect information about his previous employment:

- May 2022 – when completing an application form for a teaching role at Herts and Essex School. This came to light in September 2022.
- November 2022 – when discussing a potential application to Passmores Academy with Witness C, who worked for a teacher supply agency.
- December 2022 – when making an application to Passmores Academy. This came to light in September 2023 and was the subject of an investigation by Passmores Academy.
- October 2023 – when providing detail to another teacher supply agency.

The matter was referred to the TRA by Passmores Academy on 13 February 2024.

Findings of fact

The panel's findings of fact are as follows:

The panel reminded itself that the burden of proof in respect of each allegation was on the TRA and that in order to discharge that burden the panel needed to be satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the events in the allegation happened.

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

- 1. In or around May 2022, you submitted an application form to Herts and Essex School containing inaccurate information in relation to your employment history in that you omitted reference to your employment at Birchwood School between 1 August 2015 to 31 August 2016.**

The allegation was admitted by Mr Youssef at the beginning of the hearing.

The panel reviewed the admission alongside the evidence before it, including the TES application form which was submitted to Herts and Essex School in May 2022, and the evidence from Witness B in respect of the recruitment process undertaken by the school. The panel considered the admission to be consistent with that evidence, given that the form made no reference to Mr Youssef's previous employment at Birchwood School between 2015 and 2016.

The panel also noted the following parts of Witness B's evidence:

- Birchwood School was very near to Herts and Essex School;

- Teaching staff from the two schools were well known to each other;
- Mr Youssef's period of employment at Birchwood School in 2015-16 would have been memorable for him given that it ended with him being placed on gardening leave;
- Mr Youssef would have needed to specifically amend his TES form to remove the reference to Birchwood School.

Having considered the admitted facts and the supporting evidence, the panel finds allegation 1 proved.

2. In or around November 2022:

b) you confirmed that you were not in employment and/or your last place of employment was Boswells School, when you knew that was not correct.

Although this allegation wasn't clearly particularised in that there was no reference to who the confirmation was made to, the panel considered that this allegation related to the conversation between Mr Youssef and Witness C in November 2022, in respect of the potential teaching role at Passmores Academy.

The panel heard oral evidence from Witness C and also had regard to his two witness statements. The panel considered that the key aspects of his evidence for this allegation were as follows:

- He had a telephone conversation with Mr Youssef in November 2022 regarding a potential teaching role at Passmores Academy;
- They discussed Mr Youssef's teaching history;
- Mr Youssef said that he had been due to start a teaching role in September 2022 but that this had not gone ahead;
- Mr Youssef had indicated that he was not in employment at the time of the call;
- Mr Youssef stated that his last employment was at Boswells School and this ended on 31 August 2022.

The panel noted that Mr Youssef had previously (earlier in the TRA proceedings) indicated that he had disclosed his employment at Herts and Essex School to Witness C in November 2022 and that Witness C had told him that it was not necessary to include this information in any application.

The panel noted that there was a factual dispute on this point between Mr Youssef and Witness C. In effect, Mr Youssef's position was that he informed Witness C of his employment situation, whereas Witness C states that this did not occur.

The panel preferred the evidence of Witness C on this point. The panel found that his evidence was cogent and credible, and that he was clear on what he had said to Mr Youssef and why. The panel acknowledged that it had not heard direct evidence from Mr Youssef on this point but noted that his letter to the panel dated 7 July 2026 stated:

'With regard to the conversation with the recruitment consultant, I do not recall the

details of what was said. However, I do not dispute that the conversation took place.'

Given the difference in the respective abilities of Witness C and Mr Youssef to recollect what was said in November 2022, and the assessment the panel had reached in respect of Witness C's evidence, the panel finds allegation 2(b) proved.

3. On or around 6 December 2022, you submitted an application form to Passmores Academy containing inaccurate information in relation to your employment history in that you omitted reference to your employment at Herts and Essex School between 1 September 2022 and 8 December 2022;

The allegation was admitted by Mr Youssef at the beginning of the hearing.

The panel reviewed the admission alongside the evidence before it, including the application which was sent to Passmores Academy on 6 December 2022. The panel considered the admission to be consistent with that evidence, given that the form did not contain any reference to the period of employment at Herts and Essex School.

Having considered the admitted facts and the supporting evidence, the panel finds allegation 3 proved.

4. In or around October 2023, you provided a CV to Uniform Education which contained incorrect information about your employment history, namely:

- a) your start date at Passmores Academy was 1 September 2023, when this was not the case;**
- b) your end date at Herts and Essex School was 31 November 2022, when this was not the case.**

Both limbs of the allegation were admitted by Mr Youssef at the beginning of the hearing.

The panel reviewed the admission alongside the evidence before it, including the CV from October 2023. The panel considered the admission to be consistent with that evidence, given that the dates provided in the CV about the dates of employment at Passmores Academy and Herts and Essex School were incorrect. The panel noted that the correct start date for the Passmores Academy employment was 6 January 2023 and that the correct end date for Herts and Essex School was 8 December 2022.

Having considered the admitted facts and the supporting evidence, the panel finds allegations 4(a) and 4(b) proved.

5. Your conduct at paragraphs 1 and/or 2 and/or 3 and/or 4 was;

- a) Dishonest;**
- b) Lacked integrity;**
- c) Misleading**

Mr Youssef admitted allegation 5(a) in respect of allegation 3, and allegations 5(b) and (c) in respect of allegations 1, 3 and 4.

The panel noted that allegation 5 contained three different descriptors of Mr Youssef's behaviour, and that these ranged in seriousness from misleading, to lack of integrity, to dishonesty.

The panel noted that in professional codes of conduct, the term 'integrity' is a useful shorthand to express the higher standards which society expects from professional persons and which the professions expect from their own members. Integrity connotes adherence to the ethical standards of that profession. It is therefore linked to the manner in which that particular profession professes to serve the public. This is consistent with the ordinary meaning of the word, namely adherence to moral and ethical principles. As regards the extent of this duty, it applies not only to what professional persons say, but also to what they do.

The panel also reminded itself of the test for dishonesty as set out in the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos* [2017] UKSC 67.

'When dishonesty is in question the fact-finding tribunal must first ascertain (subjectively) the actual state of the individual's knowledge or belief as to the facts. The reasonableness or otherwise of the belief is a matter of evidence (often in practice determinative) going to whether he held the belief, but it is not an additional requirement that his belief must be reasonable; the question is whether it is genuinely held. When once his actual state of mind as to knowledge or belief as to facts is established, the question whether his conduct was honest or dishonest is to be determined by the fact-finder by applying the (objective) standards of ordinary decent people. There is no requirement that the defendant must appreciate that what he has done is, by those standards, dishonest.'

In considering each of allegations 1-4 in respect of allegation 5, the panel decided to start with whether it was misleading before assessing integrity and then dishonesty.

With allegation 1, the panel considered that the information submitted to Herts and Essex School in May 2022 was clearly misleading given that it did not contain the correct information about his employment at Birchwood School in 2015-16.

As for lack of integrity, the panel considered that the omission concerned a teaching post which should plainly have been disclosed as part of a complete employment history. The panel considered that a teacher applying for a role in a school is expected to provide full and accurate information so that appropriate recruitment and safeguarding checks can be undertaken. By omitting the Birchwood School employment, Mr Youssef fell short of those ethical standards.

In terms of dishonesty, the panel was satisfied that Mr Youssef knew he had worked at Birchwood School and knew that the application form required him to give an accurate account of his previous employment. The panel noted that the omission required Mr Youssef to have altered the leaving date for one school (Helena Romanes) and omitted the name of another (Birchwood). The panel considered that the omission was capable of improving his prospects of obtaining the role at Herts and Essex School, given the geographical proximity between Birchwood School and Herts and Essex School and the evidence that teaching staff at those schools were well known to each other. The panel inferred that this was the reason for the omission. Applying the objective standards of ordinary decent people, the panel considered that deliberately omitting that employment from an application for a teaching post was dishonest.

The panel considered in detail Mr Youssef's suggestion that the inaccuracy had occurred by 'mistake' and that it was not deliberate or dishonest. It also considered the other CVs and

school applications provided by Mr Youssef from the same time which included his time at Birchwood School. However, the panel considered that this did not change its assessment.

Accordingly, in respect of allegation 1, the panel found allegations 5(a), (b) and (c) proved.

With allegation 2(b), the panel considered the information Mr Youssef provided during the November 2022 conversation with Witness C, namely that he was not in employment and/or that his last place of employment was Boswells School.

The panel considered that this was misleading because Mr Youssef was at that time employed by Herts and Essex School, and Boswells School was not his most recent employment. The information therefore gave an inaccurate impression of his current and recent employment position.

As for lack of integrity, the panel considered that Mr Youssef was discussing a potential teaching role and knew, or ought to have known, the importance of giving accurate information about his employment history. The panel considered that giving an inaccurate account of his current and most recent employment was inconsistent with the standards of honesty and transparency expected of a teacher.

In terms of dishonesty, the panel was satisfied that Mr Youssef knew he was employed by Herts and Essex School at the time and knew that Boswells School was not his last place of employment. The panel also considered that the inaccurate information was capable of presenting him more favourably as a candidate for teaching work, and inferred that this was the reason it was provided. Applying the objective standards of ordinary decent people, the panel considered that stating otherwise in the context of discussions about a potential teaching role was dishonest.

Accordingly, in respect of allegation 2(b), the panel found allegations 5(a), (b) and (c) proved.

With allegation 3, the panel considered the application form submitted to Passmores Academy on 6 December 2022, which omitted Mr Youssef's employment at Herts and Essex School between 1 September 2022 and 8 December 2022.

The panel considered that the omission was misleading because it concealed a recent and directly relevant period of employment from a school to which Mr Youssef was applying for a teaching role. The application therefore did not present a full or accurate employment history.

As for lack of integrity, the panel considered that the omission related to very recent teaching employment and deprived Passmores Academy of information relevant to its recruitment and safeguarding checks. The panel considered that this fell significantly below the standards of candour and professional responsibility expected of a teacher.

In terms of dishonesty, the panel was satisfied that Mr Youssef knew he had worked at Herts and Essex School and knew that this employment was required to be disclosed. It also noted that the employment was recent and directly relevant to the application. The panel further considered that the omission was capable of supporting his application for employment at Passmores Academy, and inferred that this was the reason for the omission. Applying the objective standards of ordinary decent people, the panel considered that deliberately omitting it from the application was dishonest.

Accordingly, in respect of allegation 3, the panel found allegations 5(a), (b) and (c) proved.

With allegation 4, the panel considered the CV provided to Uniform Education in or around October 2023, which gave incorrect dates for Mr Youssef's employment at Passmores Academy and Herts and Essex School.

The panel considered that the CV was misleading because it gave inaccurate dates for two periods of recent teaching employment. Those dates were capable of affecting the picture presented to an agency or prospective school about Mr Youssef's employment history and continuity of employment.

As for lack of integrity, the panel considered that Mr Youssef had a responsibility to check that the CV he provided to an agency for teaching work was accurate. The panel considered that providing inaccurate information about recent teaching employment, without taking sufficient care to ensure accuracy, fell below the standards of integrity expected of a teacher.

Accordingly, in respect of allegation 4, the panel found allegations 5(b) and 5(c) proved.

The panel found the following particulars of the allegations against you not proved, for these reasons:

2. In or around November 2022:

- a) when asked whether your CV was accurate and/or up to date you said it was, when you knew that was not correct;**

The panel noted that whilst it had before it a copy of the CV updated by Witness C in November 2022, it did not have any evidence before it which indicated that Mr Youssef had been sent the CV in question or had it to hand when Witness C and Mr Youssef had the conversation in November 2022. It was therefore unable to assess the extent to which Mr Youssef would have known what was in the CV when the discussion was held.

In light of this, the panel was unable to find this allegation proved on the balance of probabilities.

5. Your conduct at paragraph 4 was;

- a) Dishonest;**

The panel was unable to infer dishonesty in respect of allegation 4. Although the dates in the CV were inaccurate and misleading, the panel did not consider that the evidence was sufficient to establish, on the balance of probabilities, that Mr Youssef knowingly provided those incorrect dates or that ordinary decent people would regard his conduct in respect of allegation 4 as dishonest, given that there was no obvious benefit to him of doing so.

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

Having found a number of the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In doing so, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: The prohibition of

teachers, which is referred to as “the Advice”.

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

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Youssef 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;

having regard for the need to safeguard pupils’ well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions

The panel also noted that the preamble to the Advice states:

“Teachers make the education of their pupils their first concern, and are accountable for achieving the highest possible standards in work and conduct. Teachers act with honesty and integrity...”

The panel considered that this was relevant given that the panel’s findings included multiple examples of dishonesty and lack of integrity.

The panel also considered whether Mr Youssef’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 noted that the behaviour of serious dishonesty was relevant in relation to this matter.

The panel considered that Mr Youssef’s conduct occurred in an educational context, as it related to applications for teaching roles in furtherance of his teaching career. The panel considered that the conduct involved repeated and deliberate failures to provide accurate information in recruitment processes, which had the potential to undermine the checks designed to safeguard pupils and maintain confidence in teacher recruitment. In relation to allegations 1 to 3, the panel considered this to be serious dishonesty. Although the panel’s findings in relation to allegation 4 did not include dishonesty, they did include a lack of integrity, because Mr Youssef had not taken sufficient care to ensure the accuracy of information provided for the purpose of obtaining teaching work. The panel considered this to be serious in light of the overall background to Mr Youssef’s behaviour and noted that he continued with his dishonest conduct notwithstanding the fact that he was under investigation for similar alleged misconduct at his previous school.

The panel noted that there was some evidence (both in respect of Mr Youssef’s [REDACTED] and his personal situation) before it and that Mr Youssef had contended that this was relevant background information in terms of his actions. The panel noted this information but concluded that it did not excuse or explain Mr Youssef’s serious shortcomings.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that Mr Youssef’s conduct amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession. The seriousness arose because the conduct related to recruitment into teaching

roles, where schools and agencies were entitled to rely on the accuracy of the information provided. The omissions and inaccuracies concerned recent and relevant employment history, occurred on more than one occasion, and were capable of undermining recruitment checks designed to protect pupils and maintain confidence in those appointed to teaching posts.

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

In relation to whether Mr Youssef'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 Youssef'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 Youssef was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found that serious dishonesty was relevant.

The panel considered that the findings were serious and that the conduct would be likely to have a negative impact on Mr Youssef's status as a teacher.

The panel considered that Mr Youssef's conduct could damage the public's perception of the teaching profession.

Members of the public would expect teachers to be truthful and comprehensive when applying for teaching posts, particularly where the information provided enables schools and agencies to undertake appropriate employment and safeguarding checks.

Repeatedly providing inaccurate or incomplete employment information in that context would be likely to undermine public confidence in the profession and in the integrity of the recruitment process for teachers.

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

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, it was necessary for the panel to consider whether to recommend that the Secretary of State impose a prohibition order.

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be made, the panel had to assess whether it would be an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it would be in the public interest to do so. The panel noted that 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 maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

The panel noted that its findings against Mr Youssef involved repeated and calculated dishonesty in pursuit of personal gain and a lack of integrity in terms of ensuring the accuracy of his job applications.

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given that Mr Youssef's actions had the potential to undermine the recruitment checks undertaken by schools and agencies before appointing teachers.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Youssef were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

The panel was also satisfied that there was a strong public interest in declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct. Mr Youssef's conduct fell outside what could reasonably be tolerated from a teacher.

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 Youssef in the profession.

Whilst there was evidence before the panel that Mr Youssef had some ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations identified above outweighed any interest in retaining him in the profession. His conduct involved repeated dishonesty in connection with applications for teaching work and was fundamentally inconsistent with the standards expected of a teacher.

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.

Having identified those public interest considerations, the panel considered whether recommending a prohibition order would be proportionate, including the likely effect of prohibition on Mr Youssef. The panel recognised that a prohibition order is not intended to be punitive, although it may have that effect. However, it considered that the seriousness, repetition and dishonesty of the conduct meant that a lesser outcome would not adequately protect the public interest.

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...;
 - dishonesty or a lack of integrity...

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 in turn. The panel noted that mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

The panel considered that Mr Youssef's actions were deliberate.

The panel noted that although Mr Youssef was experiencing [REDACTED], there was no evidence to suggest that he was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation.

The panel noted the evidence advanced by Mr Youssef in respect of his teaching career, including the following:

- A letter from Helena Romanes School commending him on his positive relationship with students;
- 45 'thank you' cards from various students at Boswells School;
- A 'Staff of the Month' Certificate from Boswells School;
- A dedication from a former student at the beginning of a book.

In the panel's view the most that could be drawn from this evidence was that Mr Youssef had been a teacher who was personable, engaging, and liked by students, during relatively short periods of employment at different schools. The panel noted that no references were provided by colleagues that could attest to his abilities as a teacher. The panel considered that this evidence, whilst positive, did not demonstrate exceptionally high standards in Mr Youssef's personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel noted that Mr Youssef had attended the first day of the hearing, and in doing so had admitted some of the allegations against him and provided an opening statement. However, given that Mr Youssef had elected not to attend the remainder of the hearing, the panel had not heard sworn evidence from him on the allegations, his reflections on them and his actions since. This meant that there was limited opportunity for the panel to fully assess his remorse and insight. Notwithstanding this, the panel considered the written information provided by Mr Youssef before and during the hearing and acknowledged that he had displayed some contrition and remorse for his actions.

The panel further noted that Mr Youssef was not fully prepared for the hearing on the day that he had attended, given that he had not downloaded the hearing bundle, and his engagement with the hearing process from that point onwards had been partial and inconsistent. Whilst recognising that this may have been caused in part by his unfamiliarity with the process and his lack of legal representation, the panel considered that this also suggested a lack of appreciation by Mr Youssef as to the seriousness of his actions and the proceedings against him.

In light of all of the information about Mr Youssef, the panel concluded that his insight into what he had done, why he had done it and the steps required to avoid repetition was limited. The panel noted that the proven allegations demonstrated repeated dishonest behaviour and considered that this may indicate an attitudinal failing on his part.

The panel further noted that the behaviour involved repeated acts of dishonesty over a period of more than half a year. Accordingly, the panel did not accept that the incidents were

out of character.

The panel first considered whether it would be proportionate to conclude the case without recommending prohibition, on the basis that publication of the panel's findings would be sufficient. It concluded that this would not be an adequate or proportionate response. Given the seriousness and repetition of the dishonesty, and its connection with recruitment into teaching roles, publication alone would not sufficiently maintain public confidence in the profession or uphold proper standards of conduct.

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 Youssef of prohibition.

The panel was therefore satisfied that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. It considered that the public interest in safeguarding pupils, maintaining confidence in the profession and upholding proper standards of conduct outweighed Mr Youssef's interests. The repeated dishonesty, in the context of applications for teaching work and for personal gain, was a significant factor in that assessment. Accordingly, the panel recommended 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 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 set aside after a specified period of time that may not be less than two 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:

- fraud or serious dishonesty

The panel considered that there were some mitigating circumstances, including Mr Youssef's [REDACTED] and the evidence that he had shown some contrition and remorse. However, it gave those factors limited weight. The misconduct involved repeated dishonesty over a sustained period in applications for teaching work, and there was limited evidence that Mr Youssef had developed full insight into the seriousness of his conduct, the reasons for it, or the steps he would take to avoid repetition. The panel considered that this indicated some ongoing risk of repetition. Balancing those matters against the fact that none of the factors indicating that no review period should be allowed were present, the panel concluded that a review period was appropriate. In the panel's view, three years would provide sufficient time for Mr Youssef to reflect on his conduct, develop and evidence meaningful insight, and demonstrate that the risk of repetition had been addressed.

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 three 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 some of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel has found some of the allegations not proven, and I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Youssef 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
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions

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

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding of dishonesty on the part of Mr Youssef, which the panel found “...involved repeated and calculated dishonesty in pursuit of personal gain and a lack of integrity in terms of ensuring the accuracy of his job applications.”

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 Youssef, 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 Youssef’s actions had the potential to undermine the recruitment checks undertaken by schools and agencies before appointing teachers.*” 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, *"...there was limited opportunity for the panel to fully assess his remorse and insight. Notwithstanding this, the panel considered the written information provided by Mr Youssef before and during the hearing and acknowledged that he had displayed some contrition and remorse for his actions."*

The panel has also commented that Mr Youssef's actions *"...suggested a lack of appreciation by Mr Youssef as to the seriousness of his actions and the proceedings against him."*

In my judgement, the lack of full insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour, and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, *"...that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Youssef 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 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 Youssef himself. The panel noted that Mr Youssef has some abilities as an educator. The panel considered the evidence supplied by Mr Youssef in respect of his teaching career, on which the panel comment,

"In the panel's view the most that could be drawn from this evidence was that Mr Youssef had been a teacher who was personable, engaging, and liked by students, during relatively short periods of employment at different schools. The panel noted that no references were provided by colleagues that could attest to his abilities as a teacher. The panel considered that this evidence, whilst positive, did not demonstrate exceptionally high standards in Mr Youssef's personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector."

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Youssef 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, *"In light of all of the information about Mr Youssef, the panel concluded that his insight into what he had done, why he had done it and the steps required to avoid repetition was limited. The panel noted that the proven allegations demonstrated repeated dishonest behaviour and considered that this may indicate an attitudinal failing on his part."*

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that the conduct of Mr Youssef involved repeated acts of dishonesty over a period of more than half a year, and the panel's finding that it "...*did not accept that the incidents were out of character.*"

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Youssef 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 considered that there were some mitigating circumstances, including Mr Youssef's [REDACTED] and the evidence that he had shown some contrition and remorse. However, it gave those factors limited weight. The misconduct involved repeated dishonesty over a sustained period in applications for teaching work, and there was limited evidence that Mr Youssef had developed full insight into the seriousness of his conduct, the reasons for it, or the steps he would take to avoid repetition. The panel considered that this indicated some ongoing risk of repetition.*"

The panel has also identified that the Advice indicates that cases in involving fraud or serious dishonesty, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate.

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 lack of full insight and remorse.

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

This means that Mr Sharif Youssef 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 17 July 2029, 3 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 Youssef remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

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



Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield

Date: 14 July 2026

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