



Mr Thomas Wilson: Professional conduct panel hearing outcome

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

July 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	6
Documents	6
Witnesses	6
Decision and reasons	7
Findings of fact	8
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	26
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	31

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

Teacher: Mr Thomas Wilson

Teacher ref number: 0857813

Teacher date of birth: 15 June 1988

TRA reference: 23380

Date of determination: 17 July 2026

Former employer: St Thomas More RC College, Manchester

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ('the panel') of the Teaching Regulation Agency ('the TRA') convened from 13 to 17 July by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Thomas Wilson.

The panel members were Mrs Bernie Whittle (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Sarah Gardiner (lay panellist) and Ms Claire Lane (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Alexander Elliott of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Ella Crine of counsel, instructed by Kingsley Napley LLP solicitors.

Mr Wilson was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of hearing dated 17 April 2026.

It was alleged that:

Mr Wilson was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst working as a teacher at St Paul's Catholic High School:

1. In September 2017, he exchanged messages with a former student, Student H, over Facebook Messenger, and/or sent overly-familiar messages to Student H.
2. On various dates between February 2022 and April 2022, in respect of Colleague C, he:
 - a. Sent:
 - i. "And you never know, maybe in the future there will be oppo! (sic)";
 - ii. "You are a beautiful woman and a great mummy.";
 - iii. "I am obviously very attracted to you but also respect you a lot as a person and a professional";
 - iv. "I may need your help at some point with wine as well. Xxx";
 - v. "Don't know how to amuse myself, any ideas!? Xx";
 - vi. "Or you could entertain me!!? Sorry couldn't help myself!!";
 - vii. "You looked very pretty today even if you didn't want to sit with me. Xxx"
 - viii. a kiss emoji;
 - ix. "Let me know if you want to meet for lunch or a drink. X"
 - x. "You looked very pretty today by the way. X";
 - xi. "Still look great! Xx"
 - xii. a photograph(s) of your naked and/or semi naked body;
 - b. sat and/or stood in her personal space;
 - c. entered the room where Colleague C was working and watched, without a reason to do so;

- d. touched and/or brushed his leg(s) against Colleague C
3. In or around the Summer of 2022, he provided Student A, a former pupil at St Paul's Catholic High School, with his personal mobile number.
4. Between around September 2022 and April 2023, he exchanged messages of an over-familiar and/or unprofessional nature with Student A, or someone he thought to be Student A, in that, he sent:
 - a. "a really great morning fuck!!"
 - b. message(s) inviting Student A to his house and/or to meet up;
 - c. message(s) asking Student A to wear a "maid's outfit"

It was alleged that Mr Wilson was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst working as a teacher at St Thomas More RC College:

5. Between around April 2023 and 30 October 2023, he exchanged messages of an over-familiar and/or unprofessional nature with Student A, or someone he thought to be Student A in that, he sent a photo of his naked torso to Student A.
6. His conduct at paragraph 1 and/or 2 and/or 3 and/or 4 and/or 5 was:
 - a. Sexual; and/or
 - b. Sexually motivated.
7. Between or around December 2024 to June 2025, in relation to Student I, a former pupil at St Paul's Catholic High School, he exchanged messages and/or viewed and/or liked their Instagram stories and/or photograph(s)

The panel noted that, in Mr Wilson's response to the Notice of Referral sent to the TRA on 8 December 2025, he admitted the facts of all allegations and admitted that they amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel also noted that Mr Wilson had previously submitted written representations to Kingsley Napley LLP on 7 October 2025 in which he:

- admitted the facts of allegation 1;
- did not make a specific admission in response to allegation 2, although he admitted that his contact with Colleague C was unprofessional;
- did not admit the facts of allegation 3;

- admitted the facts allegation 4(a) but denied the facts of allegations 4(b) and 4(c);
- admitted the facts of allegation 5;
- denied allegation 6; and
- admitted the facts of allegation 7.

Within his written representations, Mr Wilson did not admit that his actions amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel proceeded on the basis that the hearing was fully contested.

[REDACTED]

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 and anonymised pupil list – pages 5 to 8

Section 2: Notice of Hearing and response – pages 9 to 18

Section 3: TRA witness statements – pages 19 to 49

Section 4: TRA exhibits – pages 50 to 464

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 465 to 469

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

- Supplemental statement of Colleague C – pages 470 to 471
- Exhibit 41 – pages 472 to 478

The panel members confirmed that they had read all the documents within the bundle, and the additional documents that the panel decided to admit, 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 May 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]

Colleague C

Student A

Student I

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 Wilson commenced employment as a religious education teacher at St Paul's Catholic High School ('St Paul's') on 1 September 2016.

Concerns were raised on or around 9 September 2017 in relation to Mr Wilson's alleged conduct towards Student H, a former pupil of St Paul's. These concerns were addressed informally by St Paul's on or around 12 September 2017.

In May 2022, Colleague C reported concerns regarding alleged unwanted attention from Mr Wilson to St Paul's HR department. On 5 May 2022, Colleague C met with [REDACTED], and Witness B, and disclosed several messages that she alleged she had received from Mr Wilson.

Mr Wilson's employment at St Paul's terminated on 16 April 2023. On 17 April 2023, he commenced employment as assistant curriculum leader for religious education at St Thomas More RC College ('Thomas More').

On or around 7 November 2023, a parent of a former pupil at St Paul's reported that Mr Wilson had engaged in inappropriate contact with another former pupil, Student A.

Mr Wilson was arrested on or around 14 November 2023 in relation to his alleged conduct towards Student A.

Mr Wilson was suspended from work on or around 20 November 2023 and Witness A carried out an investigation on behalf of Thomas More.

Mr Wilson's employment at Thomas More terminated on or around 8 March 2024.

The matter was referred to the TRA on 12 March 2024.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

- 1. In September 2017, you exchanged messages with a former student, Student H, over Facebook Messenger, and/or sent overly-familiar messages to Student H.**

The panel noted that Mr Wilson admitted this allegation, as set out in his written representations to Kingsley Napley LLP on 7 October 2025 and his response to the Notice of Referral sent to the TRA on 8 December 2025. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the evidence available to it.

The panel had sight of screenshots of undated text messages to and from “Tom Wilson”. Witness B also produced a transcript of messages between Mr Wilson and Student H dated 9 September 2017 to 11 September 2017, which appeared consistent with the screenshots.

On the balance of probabilities, taking into account the screenshots and Mr Wilson’s admissions, the panel accepted that the transcript was an accurate record of messages exchanged over a social networking platform between Mr Wilson and Student H.

In considering whether the messages were overly-familiar, the panel noted that Mr Wilson appeared to have initiated the conversation by asking “*Hey, how was your summer? What are you doing now? Xx*”, and proceeded to ask Student H several questions regarding where Student H went to college, where she moved to and what days she was attending college that week. The panel noted, in particular, Mr Wilson’s message asking “*Have you got the house to yourself tonight? Xxx*”.

The panel also noted that Mr Wilson’s messages to Student H were followed by uses of the letter “x”, which the panel understood to symbolise “kisses”.

Taking into account the content of the messages, and the fact that they were sent over social media rather than Mr Wilson’s school email account, the panel was satisfied that they were significantly more familiar than the contact which would be expected between a teacher and a former student.

Accordingly, having considered the admitted facts and the supporting evidence, the panel was satisfied that it had been demonstrated that in September 2017, Mr Wilson exchanged messages with a Student H, a former student, over Facebook Messenger, and sent overly-familiar messages to Student H. The panel found allegation 1 proved.

- 2. On various dates between February 2022 and April 2022, in respect of Colleague C, you:**

a. Sent:

- i. **“And you never know, maybe in the future there will be oppo! (sic)”;**
- ii. **“You are a beautiful woman and a great mummy.”;**
- iii. **“I am obviously very attracted to you but also respect you a lot as a person and a professional”;**
- iv. **“I may need your help at some point with wine as well. Xxx”;**
- v. **“Don’t know how to amuse myself, any ideas!? Xx”;**
- vi. **“Or you could entertain me!!? Sorry couldn’t help myself!!”;**
- vii. **“You looked very pretty today even if you didn’t want to sit with me. Xxx”**
- viii. **a kiss emoji;**
- ix. **“Let me know if you want to meet for lunch or a drink. X”**
- x. **“You looked very pretty today by the way. X”;**
- xi. **“Still look great! Xx”**
- xii. **a photograph(s) of your naked and/or semi naked body;**

The panel noted that Mr Wilson admitted this allegation within his response to the Notice of Referral. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the evidence available to it.

The panel considered the written and oral evidence of Witness B together with a transcript of text messages between Mr Wilson and Colleague C dated 30 March 2022 to 3 May 2022. In her oral evidence, Witness B stated that this was a transcript of WhatsApp messages that Colleague C had disclosed to her and that she had not had sight of any other messages.

The panel also considered the written and oral evidence of Colleague C. Colleague C exhibited a screenshot appearing to show WhatsApp messages from Mr Wilson to her dated 20 April 2022 to 3 May 2022, which were consistent with the transcript. Within the additional documents were further screenshots of WhatsApp messages between Colleague C and Mr Wilson which, in oral evidence, Colleague C stated were dated 13 to 19 March 2022. Among these messages were two images appearing to show Mr Wilson

and Colleague C respectively, which the panel considered to be sexually suggestive in nature.

In her oral evidence, Colleague C stated that the transcript accurately depicted WhatsApp messages between her and Mr Wilson. She accepted that several messages from her during that period had not been included.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel was satisfied that the messages set out within the transcript accurately reflected messages between Colleague C and Mr Wilson. It noted that it had not had sight of a full record of all messages, including several sent by Colleague C to Mr Wilson during the relevant period.

Within the transcript:

- In reply to a message from Colleague C stating that she just wanted a friendship, Mr Wilson stated on 2 April 2022 “...*And you never know, maybe in the future there will be oppo! ... You are a beautiful woman and a great mummy. I am obviously very attracted to you but also respect you a lot as a person and as a professional ... If you ever need anything just let me know and I’m here for you. I may need your help at some point with wine as well. Xxx*”;
- On or around 5 April 2022, in reply to a message from Colleague C, Mr Wilson stated “*Oh evening sorted for you then! I haveno TV yet either. Don’t know how to amuse myself, any ideas!? Xx*”. Colleague C replied “*Read a book !! (kiss emoji)*” and Mr Wilson further replied “*Or you could entertain me!!? Sorry couldn’t help myself!!*”;
- On or around 17 April 2024, Mr Wilson sent a message which read “*You looked very pretty today even if you didn’t want to sit with me. Xxx*”, followed by a kiss emoji;
- On 20 April 2022, Mr Wilson sent a message which read “*Hey, I’m going to be in Wilmslow tomorrow because there is a Benjamin moore shop there. Let me know if you want to meet for lunch or a drink. X*”;
- On 25 April 2022, Mr Wilson sent a message which read “*How was your day? You looked very pretty today by the way. X*”;
- On 3 May 2022, Mr Wilson sent a message which read “*Good to see you. Still look great! Xx*”.

The panel also had sight of a file appearing to contain 19 images of Mr Wilson. Colleague C stated in written and oral evidence that these were images sent to her by Mr Wilson over WhatsApp. Of those images, 18 appear to show Mr Wilson’s naked torso, of which 10 appear to also appear to partially show Mr Wilson’s pubic region.

In oral evidence, Colleague C stated that the images were sent in March and April 2022, although she subsequently informed the panel that no such images were sent to her following her WhatsApp message of 2 April 2022.

The panel considered Mr Wilson's written representations that Colleague C was the first to initiate contact, that she was the first to send sexually graphic messages and photographs of herself, and that he was unaware that Colleague C did not want any communication from him.

The panel noted that it did not appear to have had sight of the complete exchange of WhatsApp messages between Mr Wilson and Colleague C. It also noted Colleague C's written and oral evidence together with the messages set out within the additional documents. In view of this, the panel found that Colleague C had, on several occasions in March and/or April 2022, reciprocated Mr Wilson's messages and images.

Nevertheless, the panel was satisfied that the messages and images described above were sent by Mr Wilson to Colleague C. Accordingly, the panel found allegations 2(a)(i), 2(a)(ii), 2(a)(iii), 2(a)(iv), 2(a)(v), 2(a)(vi), 2(a)(vii), 2(a)(viii), 2(a)(ix), 2(a)(x) and 2(a)(xii) proved.

The panel noted that the message referred to in allegation 2(a)(xi) appeared to be dated 3 May 2022. In the absence of any evidence that this message was sent between February 2022 and April 2022, the panel found allegation 2(a)(xi) not proved.

b. sat and/or stood in her personal space;

The panel noted that Mr Wilson admitted this allegation within his response to the Notice of Referral. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the evidence available to it.

The panel considered the written and oral evidence of Colleague C. She described an incident in which Mr Wilson entered St Paul's SEN hub during lunchtime, whilst she was with pupils and sat directly behind her. Colleague C stated that there were six other empty seats in the room at the time, and that she felt she did not have room to move or leave because Mr Wilson was blocking her in.

The panel considered notes of a meeting held on 5 May 2022 between Colleague C, [REDACTED], and Witness B regarding Mr Wilson's behaviour towards Colleague C. During the meeting, Colleague C referred to a similar incident in which Mr Wilson sat directly behind her, which she said made her feel uncomfortable. She stated that she messaged Mr Wilson the following day to ask him to stop coming to the hub.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel accepted Colleague C's evidence in that, on at least one occasion between February 2022 and April 2022, Mr Wilson chose to sit directly next to or behind Colleague C with the effect that it caused Colleague C to feel

uncomfortable. The panel considered that this amounted to sitting within Colleague C's personal space.

Having considered the admitted facts and the supporting evidence, the panel found allegation 2(b) proved.

c. entered the room where Colleague C was working and watched, without a reason to do so;

The panel noted that Mr Wilson admitted this allegation, as set out in his response to the Notice of Referral. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the evidence available to it.

The panel considered the notes of the meeting on 5 May 2022 between Colleague C, [REDACTED], and Witness B. During the meeting, Colleague C stated that she felt she was being watched all the time by Mr Wilson. She further stated that she had seen Mr Wilson come into St Paul's SEN hub and chapel on several occasions when he did not have a reason to be there.

In her witness evidence, Colleague C described several incidents in or around March 2022 when Mr Wilson entered the SEN hub. She also stated that she felt like she was being watched all the time by Mr Wilson.

The panel accepted that Colleague C perceived that she was being watched by Mr Wilson. It also accepted her evidence that Mr Wilson had on several occasions entered a room where Colleague C was working without an apparent work-related reason to do so.

However, the panel was unable to identify, on the evidence provided, a specific incident during the period February 2022 to April 2022 in which Mr Wilson had entered a room where Colleague C was working and watched, as alleged.

Accordingly, the panel found allegation 2(c) not proved.

d. touched and/or brushed your leg(s) against Colleague C

The panel noted that Mr Wilson admitted this allegation within his response to the Notice of Referral. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the evidence available to it.

The panel considered the notes of the meeting on 5 May 2022 between Colleague C, [REDACTED], and Witness B. During the meeting, Colleague C stated that, on 26 April 2022, Mr Wilson had sat next to her and crossed his legs so they were almost touching her. She further stated that his leg and his arm had occasionally brushed against her.

Colleague C also described an incident in which she was using the printer in the St Paul's staff room, and Mr Wilson entered the room and stood right behind her. In her witness evidence, Colleague C stated that she felt Mr Wilson's legs brush behind her. She also described the staff room as a large space and stated that there was no need for Mr Wilson to brush past her.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel was satisfied that, on at least one occasion during the period February 2022 to April 2022, Mr Wilson brushed his legs against Colleague C.

Having considered the admitted facts and the supporting evidence, the panel found allegation 2(d) proved.

3. In or around the Summer of 2022, you provided Student A, a former pupil at St Paul's Catholic High School, with your personal mobile number.

The panel noted that Mr Wilson admitted this allegation within his response to the Notice of Referral, although he did not admit it within his written representations.

The panel considered Student A's police witness statement dated 14 November 2023, in which she stated that she and Mr Wilson would contact each other via email during the summer of 2022. She further stated that Mr Wilson later gave her his personal mobile number so that they could stay in touch. Student A stated that from this point they exchanged messages via WhatsApp. The panel accepted that Student A was a former pupil at St Paul's.

In her witness statement, Student A stated that Mr Wilson sent his telephone number to her via email and asked her to message him.

The panel considered Mr Wilson's written representation that he had no recollection of giving his phone number to Student A. He further stated that his public Facebook profile previously displayed his phone number before he realised this and changed the settings to make it private.

The panel asked Student A if there was a possibility that she had obtained Mr Wilson's mobile number from his Facebook profile. Student A was adamant in oral evidence that she had not obtained Mr Wilson's mobile number from Facebook and maintained that Mr Wilson had sent his number to her via email. She stated that, as a result, she had initiated communications via WhatsApp.

The panel found Student A to be a credible and forthcoming witness. It considered that it was proven, on the balance of probabilities, that Mr Wilson had provided Student A with his personal mobile number during the summer of 2022.

The panel found allegation 3 proved.

4. Between around September 2022 and April 2023, you exchanged messages of an over-familiar and/or unprofessional nature with Student A, or someone you thought to be Student A, in that, you sent:

a. “a really great morning fuck!!”

The panel noted that Mr Wilson admitted this allegation within his response to the Notice of Referral and his written representations. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the evidence available to it.

The panel considered screenshots which appeared to show WhatsApp messages between Student A and Mr Wilson. In one of the screenshots, Mr Wilson appeared to ask Student A, “*What would you do if you were here!? Xxx*”, followed by “*I was thinking a really great morning fuck!! But not if you are too tired!! Xxx*” The panel noted that Mr Wilson then appeared to ask Student A if she would be interested in this.

The panel noted that the content of these messages was consistent with information provided by Student A during her police interview and in her police witness statement dated 14 November 2023. Student A informed the police that she received the message on 16 April 2023.

In her witness statement, Student A repeated that she received this message on 16 April 2023. In oral evidence, Student A identified the content of the screenshots as messages between her and Mr Wilson and she stated that she recalled the date of the messages [REDACTED].

On the balance of probabilities, the panel was satisfied that the images were an accurate representation of WhatsApp messages between Student A and Mr Wilson, that Mr Wilson was aware it was Student A he was corresponding with and that the message suggesting “*a really great morning fuck*” was sent on 16 April 2023.

The panel found that this contact from a teacher to an ex-student (as the panel had identified Student A was) particularly a child (as the panel had identified Student A was) was over-familiar and highly unprofessional. Therefore, the panel found allegation 4(a) proved.

b. message(s) inviting Student A to your house and/or to meet up;

The panel noted that Mr Wilson admitted this allegation in his response to the Notice of Referral but denied it within his written representations.

The panel considered the notes of Student A’s police interview and her police witness statement in which she stated that, shortly before Christmas 2022, Mr Wilson contacted her via email to tell her that he and [REDACTED] were just outside her college and to ask whether she would like to join them all for a meal.

This was consistent with Student A's written and oral witness evidence.

The panel noted that it had not had sight of the relevant message(s). However, it considered that Student A's recollection had remained consistent and found her to be a credible and forthcoming witness.

Whilst the panel heard evidence of a separate occasion where Mr Wilson invited Student A to his house, the panel noted that, within Student A's police witness statement, she described this incident as having taken place some time after Mr Wilson's message on 16 April 2023. Therefore, the panel found, on the balance of probabilities, that this incident took place after Mr Wilson's employment at St Paul's had terminated. The panel noted that this was after the period to which the allegation relates and therefore did not consider this factual matter fell within this allegation.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel found it more likely than not that, at around Christmas 2022, Mr Wilson had messaged Student A to invite her to meet up.

The panel found that this contact from a teacher to an ex-student, particularly a child, was over-familiar and highly unprofessional. Therefore, the panel found allegation 4(b) proved.

c. message(s) asking Student A to wear a "maid's outfit"

The panel noted that Mr Wilson admitted this allegation in his response to the Notice of Referral but denied it within his written representations.

The panel heard evidence from Student A of an occasion where Student A, on the advice of [REDACTED], suggested that Mr Wilson would look good in a maid's outfit. She stated that this prompted a response from Mr Wilson that Student A would look good in a maid's outfit. Within her witness evidence, Student A linked this to the occasion when she was invited to Mr Wilson's house. The panel noted its earlier finding that this incident took place after Mr Wilson's employment at St Paul's terminated and, therefore, after the period to which the allegation relates.

In the absence of any evidence that Mr Wilson had sent a message asking Student A to wear a maid's outfit whilst he was employed as a teacher at St Paul's, the panel found allegation 4(c) not proved.

5. Between around April 2023 and 30 October 2023, you exchanged messages of an over-familiar and/or unprofessional nature with Student A, or someone you thought to be Student A in that, you sent a photo of your naked torso to Student A.

The panel noted that Mr Wilson admitted this allegation within his response to the Notice of Referral and his written representations. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the evidence available to it.

The panel had sight of an image which appeared to show Mr Wilson, including his naked torso and part of his pubic region.

Within the notes of Student A's police interview and her police witness statement, she stated that this image was sent to her by Mr Wilson on 24 October 2023. This was consistent with Student A's written and oral witness evidence.

The panel considered Mr Wilson's representations that Student A had asked for a "*progress photo*", that the image in the bundle had been cropped and that it did not show that he was wearing jogging bottoms.

In her oral evidence, Student A denied that she had cropped the image and told the panel that she did not perceive the image to relate to Mr Wilson's gym progress. Student A also denied that she had requested the photograph.

The panel was satisfied that the image in the bundle was a photograph that Mr Wilson sent to Student A on or around 24 October 2023. The panel did not accept that the image had been cropped. Further, the panel noted that the image was similar to those sent by Mr Wilson to Colleague C, in that the panel considered it to be sexually suggestive in nature.

The panel was therefore satisfied that between around April 2023 and 30 October 2023, Mr Wilson exchanged messages of an over-familiar and/or unprofessional nature with Student A, or someone he thought to be Student A in that, he sent her photo of his naked torso.

The panel found that a teacher sending a sexually suggestive photograph of their partially naked body to a former student, particularly a child, was over-familiar and highly unprofessional. Therefore, the panel found allegation 5 proved.

6. Your conduct at paragraph 1 and/or 2 and/or 3 and/or 4 and/or 5 was:

a. Sexual; and/or

b. Sexually motivated.

The panel noted that Mr Wilson admitted this allegation in full within his response to the Notice of Referral. However, within his written representations he denied that his conduct was sexually motivated.

The panel considered the definition of what conduct is, or is not, to be regarded as 'sexual'. The panel was referred to the following quote from the case of *Sait v The General Medical Council [2018] EWHC 3160 (Admin)* which referred to section 78 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003: *"penetration, touching or any other activity is sexual if a reasonable person would consider that (a) whatever its circumstances or any person's purpose in relation to it, it is because of its nature sexual, or (b) because of its nature it may be sexual and because of its circumstances or the purpose of any person in relation to it (or both) it is sexual"*.

The panel also considered whether the conduct was sexually motivated. It noted that in *Basson v General Medical Council [2018] EWHC 505 (Admin)* it was stated that, *"A sexual motive means that the conduct was done either in pursuit of sexual gratification or in pursuit of a sexual relationship"*.

The panel was mindful of the Court of Appeal's conclusion in *General Medical Council v Haris [2021] EWCA Civ 763*. The court found in that case that, *"In the absence of a plausible innocent explanation for what he did, the facts spoke for themselves."*

Therefore, in determining whether Mr Wilson's conduct was sexually motivated, the panel considered whether there was a plausible innocent explanation for Mr Wilson's behaviour.

The panel considered each allegation (all of which it had found proven) in turn.

Allegation 1

The panel did not identify anything overtly sexual about the messages from Mr Wilson to Student H. The panel noted that the use of kisses at the end of messages demonstrated affection and was an over-familiar form of communication between a teacher and a former student. However, it did not consider that the use of kisses, in itself, was necessarily sexual. On the balance of probabilities, the panel did not find that these messages were of a sexual nature.

The panel further considered the content of the messages. In particular, the panel noted that Mr Wilson had asked a series of personal questions about Student H's location, living arrangements and movements. For example:

- *"What days are you in college this week? Xxx"*;
- *"Who have you moved in with or have you got your own place now?..."*;
- *"Which college are you at? Xx"*;
- *"Fun, where did you move to?..."*;

- *“Have you got the house to yourself tonight? Xxx”.*

In light of the volume of messages of this nature and the persistent contact over a short period of time, the panel could not conceive of a plausible innocent explanation for this contact towards a former student. On the balance of probabilities, the panel found it more likely than not that Mr Wilson sent these messages in pursuit of a sexual relationship with Student H. Therefore, the panel found that Mr Wilson’s conduct as found proven in respect of allegation 1 was sexually motivated.

Allegation 2a

The panel did not consider any of the text messages (not including the images) from Mr Wilson to Colleague C to be overtly sexual by themselves. It was therefore necessary for the panel to consider the messages in their wider context.

The panel took into account the sexually suggestive images that Mr Wilson sent to Colleague C, together with Mr Wilson’s message that he was *“very attracted”* to her. The panel inferred that, during the relevant period, Mr Wilson was seeking a sexual relationship with Colleague C.

The panel made the following findings on the balance of probabilities:

- the message *“I am obviously very attracted to you”* was a reference to Mr Wilson’s sexual attraction to Colleague C;
- the message *“Don’t know how to amuse myself, any ideas!? Xx”* was a reference to the performance of sexual acts; and
- the message *“Or you could entertain me!!? Sorry couldn’t help myself!!”* was a reference to the performance of sexual acts between Mr Wilson and Colleague C.

Having made those findings, the panel concluded that the text messages set out at allegations 2(a)(iii), 2(a)(v) and 2(a)(vi) were sexual in nature. The panel did not find that any of the other text messages were sexual in nature.

The panel noted its earlier finding that the photographs Mr Wilson sent to Colleague C were sexually suggestive. On that basis and in the circumstances of Mr Wilson seeking a sexual relationship with Colleague C as it had found, the panel found that the photographs referred to in allegation 2(a)(xii) were sexual in nature.

As regards whether the messages and photographs were sexually motivated, the panel noted its finding that Mr Wilson was, at the time of sending the messages and images, seeking a sexual relationship with Colleague C. The panel could not conceive of a plausible innocent explanation for the messages or photographs and considered that they were, more likely than not, sent in pursuit of a sexual relationship with Colleague C.

Therefore, the panel found that Mr Wilson's conduct as found proven in respect of allegations 2(a)(i), 2(a)(ii), 2(a)(iii), 2(a)(iv), 2(a)(v), 2(a)(vi), 2(a)(vii), 2(a)(viii), 2(a)(ix), 2(a)(x) and 2(a)(xii) was sexually motivated.

Allegations 2(b) and 2(d)

The panel did not consider the act of sitting in Colleague C's personal space to be inherently sexual. Given that this did not appear to involve any specific sexually suggestive behaviour or contact, the panel did not find that this was sexual in nature.

The panel distinguished Mr Wilson's act of sitting in Colleague C's personal space with his act of touching or brushing his legs against her. In the latter case, the panel considered that touching or brushing legs with a colleague is not an overtly sexual act, but that it may be sexual depending on the circumstances. The panel noted its finding that Mr Wilson was, at the time, seeking a sexual relationship with Colleague C. In that context, the panel found it more likely than not that Mr Wilson's conduct as found proven in respect of allegation 2(d) was sexual in nature.

In considering whether Mr Wilson's conduct was sexually motivated, the panel noted its earlier finding that Mr Wilson was, during the relevant period, seeking a sexual relationship with Colleague C. In that context, the panel found it more likely than not that Mr Wilson sat in Colleague C's personal space and brushed his legs against her, without needing to do so, in pursuit of sexual gratification or a sexual relationship with Colleague C. Accordingly, and absent any plausible innocent explanation, the panel found that Mr Wilson's conduct as found proven in respect of allegations 2(b) and 2(d), was sexually motivated.

Allegation 3

The panel did not find that Mr Wilson's act of providing his personal mobile number to Student A was sexual, either overtly or in the circumstances.

The panel went on to consider Mr Wilson's motivation. The panel firstly noted that it considered it would be very unusual and unprofessional for a teacher to provide their personal mobile number to a former student. The panel considered Mr Wilson's explanation that his actions towards Student A were motivated out of concern. However, the panel did not accept this explanation as plausible in the context of the messages from Mr Wilson to Student A that followed, including the suggestion of "*a really great morning fuck*".

Taking the circumstances into account, the panel was not satisfied that there was a plausible innocent explanation for Mr Wilson giving his personal mobile number to Student A. The panel found, on the balance of probabilities, that Mr Wilson provided his personal mobile number in pursuit of a sexual relationship with Student A. On that basis,

the panel found that Mr Wilson's conduct as found proven in respect of allegation 3 was sexually motivated.

Allegation 4

As regards allegation 4(a), the panel considered the suggestion of "*a really great morning fuck*" to be overtly sexual. The panel therefore found that this was sexual in nature.

As regards allegation 4(b), the panel did not consider that the act of inviting Student A to meet up with him [REDACTED] was sexual, either overtly or in the circumstances. Therefore, the panel did not find that this was sexual in nature.

In all the circumstances, the panel could not conceive of a plausible innocent explanation for Mr Wilson to make a suggestion to Student A of "*a really great morning fuck*" or to invite Student A to meet up with him. On the balance of probabilities, the panel found it more likely than not that Mr Wilson sent these messages in pursuit of a sexual relationship with Student A. Therefore, the panel found Mr Wilson's conduct as found proven in respect of allegations 4(a) and 4(b) to be sexually motivated.

Allegation 5

The panel noted its earlier finding that the image sent to Student A was sexually suggestive. The panel considered Mr Wilson's explanation that the image was sent in the context of a gym "*progress photo*" and/or to show Student A his alleged back injury. The panel noted that the image showed Mr Wilson's naked torso and part of his pubic region. On the balance of probabilities, the panel did not accept Mr Wilson's explanation as plausible. The panel found that the image was sexual in nature.

The panel considered the image in the wider context of the messages from Mr Wilson to Student A, including the suggestion of "*a really great morning fuck*". On the balance of probabilities, and seeing no plausible innocent alternative, the panel found it more likely than not that Mr Wilson sent this image in pursuit of sexual gratification and/or a sexual relationship with Student A. Therefore, the panel found that Mr Wilson's conduct referred to at allegation 5 was sexually motivated.

Accordingly, the panel found allegation 6 proved in respect of allegations 1, 2(a)(i), 2(a)(ii), 2(a)(iii), 2(a)(iv), 2(a)(v), 2(a)(vi), 2(a)(vii), 2(a)(viii), 2(a)(ix), 2(a)(x) and 2(a)(xii), 3, 4(a) and 4(b), and 5.

- 7. Between or around December 2024 to June 2025, in relation to Student I, a former pupil at St Paul's Catholic High School, you exchanged messages and/or viewed and/or liked their Instagram stories and/or photograph(s)**

The panel noted that Mr Wilson admitted this allegation within his response to the Notice of Referral and his written representations. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the evidence available to it.

The panel noted that this allegation related to a period after Mr Wilson had left Thomas More. The panel considered that all parties had acknowledged by their approach to this allegation (including, without limitation, Mr Wilson's admission of the allegation) that the proviso "whilst working as a teacher at St Thomas More RC College" was not intended to apply to this individual allegation and the panel proceeded in accordance with that approach.

The panel had sight of screenshots which appeared to be from Student I's Instagram account. These images showed that an individual, "*Tom Wilson*" [REDACTED] had viewed two of Student I's Instagram stories.

The panel further considered screenshots which appeared to show Student I's Instagram messages with "Tom Wilson" on 4 January 2025 which were initiated by Student I, during which Student I sought to confirm that she was communicating with Mr Wilson.

Student I stated in written and oral evidence that the messages shown in the screenshots were between her and Mr Wilson. She stated in oral evidence that the screenshots showed the full extent of her communication with Mr Wilson after she ceased to be a student of St Paul's. Student I also stated that Mr Wilson did not "like" any of her Instagram stories or posts.

The panel was satisfied that Mr Wilson had viewed at least two of Student I's Instagram stories, and that the screenshots accurately reflected Instagram messages between Student I and Mr Wilson on 4 January 2025.

The panel considered that the messages were very different in tone to those sent to Student A and Student H. In particular, the panel noted that the messages related to Student I's education, rather than her personal life, and that they did not contain kisses.

Having considered the admitted facts and the supporting evidence, the panel found allegation 7 proved.

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 Wilson, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Wilson 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.
- 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 Mr Wilson, in relation to the facts found proved at allegations 1, 3, 4(a) and 4(b), and 5, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education ('KCSIE').

The panel noted that the version of KCSIE dated September 2016 was relevant to allegation 1. The panel found that Mr Wilson's conduct, which involved making contact with a former student under the age of 18 in pursuit of a sexual relationship, was a breach of paragraph 2 in that Mr Wilson failed to safeguard and promote the welfare of children or to consider, at all times, what was in the best interests of the child.

The panel noted that the version of KCSIE dated 1 September 2022 was relevant to allegations 3 and 4(a) and 4(b). The panel noted that Mr Wilson had provided his personal mobile number to a former student under the age of 18, and then engaged in communication (some of which was sexual in nature) in pursuit of a sexual relationship with the same former student. The panel found that this conduct was a breach of paragraph 2 in that Mr Wilson failed to safeguard and promote the welfare of children or to consider, at all times, what was in the best interests of the child.

The panel noted that the version of KSCIE dated 1 September 2023 was relevant to allegation 5. The panel noted that Mr Wilson had sent a sexually suggestive photograph to a former student under the age of 18, in pursuit of a sexual relationship with the same former student. The panel found that this conduct was a breach of paragraph 2 in that Mr

Wilson failed to safeguard and promote the welfare of children or to consider, at all times, what was in the best interests of the child.

The panel also considered whether Mr Wilson'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 sexual communication with a child was relevant to allegations 4(a) and 5.

The panel noted that allegations 1, 3, 4(a) and 4(b), 5, and 7 concerned matters which took place outside the education setting.

The panel noted that the conduct found proven in respect of allegations 2(a)(i), 2(a)(ii), 2(a)(iii), 2(a)(iv), 2(a)(v), 2(a)(vi), 2(a)(vii), 2(a)(viii), 2(a)(ix), 2(a)(x) and 2(a)(xii) concerned private messages exchanged between two adults on personal devices, unrelated to education. The panel also noted that the majority of the messages were sent outside school hours. Accordingly, the panel considered that, when viewing the messages as a whole, they ought to be considered as having taken place outside the education setting.

As regards allegations 2(a)(i), 2(a)(ii), 2(a)(iii), 2(a)(iv), 2(a)(v), 2(a)(vi), 2(a)(vii), 2(a)(viii), 2(a)(ix), 2(a)(x) and 2(a)(xii), the panel considered that these concerned private messages between Mr Wilson and Colleague C, another adult, using personal devices. The panel also noted that these messages were, to some extent, reciprocated by Colleague C. In the circumstances, the panel did not find that the private messages between Mr Wilson and Colleague C affected the way Mr Wilson fulfilled his teaching role or that they may have led to pupils being exposed to, or influenced by, Mr Wilson's behaviour in a harmful way. The panel found that Mr Wilson's conduct as found proven in respect of allegations 2(a)(i), 2(a)(ii), 2(a)(iii), 2(a)(iv), 2(a)(v), 2(a)(vi), 2(a)(vii), 2(a)(viii), 2(a)(ix), 2(a)(x) and 2(a)(xii) was not unacceptable professional conduct.

As regards Mr Wilson's conduct as found proven in respect of allegations 1, 3, 4(a) and 4(b), and 5 the panel considered that these communications arose as a direct result of Mr Wilson's position as a former teacher to Student H and Student A. The panel considered that this conduct was relevant to the way Mr Wilson fulfilled his teaching role. It also found that the act of sending sexual and/or sexually motivated communications to a child gave rise to a high risk of pupils (including Student H and Student A) being exposed to harmful behaviour.

As regards Mr Wilson's conduct as found proven in respect of allegation 7, the panel considered it unprofessional for a teacher to communicate with a former student over social media. The panel noted Mr Wilson's explanation within his written representations that he was not a teacher at that time. The panel also considered that there were several

mitigating factors concerning allegation 7. In particular, Student I was over the age of 18 at the relevant time and had initiated the messages, and a period of over 18 months had passed since Student I had ceased to be a pupil of St Paul's. The panel also noted that the content of the messages related to Student I's education rather than aspects of her personal life. Taking all the circumstances into account, the panel was not satisfied that Mr Wilson's communications with Student I affected the way Mr Wilson fulfilled his teaching role or that there was a risk of pupils being exposed to or influenced by Mr Wilson's behaviour in a harmful way. The panel found that Mr Wilson's conduct as found proven in respect of allegation 7 was not unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel noted that Mr Wilson's conduct as found proven in respect of allegations 2(b) and 2(d) related to conduct within school that was sexually motivated and, in the case of allegation 2(d), sexual in nature. The panel drew upon its own experiences and concluded that such behaviour would be considered unacceptable from a teacher within an education setting, and that it risked potentially exposing pupils within St Pauls to sexual behaviour in a potentially harmful way.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that Mr Wilson's conduct, as found proven in respect of allegations 1, 2(b) and 2(d), 3, 4(a) and 4(b), and 5 amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mr Wilson was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct by reason of his actions as found proven in respect of allegations 1, 2(b) and 2(d), 3, 4(a) and 4(b), and 5. The panel was not satisfied that Mr Wilson was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct by reason of his actions as found proven in respect of allegations 2(a)(i), 2(a)(ii), 2(a)(iii), 2(a)(iv), 2(a)(v), 2(a)(vi), 2(a)(vii), 2(a)(viii), 2(a)(ix), 2(a)(x) or 2(a)(xii), or 7.

In relation to whether Mr Wilson'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 Wilson'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 Wilson was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that the offence of sexual communication with a child was relevant to allegations 4(a) and 5.

The panel noted that the facts found proven in respect of allegations 1, 3, 4(a) and 4(b), 5, and 7 took place outside the education setting.

The panel noted its earlier findings concerning the conduct found proven in respect of allegations 2(a)(i), 2(a)(ii), 2(a)(iii), 2(a)(iv), 2(a)(v), 2(a)(vi), 2(a)(vii), 2(a)(viii), 2(a)(ix), 2(a)(x) and 2(a)(xii) and treated this conduct as having taken place outside the education setting.

As regards allegations 2(a)(i), 2(a)(ii), 2(a)(iii), 2(a)(iv), 2(a)(v), 2(a)(vi), 2(a)(vii), 2(a)(viii), 2(a)(ix), 2(a)(x) and 2(a)(xii), the panel noted its finding that these concerned private messages between Mr Wilson and Colleague C, another adult, using personal devices, and that the messages were, to some extent, reciprocated by Colleague C. In those circumstances, the panel was not satisfied that these messages amounted to misconduct of a serious nature or that they were likely to have a negative impact on the public's perception of Mr Wilson as a teacher. Therefore, the panel found that Mr Wilson's conduct as found proven in respect of allegations 2(a)(i), 2(a)(ii), 2(a)(iii), 2(a)(iv), 2(a)(v), 2(a)(vi), 2(a)(vii), 2(a)(viii), 2(a)(ix), 2(a)(x) and 2(a)(xii) was not conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

As regards Mr Wilson's conduct as found proven in respect of allegations 1, 3, 4(a) and 4(b), and 5, the panel noted that Mr Wilson had engaged in communication with two children, namely Student H and Student A, which was sexually motivated and, in the case of allegations 4(a) and 5, sexual in nature. The panel considered that engaging in sexual and/or sexually motivated communications with children amounts to serious misconduct and would be considered wholly unacceptable by any reasonable member of the public. Accordingly, the panel found that Mr Wilson's conduct as found proven in respect of allegations 1, 3, 4(a) and 4(b), and 5 would likely have a negative impact on the public's perception of Mr Wilson as a teacher, therefore bringing the profession into disrepute.

As regards Mr Wilson's conduct as found proven in respect of allegation 7, the panel considered the fact that Mr Wilson engaged in communication with Student I over social media to be unprofessional behaviour. However, the panel also took note of the mitigating factors which distinguished this from Mr Wilson's communications with Student H and Student A. In particular, the panel noted that Student I was over the age of 18 at the time of the contact, that she had initiated the communication, and that the content of the messages related to Student I's education rather than her personal life. The panel also had regard to Mr Wilson's written representation that he was not a teacher at that time. In all the circumstances, the panel was not satisfied that Mr Wilson's conduct as found proven in respect of allegation 7 was of a serious nature or that it was likely to have a negative impact on the public's perception of Mr Wilson as a teacher. Accordingly, the panel found this was conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel noted that allegations 2(b) and 2(d) related to Mr Wilson's conduct towards a colleague in school which was sexually motivated and, in the case of allegation 2(d), sexual in nature. The panel found that a reasonable and well-informed member of the public would likely find sexual and/or sexually motivated behaviour by teachers in an education setting, during school hours, to be unacceptable. Accordingly, the panel found that Mr Wilson's conduct as found proven in respect of allegations 2(b) and 2(d) had the potential to damage the public's perception of Mr Wilson as a teacher, therefore bringing the profession into disrepute.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that Mr Wilson's actions, as found proven in respect of allegations 1, 2(b) and 2(d), 3, 4(a) and 4(b), and 5, constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel was not satisfied that Mr Wilson's actions, as found proven in respect of allegations 2(a)(i), 2(a)(ii), 2(a)(iii), 2(a)(iv), 2(a)(v), 2(a)(vi), 2(a)(vii), 2(a)(viii), 2(a)(ix), 2(a)(x) or 2(a)(xii), or 7, 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 a punitive effect.

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

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Wilson, it considered that there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils. In particular, the panel noted that Mr Wilson had engaged in communications with two former students under the age of 18, which were sexually motivated and, in some instances, sexual in nature. The panel considered that this conduct had the potential to put Student H and Student A at risk of serious harm.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Wilson were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession. The panel considered that the public regard the safeguarding of children as a top priority for the teaching profession and that they would expect all teachers to maintain appropriate boundaries at all times in their relationships with students and former students.

The panel found that the ordinary, intelligent and well-informed citizen would view Mr Wilson's sexual and sexually motivated communication towards two former students, as abhorrent and wholly unacceptable, and that it had the potential to significantly diminish the public's confidence in the teaching profession. The panel considered that there was a very strong public interest in being seen to take robust action in response to Mr Wilson's conduct.

The panel was of the view that there was also a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession. The panel considered that the conduct found against Mr Wilson, particularly sexually motivated and/or sexual conduct towards two former students, and towards a colleague within an education setting, fell significantly outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

In addition to the public interest considerations set out above, the panel went on to consider whether there was a public interest in retaining Mr Wilson in the profession. The panel noted that Student A and Student I described Mr Wilson positively as a teacher, and the panel had no reason to doubt his abilities as an educator. However, the panel found that the serious and repeated nature of Mr Wilson's sexually motivated conduct towards his former students, which escalated in severity between 2017 and 2022/2023, fundamentally breached the standards of conduct expected of a teacher. The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above significantly outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Wilson in the profession.

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the behaviour, noting that the Advice states that the expectation of both the public and pupils is that members of the teaching profession maintain an exemplary level of integrity and ethical standards at all times. The panel noted that a teacher's behaviour that seeks to exploit their position of trust should be viewed very seriously in terms of its potential influence on pupils and be seen as a possible threat to the public interest. The panel found that Mr Wilson's actions exploited his position as a trusted former teacher to engage in sexual and/or sexually motivated communications with two former students. The panel considered that, whilst this behaviour was severe in itself, it had the potential to cause significant and irreparable harm to Student H, Student A, and others (including other children) had it not been reported.

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

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);
- an abuse of any trust, knowledge, or influence gained through their professional position in order to advance a romantic or sexual relationship with a pupil or former pupil;
- sexual misconduct, e.g. involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature and/or that use or exploit the trust, knowledge or influence derived from the individual's professional position;
- 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);
- violation of the rights of pupils;
- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour.

The panel attached particular weight and seriousness to Mr Wilson's online behaviours towards Student H and Student A which, the panel found, involved the use of social networking platforms to pursue inappropriate and sexual relationships with former pupils.

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

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

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Wilson was acting under extreme duress.

The panel noted that Student A and Student I both described Mr Wilson, as a teacher, in a positive light, and that Student I gave evidence that her attainment in [REDACTED] improved after she was placed in Mr Wilson's class. However, the panel was not satisfied

that this was sufficient for it to conclude that Mr Wilson had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector.

Given that the panel had found repeated instances of sexually motivated conduct towards a former student in 2017 and 2022-2023, which escalated to also include conduct of a sexual nature, the panel was not satisfied that Mr Wilson's conduct was out of character.

The panel considered whether Mr Wilson had demonstrated insight or remorse. The panel noted that, in his written representations, Mr Wilson had expressed remorse for the impact of his conduct on Student A, stating that he had caused her to go through an awful ordeal. Mr Wilson also stated that he had [REDACTED].

However, the panel did not consider that Mr Wilson had, within his written representations, demonstrated an understanding of the motivations and triggers for pursuing a sexual relationship with two former students, sending sexual communications to one of those former students, or engaging in sexual conduct within an education setting.

The panel also found that Mr Wilson did not appear to fully appreciate the impact his sexually explicit message or his sexually suggestive photograph had on Student A as a child. The panel took into account Witness A's evidence that, during the investigation by Thomas More, Mr Wilson had sought to minimise his behaviour and demonstrated a lack of appreciation for the importance of safeguarding children.

Taking these matters into account, the panel found that Mr Wilson had not demonstrated any meaningful insight or remorse in respect of his conduct.

The panel considered whether it would be proportionate to conclude this case with no recommendation of prohibition, or 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 or appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order in these circumstances. The panel had regard to the severity of Mr Wilson's conduct, which the panel found to have been sexually motivated towards two former students who were children at the time. Having done so, the panel considered that a recommendation of the publication of adverse findings only would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, particularly the public interest in the safeguarding of pupils, maintaining public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct within the teaching profession.

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest in removing Mr Wilson from the teaching profession significantly outweighed the interests of Mr Wilson and any public interest in retaining him in the profession. The panel's finding that Mr Wilson had engaged in conduct of sexual nature towards Student A, and sexually motivated conduct towards Student A and Student H, were significant factors in forming that opinion alongside Mr Wilson's lack of insight into these behaviours. 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 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.

The panel found that this case fell into the following categories:

- serious sexual misconduct e.g. where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons, particularly where the individual has used their professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons; and
- any sexual misconduct involving a child.

The panel noted its findings that Mr Wilson had engaged in sexually motivated communications towards two former students in 2017 and 2022-2023 respectively, and in the latter instance he had engaged in sexual conduct towards Student A whilst she was under the age of 18. The panel considered that, had Mr Wilson's conduct not been reported on each occasion, it had the potential to result in serious harm to Student H, Student A and others, including other children. The panel therefore found that this was a case of serious sexual misconduct involving a child.

The panel noted that Mr Wilson had been informally warned about his communications with Student H in 2017, and that he had expressed an understanding of the seriousness of his conduct. Nevertheless, the panel found that he had engaged in further sexually motivated contact with Student A in 2022 and 2023, which escalated to the suggestion of "*a really great morning fuck*" and, later, sending a partially naked photograph of himself to Student A. Given the repeated and escalating nature of Mr Wilson's conduct, the panel could not be satisfied that there would be no risk of repetition of his behaviour if he were to be permitted to re-enter the teaching profession. The panel found that any such

repetition would have the potential to cause severe and irreversible harm to other children.

Paragraph 51 of the Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate. None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel's findings.

The panel noted its earlier finding that Mr Wilson had not demonstrated meaningful insight or remorse for his conduct. The panel considered that, whilst Mr Wilson's conduct in itself amounted to a severe and fundamental breach of his position of trust as a teacher, the potential consequences of his conduct, including harm to Student H, Student A and other children, could have been far more severe, had it not been reported. The panel did not find evidence that Mr Wilson properly appreciated this.

The panel carefully considered whether it would be proportionate to recommend a review period. Taking into account the severity of Mr Wilson's conduct, the repeated and escalating nature of that conduct from sexually motivated communications to communications of a sexual nature towards a child, Mr Wilson's lack of meaningful insight, and the risk of further repetition, the panel found that the public interest weighed strongly against allowing Mr Wilson the opportunity to return to the teaching profession.

The panel concluded that its findings, particularly its findings of serious sexual misconduct and sexual misconduct involving a child, indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate or in the public interest. As such, the panel decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended without provisions for a review period.

Accordingly, the panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State was that Mr Wilson be prohibited from the teaching profession with immediate effect, without provisions for a review period.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

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

In this case, the panel has found some of the allegations proven and found that some those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel has also found some of the allegations not proven and further, that some proven allegations do not amount to unacceptable

professional conduct or conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute. I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Thomas 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.
- 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 Mr Wilson 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 Mr Wilson fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of sexual motivation in Mr Wilson's conduct towards two former pupils, who were children at the time the conduct occurred.

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 Wilson, 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, *"In light of the panel's findings against Mr Wilson, it considered that there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils. In particular, the panel noted that Mr Wilson had engaged in communications with two former students under the age of 18, which were sexually motivated and, in some instances, sexual in nature. The panel considered that this conduct had the potential to put Student H and Student A at risk of serious harm."* A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, *"The panel noted that, in his written representations, Mr Wilson had expressed remorse for the impact of his conduct on Student A, stating that he had caused her to go through an awful ordeal."*

However, the panel has also commented that it *"...did not consider that Mr Wilson had, within his written representations, demonstrated an understanding of the motivations and triggers for pursuing a sexual relationship with two former students, sending sexual communications to one of those former students, or engaging in sexual conduct within an education setting."*

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, *"Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Wilson were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession. The panel considered that the public regard the safeguarding of children as a top priority for the teaching profession and that they would expect all teachers to maintain appropriate boundaries at all times in their relationships with students and former students."*

I am particularly mindful of the finding of sexually motivated behaviour 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 Wilson himself. The panel considered that Student A and Student I both described Mr Wilson positively. However, the panel *“...was not satisfied that this was sufficient for it to conclude that Mr Wilson had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector.”*

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel's comments concerning the lack of insight or remorse. The panel has said, *“The panel also found that Mr Wilson did not appear to fully appreciate the impact his sexually explicit message or his sexually suggestive photograph had on Student A as a child.”*

...

Taking these matters into account, the panel found that Mr Wilson had not demonstrated any meaningful insight or remorse in respect of his conduct.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that Mr Wilson engaged in sexually motivated behaviour towards two former pupils as well as a colleague.

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

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended that no provision should be made for a review period.

I have considered the panel's comments *“Taking into account the severity of Mr Wilson's conduct, the repeated and escalating nature of that conduct from sexually motivated communications to communications of a sexual nature towards a child, Mr Wilson's lack of meaningful insight, and the risk of further repetition, the panel found that the public*

interest weighed strongly against allowing Mr Wilson the opportunity to return to the teaching profession.”

I have considered whether not allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the seriousness of the conduct found proven, including the sexually motivated communication towards a child, and the lack of full insight or remorse.

I consider therefore that allowing for no review period is necessary to maintain public confidence and is proportionate and in the public interest.

This means that Mr Thomas Wilson is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children’s home in England.

Furthermore, in view of the seriousness of the allegations found proved against him, I have decided that Mr Wilson shall not be entitled to apply for restoration of his eligibility to teach.

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

Mr Wilson 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: 24 July 2026

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