



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Rashid Umran: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome**

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

**July 2026**

## Contents

|                                                          |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Introduction                                             | 4  |
| Allegations                                              | 4  |
| Summary of evidence                                      | 4  |
| Documents                                                | 4  |
| Statement of agreed facts                                | 5  |
| Decision and reasons                                     | 5  |
| Findings of fact                                         | 6  |
| Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State         | 8  |
| Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State | 12 |

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

**Teacher:** Mr Rashid Umran

**Teacher ref number:** 2150058

**Teacher date of birth:** 25 April 1979

**TRA reference:** 23715

**Date of determination:** 2 July 2026

**Former employer:** Dame Ellen Pinsent School, Birmingham

## **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 2 July 2026 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Rashid Umran.

The panel members were Mr Tom Snowdon (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Clare Russell (lay panellist) and Mrs Rachel Curry (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Katie Garcia of Birketts LLP Solicitors.

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Umran that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Umran provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted conviction of a relevant offence. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, Ms Katie Wills of Capsticks LLP, Mr Umran, or any representative for Mr Umran.

The meeting took place in private.

## **Allegations**

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 2 July 2026.

It was alleged that Mr Umran was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that on 22 October 2024 he was convicted at St Albans Crown Court of:

1. Three counts of making indecent photograph/pseudo-photograph of a child
2. Two counts of sexual communication with a child
3. Causing a child to watch a sexual act
4. Two counts of causing or inciting sexual exploitation of a child
5. Eight counts of inciting a child to engage in sexual activity

Mr Umran admitted the facts of allegations 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 and that the admitted facts amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence, as set out in the response to the notice of referral signed by Mr Umran on 30 September 2025 and in the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Umran on 18 November 2025.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section 1: Chronology, anonymised person list and list of key people – pages 3 to 5

Section 2: Notice of referral, response and notice of meeting – pages 6 to 29

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 30 to 34

Section 4: TRA documents – pages 35 to 324

Section 5: Teacher documents – page 325

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

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

## Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Umran on 18 November 25 and was signed by the presenting officer.

## Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

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

Mr Umran commenced employment at Dame Ellen Pinsent School (the "School") on 1 September 2022 as a classroom teacher.

On 30 August 2023, the Local Authority Department Office ("LADO") contacted [REDACTED] the head teacher of the School, to inform the School that Mr Umran had been arrested by the police and released on bail.

On 31 August 2023 Mr Umran was suspended from the School.

On 3 September 2023 Mr Umran emailed the School to confirm that he had been arrested, charged [REDACTED].

Between 15 January 2024 and 20 March 2024, the School investigated the alleged conduct of Mr Umran.

Following a disciplinary hearing on 9 May 2024, the School made a referral to the TRA and [REDACTED] and Mr Umran's employment at the School was terminated.

Mr Umran was convicted of:

1. Three counts of making indecent photograph/pseudo-photograph of a child
2. Two counts of sexual communication with a child
3. Causing a child to watch a sexual act
4. Two counts of causing or inciting sexual exploitation of a child
5. Eight counts of inciting a child to engage in sexual activity

Mr Umran was convicted at St Albans Crown Court on 22 October 2024, and was subsequently sentenced on 20 December 2024 to a total prison term of 10 years and 8 months. Mr Umran was also placed on the sex offender register for life, made subject of a sexual harm prevention order until further notice, [REDACTED].

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

The panel found the following particulars of the allegation(s) against you proved, for these reasons:

**On 22 October 2024 you were convicted at St Albans Crown Court of:**

- 1. Three counts of making indecent photograph/pseudo-photograph of a child**
- 2. Two counts of sexual communication with a child**
- 3. Causing a child to watch a sexual act**
- 4. Two counts of causing or inciting sexual exploitation of a child**
- 5. Eight counts of inciting a child to engage in sexual activity**

The panel considered the Statement of Agreed Facts signed by Mr Umran on 18 November 2025. In that document, Mr Umran admitted all of the allegations and further admitted that these were convictions of relevant offences. The panel also noted that Mr Umran had entered guilty pleas in the criminal proceedings. Notwithstanding those admissions, the panel reached its determination on the basis of the evidence before it.

The panel noted page 8 of Teacher Misconduct: The Prohibition of Teachers (the "Advice"), which states that where there has been a conviction of a criminal offence, a panel will accept the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by it unless exceptional circumstances apply. The panel found that no exceptional circumstances arose in this case.

The panel was provided with a certificate of conviction dated 13 January 2025 from St Albans Crown Court. The certificate confirmed that, on 22 October 2024, Mr Umran was convicted of:

1. Three counts of making an indecent photograph/pseudo-photograph of a child;
2. Two counts of sexual communication with a child;
3. Causing a child to watch a sexual act;

4. Two counts of causing or inciting the sexual exploitation of a child; and
5. Eight counts of inciting a child to engage in sexual activity.

The panel further noted that Mr Umran was sentenced to a total prison term of 10 years and 8 months. He was also made subject to lifetime notification requirements, an indefinite Sexual Harm Prevention Order and was [REDACTED].

Having considered the certificate of conviction, the Statement of Agreed Facts and Mr Umran's admissions, the panel was satisfied that allegations 1 to 5 were proved.

### **Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence**

Having found the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to conviction of a relevant offence.

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

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Umran 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
  - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
  - not undermining fundamental British values, including...the rule of law...
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards...

The panel noted that although the offence occurred outside a school setting, the individual’s actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting for the reason that the offences he was convicted of involved children.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence would have had an impact on the safety and/or security of pupils and/or members of the public.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Umran’s behaviour in committing the offence would affect

public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. His conduct ran entirely counter to what should have been at the very core of his practice as a teacher, being the safeguarding and wellbeing of children.

The panel noted that Mr Umran's behaviour ultimately led to a significant sentence of imprisonment, which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed.

The panel also considered the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

This was a case concerning an offence involving sexual activity, sexual communication with a child, any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or pseudo photograph or image of a child, or permitting any such activity, including one-off incidents, which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel noted that Mr Umran had committed multiple criminal offences concerning two children, Child A being of the ages 13 to 15 during the period of the offences and Child B who was 14 during the offence and Mr Umran's engagement with those children was whilst he was a teacher.

The panel also found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Umran's ongoing suitability to teach.

The panel considered that a finding that these convictions were for relevant offences was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

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

Given the panel's findings in respect of a conviction of a relevant offence, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

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

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

standards of conduct and that prohibition strikes the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest, if they are in conflict.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Umran, which involved convictions for multiple, serious sexual offences against children resulting in a total prison term of 10 years and 8 months, and an indefinite Sexual Harm Prevention Order, there was a very strong public interest consideration in the protection of pupils and other members of the public. His actions raised obvious and significant public and child protection concerns.

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, not least given that the criminal acts concerning which he had been found guilty were clearly enormously harmful to children.

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

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

In addition to the public interest considerations set out above, the panel went on to consider whether there was a public interest in retaining Mr Umran in the profession. The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above entirely outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Umran in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct 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.

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 Umran.

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

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of the Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures;

- sexual misconduct, e.g. involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature ...
- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing, or publishing any indecent photograph or image, or indecent pseudo photograph or image, of a child, or permitting such activity, including one-off incidents;
- 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);
- actions or behaviours [...] that undermine fundamental British values of democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty, [...].

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 Umran's actions were not deliberate.

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

There was no evidence that Mr Umran demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel did not accept that the incident was out of character.

In relation to mitigation, the panel noted that Mr Umran's certificate of conviction recorded that he pleaded guilty.

The panel further noted that in Mr Umran's handwritten note dated 1 August 2025, he had stated that he understood that he would "*not ever teach again*". The panel noted that in the teacher's written submissions he stated that he had no evidence to submit. The panel also considered the sentencing remarks dated 20 December 2024 in which His Honour Judge Johnson refers to reading a letter from Mr Umran expressing his remorse but stated that "*the letter was almost all about [him] save for a half sentence which refers to the negative impact [his] choices have had on others. That is, I have to say, that sentence rather an understatement of the significant and one suspects life changing impact of this offending on those two young girls.*" The sentencing remarks also state "*the strongest mitigation that I can see comes from the proactive steps you've taken since your arrest to seek help and I do give you credit for that because having acted in this way, in some ways the least you can do but in some ways all you can do is to seek to ensure that this never happens again.*"

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

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate or 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 Umran of prohibition.

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Umran. The obvious seriousness of the offences and that they involved sexual communication and activities with children between the ages of 13 and 15, were significant factors in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

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

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

These include:

- 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;
- any sexual misconduct involving a child; and
- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or indecent pseudo photograph or image of a child, including one off incidents.

These factors were clearly demonstrated by the convictions.

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 again noted that they had found that Mr Umran had been convicted of a serious criminal offence concerning sexual activity and communication with children between the ages of 13 and 15. The panel further noted there was a custodial sentence given to Mr Umran and found the offending to be extremely serious.

The panel noted that there was no material evidence of insight, remorse, or meaningful consideration of the impact that his offending had had on the children involved.

There was no material evidence that Mr Umran would not proceed to commit similar offences in the future. The panel noted that within the sentencing remarks dated 20 December 2024 his honour Judge Johnson states *"I am satisfied you do present such a risk when I look at this offending as a whole, the involvement of two children, the lengthy period of time it's persisted for, the extremities of some of the sexual behaviour involved and your attempt to have evidence deleted"*.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended 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 all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to a relevant conviction.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Umran 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

- showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
- not undermining fundamental British values, including...the rule of law...
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards...

The panel was satisfied “...that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Umran’s ongoing suitability to teach.”

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding “...that Mr Umran had committed multiple criminal offences concerning two children, Child A being of the ages 13 to 15 during the period of the offences and Child B who was 14 during the offence and Mr Umran’s engagement with those children was whilst he was a teacher.”

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 a relevant conviction, 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 Umran, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children. The panel has observed, “There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, not least given that the criminal acts concerning which he had been found guilty were clearly enormously harmful to children.” 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 the teacher’s written submissions he stated that he had no evidence to submit. The panel also considered the sentencing remarks dated 20 December 2024 in which His Honour Judge Johnson refers to reading a letter from Mr Umran expressing his remorse but stated that “the letter was almost all about [him] save for a half sentence which refers to the negative impact [his] choices have had on others. That is, I have to say, that sentence rather an understatement of the significant and one suspects life changing impact of this offending on those two young girls.” The sentencing remarks also state “the strongest mitigation that I can see comes from the proactive steps you’ve taken since your arrest to seek help and I do give you credit for that because having*

*acted in this way, in some ways the least you can do but in some ways all you can do is to seek to ensure that this never happens again."*

In my judgement, the lack of evidence of full insight and remorse 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 Umran were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession"*.

I am particularly mindful of the finding of criminal offences being committed against two children in this case, and the impact this has on the public confidence 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 a relevant conviction, 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 Umran himself. The panel comment, *"There was no evidence that Mr Umran demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel did not accept that the incident was out of character."*

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel's comments concerning the lack of insight or remorse. The panel has said, *"The panel noted that there was no material evidence of insight, remorse, or meaningful consideration of the impact that his offending had had on the children involved."*

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that *"Mr Umran had been convicted of a serious criminal offence concerning sexual activity and communication with children between the ages of 13 and 15. The panel further noted*

*there was a custodial sentence given to Mr Umran and found the offending to be extremely serious.”*

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Umran 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, *“There was no material evidence that Mr Umran would not proceed to commit similar offences in the future. The panel noted that within the sentencing remarks dated 20 December 2024 his honour Judge Johnson states “I am satisfied you do present such a risk when I look at this offending as a whole, the involvement of two children, the lengthy period of time it’s persisted for, the extremities of some of the sexual behaviour involved and your attempt to have evidence deleted”.*

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 and the impact this likely had on two children.

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

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

**Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield**

**Date: 6 July 2026**

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