



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Gary Corbett: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

July 2026

Contents

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

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

Teacher: Mr Gary Corbett

TRA reference: 21016

Date of determination: 7 July 2026

Former employer: Special Educational Needs and Disabilities Academies Trust (SENDAT), Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk.

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 6 to 7 July 2026 at Cheylesmore House, 5 Quinton Road, Coventry CV1 2WT, to consider the case of Mr Gary Corbett.

The panel members were Mr Adnan Qureshi (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Fiona Fowles (teacher panellist) and Mr Tim Cole (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Helen Kitchen of Blake Morgan LLP, solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Caroline Collins of Capsticks LLP.

Mr Gary Corbett was present and was represented by Mr Colin Henderson, solicitor, from The Reflective Practice.

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

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 16 April 2026.

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

1. On or about 28 November 2021, while employed at TCES East London Independent School, he declared that he had QTLS status in an application for a position with Special Education Needs and Disabilities Trust (“the Trust”) when this was not the case.
2. On or about 7 June 2022, while employed at the Trust, he produced and submitted a document in support of a mortgage application that:
 - a. included false information about his employment status;
 - b. included false information about his salary;
 - c. included the Trust’s letterhead without the Trust’s knowledge or consent;
 - d. purported to be written and/or signed by Person A when that was not the case;
 - e. was produced without Person A’s knowledge or consent.
3. His conduct at 1 and/or 2 above was dishonest.

Mr Corbett admitted the facts of allegations 1 and 2 and allegation 3 as it related to allegation 2. He denied the facts of allegation 3 as it related to allegation 1.

Mr Corbett admitted that his conduct in relation to admitted allegation 1, allegation 2 and allegation 3 as it related to allegation 2 constituted unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology and List of Key People – pages 5 to 6

Section 2: Notice of Proceedings and Response – pages 7 to 24

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency Witness Statements and Exhibits – pages 25 to 210.

Section 4: Other Relevant Teaching Regulation Agency Documents – pages 211 to 224

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 225 to 261.

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

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

Witnesses

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

- Witness A, [REDACTED]

The statements of two further witnesses for the TRA were not in dispute and were admitted by agreement between the parties, these being the statements of:

- Witness B, [REDACTED]
- Witness C, [REDACTED]

Mr Gary Corbett gave oral evidence to the panel.

Mr Corbett called evidence from a character witness, Witness D, [REDACTED]

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

On 28 November 2021 Mr Corbett applied for the role of School Improvement Lead at the Special Education Needs and Disabilities Trust (“SENDAT”) (“the Trust”)

On 1 January 2022 Mr Corbett was employed as a School Improvement Lead at the Trust.

On 13 June 2022 the Trust discovered a letter on its online system which incorrectly appeared to confirm that Mr Corbett had passed his probation and that his salary was being increased.

On or about 15 June 2022 the Trust commenced a local level investigation.

On 12 July 2022 Mr Corbett's employment at the Trust came to an end.

On 27 July 2022 the Trust made a referral to the TRA regarding Mr Corbett.

The panel had careful regard to the oral and documentary evidence presented and the parties' submissions. It accepted the legal advice provided.

The panel confirmed that it had not relied upon any findings made during the Trust's investigations or hearings. It formed its own view of the allegations before it based on the evidence presented to it. It had regard only to the allegations addressed to Mr Corbett in the Notice of Hearing.

The panel had exercised its own judgment in determining whether to accept the admissions made by Mr Corbett.

The panel applied the civil standard "on the balance of probabilities" in its decision making.

In making its decisions, including on the issue of dishonesty, it had regard to Mr Corbett's previous good character, the character reference attesting to his good character and the admission of dishonesty made by him in relation to allegation 3 as it applied to allegation 2.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

- 1. On or about 28 November 2021, while employed at TCES East London Independent School, you declared that you had QTLS status in an application for a position with Special Education Needs and Disabilities Trust ("the Trust") when this was not the case.**

The facts of allegation 1 were admitted by Mr Corbett who accepted that he had acted as described in the allegation.

The panel noted that it had received evidence of the following which it accepted:

- From Mr Corbett, that he had failed to correctly declare his teaching status on his application for the position as School Improvement Lead at the Trust. He had recorded that he held QTLS when this was not the case.
- From Witness A, that possessing QTLS or QTS was a key eligibility criterion for the role of School Improvement Lead, the role for which Mr Corbett applied in November 2022. The role was all about improving schools and outcomes for young people so the successful candidate needed to be a qualified teacher.

Holding that status would support the post holder in commenting on the quality of lessons, and teaching and learning.

- From Witness A, that Mr Corbett recorded on his on-line application that he possessed QTLS. Witness A was part of the interview panel for Mr Corbett but had no record that Mr Corbett was asked about his teaching status during interview although his application form was checked to ensure that he met the eligibility criteria of holding QTS or QTLS.
- From the statement of Witness C that Mr Corbett had not undertaken any professional formation as part of a professional formation programme leading to QTLS, so did not hold QTLS at the relevant time.

Mr Corbett told the panel that he had undertaken the 7307 and 7407 City and Guilds courses, finishing in 2006, and that he had recorded this on his application to the Trust as his having obtained QTLS. This was on the basis that he believed his qualification was equivalent to his obtaining QTLS. He accepted that he had not carried out any formal checks, for example with the IFL or SET (its successor body) or the TRA, about this equivalence. He had also not undertaken any checks on-line. Instead, he relied on his having been told, in 2006, by a senior training co-ordinator, [REDACTED], and by another tutor at the college where he undertook his City and Guild studies that the courses he had undertaken were equivalent to a Certificate in Education. He told the panel that on this basis he understood that he was a qualified teacher in the post 16 (further education) sector and had recorded his holding QTLS. Mr Corbett accepted in his evidence that he should not have recorded that he held QTLS on his application to the Trust and that he should have been more diligent in checking his teaching status.

Mr Corbett accepted that he had not maintained his initial membership of the IFL which had started in March 2008 and on which he had logged on-line his CPD until 2011. He had not become a member of SET (the successor body to the IFL). He explained that this situation arose because the card on which he had authorised payment of his IFL membership fee had expired. He had not taken any steps to rectify this position.

The panel noted that Mr Corbett had undertaken safeguarding roles in various educational institutions and had been involved in recruitment. He accepted that he understood the importance of candidates recording the correct information on applications to ensure “safer recruitment”.

Taking account of this evidence, which the panel found to be consistent with the admission made by Mr Corbett, the panel accepted the admission made by Mr Corbett and found allegation 1 proven.

2. On or about 7 June 2022, while employed at the Trust, you produced and submitted a document in support of a mortgage application that:

- a. included false information about your employment status;**
- b. included false information about your salary;**
- c. included the Trust's letterhead without the Trust's knowledge or consent;**
- d. purported to be written and/or signed by Person A when that was not the case;**
- e. was produced without Person A's knowledge or consent.**

Mr Corbett admitted allegation 2 including all of its sub particulars.

The panel noted that it had received evidence of the following which it accepted;

- From Mr Corbett, that he accepted fabricating the letter dated 7 June 2022, that bore the Trust's letterhead and was signed on behalf of a fictitious third party, a non-existent Head of HR at the Trust. The name and signature added had been that of an individual who had previously provided him with a letter for a remortgage on his previous property (Person A), who had no role at the Trust. The forged letter falsely stated that it confirmed that Mr Corbett had received a salary increase to £65,000pa which would commence on 26 July 2022, in line with the payroll process, and, that he had passed his probationary period, both of which were untrue. Mr Corbett had undertaken this as he felt under considerable stress to buy a property at the time. He had sold his former home (that was some distance away from his new workplace) and a previous purchase had fallen through late on in the conveyancing process. He had no stable accommodation and was living in hotels, B and B's, Air B and B's and on a couple of occasions stayed overnight in his car. He confirmed that the mortgage he was seeking was dependent on the figure for his earnings in the forged letter.
- From Witness A, that the job offer to Mr Corbett included a probationary period of six months, a period referenced in the Trust's Terms and Conditions and the Job Description. Subject to no concerns arising Mr Corbett's probation would have been due to end in early July 2022. Mr Corbett had been on track to successfully complete the probation until the forged letter came to light. Successful completion of the probationary period would not have resulted in an immediate salary increase. Any annual increase would have taken effect from 1 September 2022. Mr Corbett had not asked the Trust for a letter confirming his salary and employment status for the purpose of his mortgage application. His salary range, which was detailed in the role job description, had been discussed with him at interview. The figure in the forged letter was higher than Witness A expected would have been included in any pay rise that would have been given to Mr Corbett in September 2022, even if it had been two salary points upwards in recognition of exceptional performance. He would not have expected the increase to have been two salary points upwards.

- Also from Witness A, that Mr Corbett had access to the Trust's letterhead on the Trust's on-line system for use for appropriate purposes. Its use to create the forged letter was not authorised and was not use for a legitimate purpose. It was for Mr Corbett's personal gain. An IT change log confirmed that the letter head was accessed and modified by Mr Corbett on 7 June 2022.
- Additionally, from Witness A, that in May 2022 he had been made aware that Mr Corbett was experiencing some accommodation issues and, on occasion, was sleeping in his car. [REDACTED] In a meeting in May they talked through a few options, and an arrangement was then reached for Mr Corbett to live in a property that was being rented out by a friend of a senior Trust staff member. At a later investigatory meeting in June 2022 Mr Corbett had stated that he forged the letter saying that he knew it was wrong but had no family network and did not want to sleep in his car again. He also stated that he forwarded the letter to his mortgage advisor and assumed it therefore went to his mortgage lender. He accepted that he did not know what his future salary would be if he passed his probation but based the figure in the forged letter on the top point in the salary range.
- From Witness B, [REDACTED], that she had contacted Mr Corbett's mortgage lender and been advised by the Application Fraud Department "that the letter confirming a salary increase had been required by them in order to evidence that the actual amount in the original mortgage offer was affordable by ... Mr Corbett as otherwise it would not have been within ... [his] existing salary. ... the mortgage offer would now have to be withdrawn".

On the basis of this evidence the panel found allegation 2 proven on the balance of probabilities.

3. Your conduct at 1 and/or 2 above was dishonest.

In the context detailed, and being mindful of the legal advice provided to it, the panel proceeded to consider if Mr Corbett's actions were dishonest.

The panel first considered allegation 3 as it related to allegation 1.

Mr Corbett denied allegation 3 in relation to allegation 1.

Mr Corbett's evidence was that it was his honest belief that he had QTLS or a status equivalent to QTLS based on his having undertaken "the teacher training route via Chelmsford College who sub-contracted this to NOVA training". He undertook the one-year City and Guilds 7307 and this enabled him to continue to undertake two further years of the City and Guilds 7407 course and obtain that qualification in 2006. He had been told by Person B, [REDACTED], that this new initiative was "the equivalent of the Certificate in Education" which he understood "was the usual study route to become a qualified teacher in the post 16 (Further Education) sector". Mr Corbett's evidence was

that he had checked this equivalence with [REDACTED], Person C, “who also confirmed this to ... [him] verbally”. So, after completing the third stage of the City and Guilds 7407 in August 2006 he believed that he was a qualified teacher in the Post 16 (Further Education) sector.

Mr Corbett’s evidence was that he enrolled in the Institute of Learning (IFL) in March 2008 (which was free for existing FE teachers) and undertook CPD which he logged on its on-line system until 2011. He believed that he started to pay for membership after 2008 but that it lapsed when his credit card expired. He then “overlooked renewing this which...[he] accept[s] was careless and unprofessional” He then did not re-new his membership as he went into school teaching in 2013, before IFL was abolished and the changes to the scheme for qualified teachers detailed in the evidence of Witness C took place.

Mr Corbett said that in his subsequent roles the issue of his qualification was only raised with him on one occasion. This was raised by an HR adviser, in about 2018, who was struggling to find out about the City and Guilds 7407 qualification. Mr Corbett told the adviser that his City and Guilds 7307 and 7407 certificates were equivalent to a Certificate in Education. The issue was not raised with him again. In consequence of this he continued to believe that his qualification was equivalent to QTLS.

Mr Corbett confirmed that it was in his genuine, but mistaken, belief that his qualification was equivalent to a Certificate in Education that he selected the option of QTLS in his on-line application to the Trust.

The panel accepted the explanation provided by Mr Corbett that he had a genuine, but mistaken and erroneous, belief that he held a qualification that was equivalent to QTLS. It accepted that Mr Corbett maintained this belief over many years as on only one subsequent occasion had any question been raised about his teacher status although he had been employed in a number of different roles. When he had responded to that query his employer had not come back to him with any further issues or concerns. He believed the query had arisen as a result of the education route he had undertaken only being available for a limited period of time some years ago. The panel found this to be a credible explanation for his on-going erroneous misunderstanding of his teaching status.

Taking account of this evidence, the panel was not satisfied that the subjective and objective tests of dishonesty as identified in the case of Ivey v Genting Casinos were met in relation to allegation 3 as it related to allegation 1.

On this basis the panel found allegation 3 as it related to allegation 1 not proven.

The panel then went on to consider allegation 3 as it related to allegation 2.

Mr Corbett admitted allegation 3 in relation to allegation 2.

The panel noted that it had received the following evidence, which it accepted, in relation to allegation 3 as it applied to allegation 2:

- From Mr Corbett, that he accepted that he had been dishonest. He had fabricated the letter with the false content and name and signature and provided it to his mortgage advisor and understood that it was to be passed on to his mortgage lender.
- Also from Mr Corbett, that he had known that he had not passed his probation and had not been aware of what pay rise, if any, he may have received on passing his probation. He knew that his lender could accept future earnings when applying for a mortgage and that his lender wanted confirmation of his being on track to pass the probation before confirming the mortgage finance based on his expected salary.

Taking account of this evidence, which the panel found to be consistent with the admission made by Mr Corbett, the panel accepted the admission made by Mr Corbett in relation to allegation 3 as it related to allegation 2.

The panel found allegation 3 proven as it related to allegation 2.

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

Mr Corbett admitted that his actions in the admitted allegations, and which the panel had found proven, amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Having found a number of the allegations proven, and having disregarded the allegation found not proven, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of the proven 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 was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Corbett in relation to the facts proven involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. He had acted dishonestly by forging a letter which included false information, including about his employment position and his earning. He had submitted it to his mortgage broker, for onwards submission to his mortgage lender. This was particularly concerning as Mr Corbett was aware that there were procedures in place at the Trust to produce letters of this nature. With regard to his declaration about his qualification, the panel considered that Mr Corbett had not exercised the required degree of care and attention to establish the true position with

regard to the equivalence, or otherwise, of his qualification to the QTLS before making this declaration. This undermined the principles of safer recruitment and created a potential risk of reputation harm to those who employed him. The panel considered in all the circumstances that his lack of care was sufficiently serious to amount to a breach of the Teacher Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Corbett was in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers act with honesty...
- A teacher is expected to demonstrate consistently high standards of personal and professional conduct.
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach.

The panel considered whether Mr Corbett'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 fraud was relevant in relation to allegation 2 and allegation 3 as it related to allegation 2.

The panel found that Mr Corbett's actions in the proven allegations were of a serious nature and fell significantly short of the standards expected of a teacher and so amounted to unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel also took into account that, in relation to allegation 2 and allegation 3 as it related to allegation 2, Mr Corbett's actions were intentional and were a breach of the trust placed in him as a senior leader by the Trust. Additionally, being in a senior leadership role at the Trust he should have been acting as a role model for others. The panel also took into account Mr Corbett's failure to act on his understanding, at the time, that his actions were inappropriate and demonstrated a lack of honesty.

For these reasons the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Corbett 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 Corbett was guilty of unacceptable professional misconduct.

In relation to whether Mr Corbett'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 Corbett's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice. The panel concluded that the offence of fraud was relevant.

The findings of misconduct are serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public's perception of a teacher and the institution in which they work.

For these reasons the panel found that Mr Corbett's actions in relation to the proven allegations constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In summary, having found the facts of allegations 1, 2 and allegation 3 as it relates to allegation 2 proven, the panel further found that Mr Corbett's conduct in relation to those allegations amounted to both unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

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

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

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely:

- the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct within the teaching profession.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Corbett, which involved dishonesty in producing a fraudulent letter on Trust headed notepaper, which included false information and a falsified signatory in the context of the Trust, there was a strong public interest in declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct in the profession as the conduct found against Mr Corbett was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

In addition, confidence in the profession would be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Corbett was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

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 Corbett in the profession. The panel decided that there was a public interest consideration in retaining Mr Corbett in the profession as he could continue to provide a contribution to it. No doubt had been cast upon his abilities as an educator and his evidence showed that he had made a range of contributions to various educational bodies over a number of years particularly to those who provide educational support to pupils with Special Educational Needs. The panel noted, in particular, that Mr Corbett is currently undertaking an Executive Headteacher role at PCT Education, where he has been an Executive Headteacher of a Social Emotional and Mental Health School since September 2023. The panel considered that he had made a significant contribution to and had had a positive impact in a part of the education sector that is under growing pressure and where there is an increasing need for specialist provision.

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 Corbett.

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 proven. 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.
- abuse of trust.
- dishonesty.
- any activity that knowingly substantiates another person's statements where they are known to be false. The panel considered this relevant as Mr Corbett had produced the forged letter, falsely signed off in the name of Person A, to his mortgage broker to be passed to his mortgage lender.

Although the panel considered that dishonesty and abuse of trust were relevant factors, it did not consider that Mr Corbett's dishonesty and abuse of trust were at the most serious end of the spectrum. This was reflected in the panel's earlier finding that Mr Corbett's conduct had involved behaviours associated with fraud but not behaviours associated with serious dishonesty.

Even though some of the behaviour found proven 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 the teacher's actions were not deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Corbett was acting under extreme duress. However, the panel recognised that Mr Corbett's misconduct occurred at a time when he was under serious stress as a consequence of his not having any secure accommodation and when he was working in an area where he had no existing family or friendship support network. He felt isolated and under pressure. He became increasingly concerned that the prospect of being able to obtain secure accommodation was diminishing as time progressed. He did not want to revert to having to sleep in his car again.

The panel was aware and took into account that Mr Corbett's dishonesty had been to serve his own personal interests. He put those interests ahead of the interests of the Trust and his profession.

The panel also noted Mr Corbett's good professional and personal history prior to these events. He had demonstrated good standards in his professional conduct and had made a valuable contribution to the education sector. The panel accepted that the incidents were out of character.

The panel also took into account the following factors:

- Mr Corbett's teaching and leadership skills were recognised in terms of his appointment to his current role as Executive Head at PCT Education Services Limited. It was to Mr Corbett's credit that he had made his new employer aware of the TRA matters and had continued to work successfully in his new role although the stress of facing the TRA's proceedings was weighing upon him.
- That Mr Corbett had made admissions in the local disciplinary process and had engaged with, and made admissions in, the TRA's regulatory proceedings.
- The panel understood that the issues arose in a very particular set of personal circumstances, Mr Corbett moving away alone and some distance from his home and having difficulties securing accommodation.

- That Mr Corbett had expressed regret and remorse for his actions. He had fully recognised and accepted the seriousness of his actions and taken full responsibility for them. The panel considered that he had very genuinely reflected, in a positive and in-depth way, upon his actions.
- That Mr Corbett had engaged with the Society for Education and Training (SET) and was looking to “top-up” his qualification by signing up for the Level 5 Diploma in Teaching.
- Mr Corbett had demonstrated good insight into what had gone wrong and the contextual issues that had led to him act as he did. He has sought to address how he handles stressful situations including better planning and prioritisation, asking for support and taking time to reflect. He told the panel that he will never allow stresses to cause him to act in a way that impacts on his ethical professional standards and the panel believed, and was reassured by, this commitment. The panel noted that Mr Corbett now had a good family and friend support network around him and understood its importance to him. The panel would encourage him to ensure that he continues to develop his support network, including at work, and that he accesses it when needed.
- The reference and oral evidence provided in support of Mr Corbett from Witness D, [REDACTED], Mr Corbett’s employer, and a director of a range of other care and educational companies. He had known Mr Corbett since July 2023. He attested to Mr Corbett being a “humble, compassionate, highly intelligent, and skilled individual” who “consistently goes above and beyond to ensure .. [the Company’s] schools remain safe, engaging and supportive environments”. He is “highly respected and admired by colleagues, parents and ... the students he serves”. He described Mr Corbett as an “exceptional leader”.
- That it was very clear to the panel when Mr Corbett gave evidence that he had a very genuine passion for teaching in the SEND sector and was enthusiastic to continue to contribute to the education and achievements of pupils within it. His skills and knowledge would be highly valued in this sector.

Taking account of the mitigating factors identified above, and Mr Corbett’s insight and remorse, the panel was of the view that the risk of repetition had been minimised to an acceptable level. The panel considered that Mr Corbett clearly understood the importance of acting with honesty and being diligent in properly representing his educational status at all times, even when faced with stressful circumstances.

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, the recommendation of no prohibition order would be both a proportionate and an appropriate response. Given that the nature and severity of the behaviour were not at the most serious end of the possible spectrum and, having considered the mitigating factors that were present, the panel determined that a recommendation for a prohibition order would not be appropriate in this case. The panel considered that the publication of the adverse findings it had made was sufficient to send an appropriate message to Mr Corbett as to the standards of behaviour that are not acceptable, and the publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession.

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 sanction.

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

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

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Gary Corbett should not be the subject of a prohibition order. The panel has recommended that the findings of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute should be published and that such an action is proportionate and in the public interest.

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

- Teachers act with honesty...
- A teacher is expected to demonstrate consistently high standards of personal and professional conduct.
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach.

The panel has found that the conduct of Mr Corbett fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

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 Corbett, 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 and safeguard pupils. The panel does not mention having considered any evidence that Mr Corbett's behaviour placed the safety and wellbeing of his pupils in jeopardy.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which the panel has set out as follows:

"That Mr Corbett had expressed regret and remorse for his actions. He had fully recognised and accepted the seriousness of his actions and taken full responsibility for them. The panel considered that he had very genuinely reflected, in a positive and in-depth way, upon his actions."

"Mr Corbett had demonstrated good insight into what had gone wrong and the contextual issues that had led to him act as he did. He has sought to address how he handles stressful situations including better planning and prioritisation, asking for support and taking time to reflect. He told the panel that he will never allow stresses to cause him to act in a way that impacts on his ethical professional standards and the panel believed, and was reassured by, this commitment. The panel noted that Mr Corbett now had a good family and friend support network around him and understood its importance to him. The panel would encourage him to ensure that he continues to develop his support network, including at work, and that he accesses it when needed."

I have therefore given this element some 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 has observed:

"The findings of misconduct are serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public's perception of a teacher and the institution in which they work."

I am particularly mindful of the finding of dishonesty in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

I have had to consider that the public has a high expectation of professional standards of all teachers and that the public might regard a failure to impose a prohibition order as a failure to uphold those high standards. In weighing these considerations, I have had to consider the matter from the point of view of an “ordinary intelligent and well-informed citizen.”

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mr Corbett himself. The panel has commented:

“The panel also noted Mr Corbett’s good professional and personal history prior to these events. He had demonstrated good standards in his professional conduct and had made a valuable contributed to the education sector. The panel accepted that the incidents were out of character.”

The panel also took account of the reference and oral evidence provided in support of Mr Corbett by his current employer.

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Corbett 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 finding that the nature and severity of Mr Corbett’s behaviour were not at the most serious end of the possible spectrum. The panel has said:

“Although the panel considered that dishonesty and abuse of trust were relevant factors, it did not consider that Mr Corbett’s dishonesty and abuse of trust were at the most serious end of the spectrum. This was reflected in the panel’s earlier finding that Mr Corbett’s conduct had involved behaviours associated with fraud but not behaviours associated with serious dishonesty.”

I have taken account of the panel’s comments on the mitigating factors in this case. The panel has found no evidence that Mr Corbett’s actions were not deliberate or that he was acting under extreme duress, but has said:

“However, the panel recognised that Mr Corbett’s misconduct occurred at a time when he was under serious stress as a consequence of his not having any secure

accommodation and when he was working in an area where he had no existing family or friendship support network. He felt isolated and under pressure. He became increasingly concerned that the prospect of being able to obtain secure accommodation was diminishing as time progressed. He did not want to revert to having to sleep in his car again.”

I have noted the panel’s comments on the contribution that Mr Corbett has made and is making to the sector, including:

“That it was very clear to the panel when Mr Corbett gave evidence that he had a very genuine passion for teaching in the SEND sector and was enthusiastic to continue to contribute to the education and achievements of pupils within it. His skills and knowledge would be highly valued in this sector.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments that the risk of repetition had been minimised to an acceptable level. The panel has said:

“Taking account of the mitigating factors identified above, and Mr Corbett’s insight and remorse, the panel was of the view that the risk of repetition had been minimised to an acceptable level. The panel considered that Mr Corbett clearly understood the importance of acting with honesty and being diligent in properly representing his educational status at all times, even when faced with stressful circumstances.”

For these reasons, I have concluded that a prohibition order is not proportionate or in the public interest. I consider that the publication of the findings made would be sufficient to send an appropriate message to the teacher as to the standards of behaviour that were not acceptable and that the publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D Oatley', with a large, sweeping loop at the end.

Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 8 July 2026

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