



Mr Daniel Ata-Baah: 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	4
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	11

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

Teacher: Mr Daniel Ata-Baah

Teacher ref number: 0348420

Teacher date of birth: 27 January 1969

TRA reference: 18202

Date of determination: 24 July 2026

Former employer: City of London Academy Southwark, London

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ('the panel') of the Teaching Regulation Agency ('the TRA') convened on 24 July 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Daniel Ata-Baah.

The panel members were Mr Dara Islam (lay panellist – in the chair), Mr Alan Wells (former teacher panellist) and Ms Lucy Conley (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr James Corrish of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Cher Lyne Peh of Browne Jacobson LLP solicitors.

Mr Ata-Baah was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

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

It was alleged that Mr Ata-Baah was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:

1. On or around 12 November 2024, he was convicted at Croydon Crown Court for the offence of Assault of a Girl Under 13 by Touching contrary to Sexual Offences Act 2003.

Mr Ata-Baah provided no admissions.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 4 to 15

Section 2: TRA Documents – pages 17 to 74

Section 3: Teacher documents – page 75

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 April 2018, (the 'Procedures').

Witnesses

No witnesses were called to give oral evidence at the hearing.

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 Ata-Baah commenced employment as lead teacher in mathematics at City of London Academy Southwark ('the School') on 1 January 2018.

On 1 March 2018, Mr Ata-Baah informed [REDACTED], Individual A, that an allegation had been made against him of sexual offences which could result in a conviction for a criminal offence. He was suspended with immediate effect.

Mr Ata-Baah subsequently resigned from his position at the School on 9 November 2018.

The matter was referred to the TRA by [REDACTED] on 1 March 2019.

On 12 November 2024, Mr Ata-Baah was allegedly convicted at Croydon Crown Court of one count of assaulting a girl under 13 by touching.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

- 1. On or around 12 November 2024, you were convicted at Croydon Crown Court for the offence of Assault of a Girl Under 13 by Touching contrary to Sexual Offences Act 2003**

The panel noted that Mr Ata-Baah provided no admission to the facts of this allegation.

The panel considered the document Teacher misconduct: The prohibition of teachers, which is referred to as 'the Advice'. Page 8 of the Advice states that where there has been a conviction at any time of a criminal offence, the panel will accept the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction, unless exceptional circumstances apply. The panel did not find that any exceptional circumstances applied in this case.

The panel had been provided with a copy of the certificate of conviction from Croydon Crown Court, which detailed that Mr Ata-Baah had been convicted on 12 November 2024 of one count of assaulting a girl under 13 by touching, contrary to Sexual Offences Act 2003.

In respect of this allegation, the panel saw that Mr Ata-Baah was sentenced to 18 months' imprisonment, suspended for 24 months, together with a 20-day rehabilitation activity requirement and an 80-hour unpaid work requirement. He was also made subject to a sexual harm prevention order for 10 years and a restraining order for 5 years, [REDACTED], and ordered to pay £500 in prosecution costs.

The panel's attention was also drawn by the presenting officer to the Judge's sentencing remarks of 13 February 2025 in relation to the conviction in which the Judge stated "*You are to be sentenced by me today, as you know, for one offence of sexual assault on a child [...] when she was under 13*". The presenting officer submitted that this was further evidence of the conviction.

Having considered the evidence before it, including the certificate of conviction, the panel found allegation 1 proved.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

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

The panel first considered whether the conduct of Mr Ata-Baah, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Ata-Baah 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;
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others; and
 - not undermining fundamental British values, [...] the rule of law [...] and mutual respect [...]
- 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 considered that Mr Ata-Baah's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting, as the offence involved a sexual assault of a child under 13.

Given the nature of the conviction, and the behaviour necessarily involved in committing the offence, the panel was satisfied that Mr Ata-Baah's behaviour could 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 Ata-Baah's behaviour in committing a sexual assault of a child would clearly undermine public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel considered that Mr Ata-Baah's actions would likely affect public confidence in the teaching profession if Mr Ata-Baah was allowed to continue teaching.

The panel noted that Mr Ata-Baah's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, (albeit that it was suspended) which was indicative of the seriousness of the offence committed.

The panel noted that it had information as to the facts of the offence within the documents in front of it and these described Mr Ata-Baah sexually assaulting a child whom he had asked to sit on his lap, including by touching her breasts over her clothing for his own sexual gratification. The panel noted that a witness had evidenced that they thought they saw his erect penis under his clothing at the time.

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, which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel considered the seriousness of the offence, as reflected in the sentence imposed. In particular, it noted that Mr Ata-Baah had received a suspended sentence of imprisonment, despite there being no evidence of previous convictions. The panel noted that the Judge in these matters also imposed a sexual harm prevention order, his considering it was necessary to protect the public.

The panel considered this to be a very serious offence and did not consider that it had any evidence of mitigating circumstances.

The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction and the nature of that behaviour was highly relevant to Mr Ata-Baah's ongoing suitability to teach.

The panel considered that a finding that this conviction was for a relevant offence 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.

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Ata-Baah, which involved a criminal conviction for sexual assault of a child under 13, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Ata-Baah was 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 Ata-Baah 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 Ata-Baah in the profession.

The panel was presented with no evidence that Mr Ata-Baah had ability as an educator, and the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Ata-Baah in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and he sought to exploit his position of trust, as referenced in the Judge's sentencing remarks which it had seen.

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.

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 Ata-Baah.

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;
- 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);
- 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); and
- violation of the rights of 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.

Mr Ata-Baah's actions were clearly deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Ata-Baah was acting under extreme duress.

There was no evidence to demonstrate that Mr Ata-Baah had exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel had no evidence that the incident was out of character.

It was not indicated to the panel that Mr Ata-Baah had been previously subject to disciplinary proceedings/warnings and the panel noted the Judge's observations that he was of previously good character.

The panel was not otherwise presented with any evidence pertaining to Mr Ata-Baah's character or evidence which would demonstrate any level of insight or remorse on Mr Ata-Baah's part.

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

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings would be sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Ata-Baah 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 Mr Ata-Baah. The serious nature of Mr Ata-Baah's conviction for sexual assault of a child was a significant factor 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. The panel found two of these to be appropriate including "*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 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 it had no evidence of insight, mitigation or remorse on Mr Ata-Baah's part and no reason not to fear that behaviour of exactly the nature which the conviction demonstrated was proven against him, would not be repeated by Mr Ata-Baah were he permitted to teach again.

Noting the guidance from the Advice and the seriousness of the offence against a child which it had found Mr Ata-Baah had been convicted of, and the clear relevance of that offence to the safeguarding and safety of children, the panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate. 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.

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 the allegation 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 Daniel Ata-Baah should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Ata-Baah 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;
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others; and
 - not undermining fundamental British values, [...] the rule of law [...] and mutual respect [...]
- 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 Ata-Baah involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE).

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a conviction for a sexual assault on a child, which resulted in a suspended sentence of imprisonment.

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 Ata-Baah, 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 has observed:

“In light of the panel’s findings against Mr Ata-Baah, which involved a criminal conviction for sexual assault of a child under 13, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils.”

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 has set out as follows:

“The panel was not otherwise presented with any evidence pertaining to Mr Ata-Baah’s character or evidence which would demonstrate any level of insight or remorse on Mr Ata-Baah’s part.”

In my judgement, the lack of evidence of 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 has observed:

“Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Ata-Baah was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of a conviction for a sexual assault on a child 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 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 Ata-Baah himself. The panel has commented:

“There was no evidence to demonstrate that Mr Ata-Baah had exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel had no evidence that the incident was out of character.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Ata-Baah 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 serious nature of Mr Ata-Baah's conviction for sexual assault on a child. The panel has that “Mr Ata-Baah's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, (albeit that it was suspended) which was indicative of the seriousness of the offence committed.” I have also placed considerable weight on the panel's findings that Mr Ata-Baah's actions were “clearly deliberate” and that there was no evidence to suggest he was acting under extreme duress.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Mr Ata-Baah 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, 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:

"The panel again noted that it had no evidence of insight, mitigation or remorse on Mr Ata-Baah's part and no reason not to fear that behaviour of exactly the nature which the conviction demonstrated was proven against him, would not be repeated by Mr Ata-Baah were he permitted to teach again.

Noting the guidance from the Advice and the seriousness of the offence against a child which it had found Mr Ata-Baah had been convicted of, and the clear relevance of that offence to the safeguarding and safety of children, the panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate. 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."

I have considered whether not allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate response 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 serious nature of the offence of which Mr Ata-Baah was convicted, the lack of evidence of insight and remorse, and the risk of repetition.

This means that Mr Daniel Ata-Baah 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 allegation found proved against him, I have decided that Mr Ata-Baah 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 Ata-Baah has a right of appeal to the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this order.



Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 27 July 2026

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