



Mr Jamil Wali: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

July 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Witnesses	6
Decision and reasons	6
Findings of fact	7
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	22
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	26

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

Teacher: Mr Jamil Wali

TRA reference: 23916

Date of determination: 28 July 2026

Former employer: King's Leadership Academy, Liverpool

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ("the panel") of the Teaching Regulation Agency ("the TRA") convened on 1 to 3 June 2026 and 27 and 28 July 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Jamil Wali.

The panel members were Mr Duncan Tilley (lay panellist – in the chair), Ms Amy Howe (teacher panellist) and Mrs Kate Charles (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Kimberley Clayton of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Felix Keating of Three Raymond Buildings Barristers on behalf of Kinglsey Napley LLP.

Mr Wali was present and was represented by Mr Jonathan Storey of Cornwall Street Barristers.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of hearing dated 5 February 2026 as amended by the preliminary application referred to below.

It was alleged that Mr Wali was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst working as a Mathematics Teacher at the King's Leadership Academy ('the Academy'):

1. Between in or around January 2024 to in or around March 2024, he did not maintain appropriate professional boundaries with Pupil A, in that:
 - a. He exchanged emails of an inappropriate and/or personal nature with Pupil A;
 - b. The emails he exchanged with Pupil A were excessive;
 - c. Some of the emails he sent to Pupil A were outside of the Academy's working hours.
2. Following safeguarding training and/or a meeting with the Deputy Designated Safeguarding Lead on or around 29 January 2024, he did not follow the training and/or recommended actions from the meeting, in that:
 - a. On or around 27 January 2024, he did not send an email that he received from Pupil A directly to a member of the Academy's Safeguarding Team; and/or
 - b. On or around 8 February 2024, he did not upload the email that Pupil A had sent him onto CPOMs.
3. His conduct referred to in paragraphs 1(a), 1(b) and/or 1(c) above was of a sexual nature.

The teacher's representative set out Mr Wali's position in relation to the allegations as follows:

Mr Wali admitted the facts of allegations 1(a) and 1(b).

Mr Wali did not admit the facts of allegation 1(c). Whilst he accepted that he had sent emails outside school hours, he did not accept that he was aware that doing so was contrary to the Academy's expectations or policies.

Mr Wali did not admit the facts of allegation 2(a). He accepted that he did not forward the email directly to a member of the safeguarding team and instead shared the concern with Individual A. However, he maintained that Individual A was a member of the senior leadership team. He did not accept that his actions amounted to a failure to follow safeguarding procedures.

Mr Wali did not admit the facts of allegation 2(b). He accepted that he did not upload the relevant email to CPOMS but stated that he had recorded the substance of the concern by way of a paraphrased entry and did not accept that his actions constituted a failure to follow safeguarding procedures.

Mr Wali did not admit the facts of allegation 3 and denied that his conduct was of a sexual nature.

Mr Wali did not admit that his conduct in allegations 1(a), 1(b) 1(c), 2(a), 2(b) and 3, if proven, amounted to 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 key people list – pages 4 to 6

Section 2: Notice of hearing and response – pages 7 to 13

Section 3: TRA witness statements – pages 14 to 26

Section 4: TRA documents – pages 27 to 272

Section 5: Teacher's representations – pages 273 to 347

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

- The TRA's documents (18 pages), including extracts from the Academy's CPOMS records, email correspondence relating to Pupil A dated 13 March 2024 and the Staff Code of Conduct – to be numbered pages 348 to 365;
- The teacher's additional documents (4 pages), including one certificate awarded on 17 May 2026 and three pages of reflective material produced on 18 May 2026 - to be numbered pages 366 to 369; and
- The teacher's further bundle of documents (20 pages), consisting primarily of certificates and supporting material – to be numbered pages 370 to 389.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the hearing and the additional documents that the panel decided to admit.

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

Witnesses

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

Witness A – [REDACTED]

Witness B – [REDACTED]

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 1 September 2022, Mr Wali commenced employment as a Mathematics Teacher at the Academy, having previously been a pupil and later undertaken teacher training there.

On 6 December 2023, Mr Wali reported safeguarding concerns regarding Pupil A, a vulnerable [REDACTED], via the Academy's CPOMS system, which is the Academy's safeguarding reporting platform.

Between 9 January 2024 and 12 March 2024, Mr Wali allegedly engaged in extensive email correspondence with Pupil A, totalling approximately 204 emails. Some of this communication occurred outside working hours and involved overly familiar language, alleged to be inconsistent with appropriate professional boundaries.

On 27 January 2024, a safeguarding concern arose after Pupil A sent Mr Wali an email. This was not immediately reported in line with Academy procedures and instead came to the attention of Witness B, [REDACTED], via Individual A, a member of the mathematics department.

On 29 January 2024, Mr Wali met with Witness B and was instructed to forward all communications from Pupil A to the safeguarding team, avoid direct contact, and maintain appropriate boundaries.

On 8 February 2024, Mr Wali recorded a safeguarding concern on CPOMS regarding Pupil A, summarising her email rather than uploading it in full, contrary to earlier instructions from 29 January 2024.

Between late January and March 2024, Mr Wali continued to engage in direct email communication with Pupil A despite the safeguarding advice he had received from Witness B.

On 13 March 2024, Mr Wali recorded on CPOMS that he had blocked Pupil A from emailing him and apologised for not fully following safeguarding procedures. It was alleged that he continued some level of communication with Pupil A.

On 14 March 2024, the Academy's monitoring system, "Senso", flagged concerns regarding Mr Wali's further email correspondence with Pupil A, prompting further review by the Academy.

On or around 18 March 2024, a referral was made to the Local Authority Designated Officer ("LADO"), and Mr Wali was suspended pending investigation.

On 15 April 2024, Mr Wali attended an investigatory meeting, where he admitted sending emails to Pupil A and including personal content, whilst maintaining that he believed his conduct to be appropriate.

On 17 May 2024, a disciplinary hearing was held at the Academy, at which it was alleged that Mr Wali had failed to maintain professional boundaries, engaged in inappropriate communication with a vulnerable pupil, and failed to follow safeguarding procedures.

Following the disciplinary process, the Academy referred the matter to the TRA.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

The panel first considered the following particulars of the allegations against you:

1. Between in or around January 2024 to in or around March 2024, you did not maintain appropriate professional boundaries with Pupil A, in that:

- a. You exchanged emails of an inappropriate and/or personal nature with Pupil A;**
- b. The emails you exchanged with Pupil A were excessive;**
- c. Some of the emails you sent to Pupil A were outside of the Academy's working hours.**

The panel noted that Mr Wali admitted the facts of allegations 1(a) and 1(b).

Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the evidence available to it.

The panel noted that Mr Wali denied the facts of allegation 1(c). Mr Wali accepted that emails were sent outside normal school hours. However, he said he was not aware of any Academy requirement preventing him from emailing pupils outside working hours

and referred to staff routinely receiving and sending communications outside normal working hours.

Mr Wali did not admit that his conduct in allegations 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c) would amount to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel considered the summary of the email conversation between Mr Wali and Pupil A between January 2024 and March 2024 and noted that its content was highly personal and informal. Mr Wali made comments such as *"you mean a lot to me"*, *"I am always here"*, *"I got your back"*, and *"that's what friends are for"*.

The panel further observed that he used informal and colloquial language, including phrases such as *"bro just say it"* and *"wasteman"*. He also engaged Pupil A in discussions about her friendships, family circumstances, relationships, [REDACTED]. In addition, Mr Wali shared aspects of his own personal experiences, including references to past romantic relationships, stating in one email, *"I used to be obsessed with certain someone for such a long time"* and *"until one day I woke up and chose violence and deleted her"*.

The panel observed that Mr Wali appeared to assume a role beyond that of a teacher, positioning himself as a primary source of support for Pupil A. In particular, the panel noted instances where he suggested that he would personally help her and encouraged continued communication with him, stating in one email, *"u can come to me with the same problem 1000 times"*.

The panel also noted emails in which Mr Wali appeared to discourage or manage the involvement of safeguarding staff, for example stating, *"I'm not gonna tell her now. Relax"* and further stating *"they won't see emails coz I'll say she said it in person"*.

The panel observed that the volume of email communication was considerable, with approximately 204 emails exchanged during this period. The panel noted that the frequency of the emails went beyond what would be expected in the context of a professional teacher-pupil relationship.

The panel further noted that a number of the emails were sent during the evening and early morning, and at weekends.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Witness A, [REDACTED].

In his written statement, Witness A stated that safeguarding concerns were brought to his attention following alerts generated by the Academy's systems, which identified a significant volume of email communication between Mr Wali and Pupil A. He stated that the content of those emails demonstrated a level of familiarity and personal engagement which, in his view, went beyond appropriate professional boundaries.

The panel noted Witness A's evidence in his written statement, which he confirmed in oral evidence, that the volume and nature of the email exchanges had given rise to concern on the part of the safeguarding team. He also confirmed that the Academy did not encourage teachers to email pupils and that maintaining appropriate professional boundaries formed part of safeguarding expectations. Witness A stated that over 200 emails had been exchanged and that a number of these were identified by the safeguarding team as a cause for concern due to their informal and over familiar nature.

Witness A further gave evidence in his written statement that staff were required to report safeguarding concerns through CPOMS and to refer matters directly to the safeguarding team. He stated that, in his view, Mr Wali should not have engaged in ongoing email communication with Pupil A and should instead have referred the concerns to safeguarding staff. The panel also noted from Witness A's evidence that Mr Wali had received safeguarding training and was aware of the relevant procedures.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Witness B, [REDACTED].

In her witness statement, Witness B explained that the Academy had clear safeguarding procedures, including regarding the use of CPOMS, which system all staff were trained to use to report concerns relating to pupil welfare. She stated that safeguarding concerns should be reported promptly and shared with the safeguarding team.

Witness B further stated in her witness statement that Pupil A was a vulnerable pupil [REDACTED], and that the safeguarding team was involved in providing that support. She explained that appropriate systems were in place within the Academy to manage safeguarding concerns.

The panel noted Witness B's evidence regarding the events of 27 January 2024, when Mr Wali received an email from Pupil A [REDACTED]. Witness B stated that this should have been forwarded directly to the safeguarding team and recorded on CPOMS.

The panel further considered Witness B's evidence in her witness statement regarding the meeting on 29 January 2024. Witness B stated that she advised Mr Wali to forward any further emails from Pupil A to the safeguarding team, record concerns on CPOMS, avoid being alone with Pupil A, and ensure that safeguarding staff, rather than he, dealt with the pupil's concerns.

In her oral evidence, Witness B confirmed that this meeting was intended to provide safeguarding guidance and to ensure that concerns relating to Pupil A were managed appropriately, rather than to address any concerns about Mr Wali's conduct at that stage.

The panel also noted Witness B's evidence that although Mr Wali followed this advice on some occasions, there were later instances where he did not upload full email content to

CPOMS and continued to engage directly with Pupil A. She stated that this led to increasing concern and the matter being escalated to Individual B, [REDACTED], in March 2024.

Witness B further stated in her oral evidence that Mr Wali appeared to be acting out of concern for Pupil A's welfare. However, she considered that he did not have the appropriate training or role to manage those concerns and should have referred them to the safeguarding team.

The panel then considered the oral evidence and written statement of Mr Wali.

In respect of allegation 1(a), Mr Wali accepted in his written statement that he exchanged emails with Pupil A which were personal and informal in nature. He acknowledged that he had used language such as "*bro*" and "*mate*" when communicating with Pupil A and accepted that this was inappropriate in the context of teacher-pupil communication.

In his oral evidence, Mr Wali accepted that he had failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries. He stated that, with the benefit of hindsight, his communications had become over familiar and had blurred the distinction between a professional teacher-pupil relationship and a more personal relationship. He accepted that referring to a pupil as "*bro*" and "*mate*", and engaging in discussions about personal matters, was inappropriate and could create over familiarity and shift the dynamic towards a more peer-based relationship.

He accepted that he had intended to provide support which he was not qualified to provide. Mr Wali stated that his intention had been to support Pupil A because he was concerned about her welfare and wellbeing. He accepted, however, that it was not his role to become personally involved in her care and that safeguarding concerns should have been referred to the appropriate professionals.

In respect of allegation 1(b), Mr Wali accepted in his written statement that the volume of emails exchanged with Pupil A was excessive.

In his oral evidence, Mr Wali stated that he had not appreciated at the time the number of emails that had been exchanged. He explained that he had continued to respond because he believed he could help Pupil A. He accepted that, in his view, his continued engagement contributed to Pupil A becoming reliant upon him for support. Mr Wali further accepted that his communications with Pupil A exceeded what would ordinarily be expected within a professional teacher-pupil relationship and that he should instead have referred safeguarding concerns through the appropriate channels.

In relation to allegation 1(c), Mr Wali set out in his written statement that he was not aware of any Academy policy prohibiting staff from emailing pupils outside working hours.

In his oral evidence, Mr Wali confirmed that he was not aware of a requirement that staff should not email pupils outside Academy working hours. He stated that pupils and staff frequently sent emails after school hours, sometimes as late as 10pm or 11pm, and that staff routinely received communications outside normal working hours. He explained that staff received briefings from Witness A and members of the senior leadership team which they were expected to review before the next school day, and that many teachers continued to undertake work from home, including lesson planning. Mr Wali stated that he did not recall receiving any training, policy or instruction which prohibited email communication with pupils outside Academy working hours and maintained that, had he been aware of such a requirement, he would have complied with it.

Allegation 1(a)

The panel noted that Mr Wali admitted allegation 1(a) in both his written and oral evidence. In his witness statement, he accepted that he exchanged emails with Pupil A that were personal and informal in nature. In his oral evidence, he accepted that he had failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries and that his communications had become over familiar and had blurred the distinction between a professional teacher-pupil relationship and a more personal relationship.

The panel also relied upon the summary of the email exchanges between Mr Wali and Pupil A. In particular, the panel noted examples where Mr Wali stated "*you mean a lot to me*", "*I am always here*", "*I got your back*" and "*that's what friends are for*". The panel further noted his use of informal language, including terms such as "*bro*" and "*mate*", and his discussions with Pupil A regarding personal matters including friendships, relationships, family circumstances [REDACTED].

The panel found that the nature and content of these communications went well beyond what would be expected within a professional teacher-pupil relationship. In particular, the panel considered that Mr Wali had disregarded the distinction between a professional and personal relationship through his use of over familiar language, discussions about personal matters and expressions of personal support towards Pupil A.

Having considered Mr Wali's admissions and the supporting evidence, including the content and nature of the email exchanges, the panel found that Mr Wali exchanged emails of an inappropriate and/or personal nature with Pupil A.

Accordingly, the panel found allegation 1(a) proved.

Allegation 1(b)

The panel noted that Mr Wali admitted allegation 1(b) in both his written and oral evidence. In his witness statement, he accepted that the volume of emails exchanged with Pupil A was excessive. In his oral evidence, he accepted that he had continued to

engage with Pupil A when he should instead have referred safeguarding concerns through the appropriate channels.

The panel also relied on the documentary evidence showing that approximately 200 emails were exchanged between Mr Wali and Pupil A between January and March 2024. The panel noted Witness A's evidence, set out in both his witness statement and oral evidence, that the volume of communication had raised safeguarding concerns and was considered excessive by the Academy.

The panel considered the submission made on behalf of Mr Wali that the number of emails exchanged, viewed in isolation, did not necessarily mean that the communications were excessive. The panel accepted that the number of emails alone did not necessarily establish that the communications were excessive. However, the panel concluded that the volume of communication could not be viewed in isolation from its content. Having found that a number of the emails were inappropriate and/or personal in nature, the panel was satisfied that the extent of the communication exceeded what would be expected within a professional teacher-pupil relationship.

Having considered Mr Wali's admissions and the supporting evidence, including the volume of the email exchanges and the panel's finding that a number of those communications were inappropriate and/or personal in nature, the panel found that the emails exchanged with Pupil A were excessive.

Accordingly, the panel found allegation 1(b) proved.

Allegation 1(c)

The panel accepted that a number of emails were sent outside normal school hours. It noted the email evidence showing communications sent during the evening and early morning, including emails sent at approximately 9:52pm, 10:41pm and 11:01pm on 1 March 2024 and at 5:02am on 12 March 2024.

The panel considered the evidence of Witness A, who stated in his oral evidence that he had implemented an expectation that staff should not email pupils after 6pm and that this formed part of the Academy's culture. However, the panel also considered Mr Wali's evidence that he was unaware of any such policy or instruction and that staff routinely communicated outside normal working hours.

The panel noted that it had not been provided with any contemporaneous policy, staff briefing, training material or other documentary evidence identifying the Academy's working hours during the relevant period.

Whilst the panel accepted that a number of emails were sent late in the evening and early in the morning, and at weekends, it was not satisfied that the TRA had established,

on the balance of probabilities, that the Academy had established and was enforcing agreed working hours.

Having considered the documentary, oral and written evidence before it, including Witness A's evidence regarding the Academy's expectations on emailing pupils and Mr Wali's evidence that he was unaware of any such requirement, the panel was not satisfied that there was sufficient evidence before it to establish what the Academy's working hours were between January and March 2024.

The panel was therefore not satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that some of the emails sent by Mr Wali to Pupil A were outside of the Academy's working hours.

Accordingly, the panel found allegation 1(c) not proved.

2. Following safeguarding training and/or a meeting with the Deputy Designated Safeguarding Lead on or around 29 January 2024, you did not follow the training and/or recommended actions from the meeting, in that:

a. On or around 27 January 2024, you did not send an email that you received from Pupil A directly to a member of the Academy's Safeguarding Team;

The panel noted that Mr Wali denied allegation 2(a). Whilst he admitted that he did not send the email directly to a member of the safeguarding team, he maintained that he had complied with the safeguarding process by reporting the concern to Individual A, a member of the senior leadership team, and by subsequently recording the matter on CPOMS.

The panel noted that Mr Wali denied that his conduct in allegation 2(a) amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel noted the CPOMS incident report dated Saturday 27 January 2024 at 20:09, which recorded that Mr Wali had raised concerns about Pupil A, [REDACTED], following an email sent by Pupil A on "*Saturday at 1am*".

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Witness A. In his written statement, Witness A stated that safeguarding concerns should be reported directly to the safeguarding team and recorded on CPOMS. He explained that staff were required to refer such matters promptly to those with safeguarding responsibility, rather than managing them independently.

Witness A further set out in his written statement, and confirmed in his oral evidence, that where a pupil disclosed serious safeguarding concerns, those concerns should be communicated directly to the safeguarding team. He stated that, in his view, Mr Wali

should have referred the email from Pupil A to the safeguarding team rather than dealing with the matter in the way that he did.

The panel then considered the oral evidence and written statement of Witness B. In her witness statement, Witness B explained that safeguarding procedures required staff to report concerns promptly through CPOMS and to share relevant information directly with the safeguarding team.

Witness B further stated in her witness statement that, on 27 January 2024, she became aware that Mr Wali had received an email from Pupil A [REDACTED]. She stated that this email should have been forwarded directly to the safeguarding team and recorded in full on CPOMS.

The panel noted Witness B's evidence, as set out in her witness statement and in her oral evidence, that the appropriate course of action in such circumstances was to refer the matter immediately to the safeguarding team so that it could be managed by those with responsibility for safeguarding.

In her oral evidence, Witness B confirmed that safeguarding concerns of this nature should not be managed by an individual member of staff and that the purpose of the safeguarding process was to ensure that vulnerable pupils received appropriate support through established procedures.

The panel considered Mr Wali's oral evidence and written statement. Mr Wali accepted that he did not initially send the email received from Pupil A on 27 January 2024 directly to a member of the safeguarding team. He stated that, instead, he contacted Individual A, whom he regarded as a trusted member of the senior leadership team. He subsequently recorded the matter on CPOMS later the same day. Mr Wali accepted that this did not fully comply with the expected safeguarding procedures but stated that he took steps to escalate the concern within a short timeframe.

In his oral evidence, Mr Wali explained that he was concerned by the contents of the email and believed that he was acting in Pupil A's best interests. He stated that he had concerns regarding Pupil A's welfare and wanted the matter to be addressed. Mr Wali accepted that he did not follow the safeguarding process as alleged and acknowledged that the email should have been referred directly to the safeguarding team.

Mr Wali maintained that he did not intend to withhold safeguarding information and stated that he took steps to report the concerns by making a CPOMS entry on 27 January 2024. He accepted, however, that this did not fully comply with the safeguarding procedures that he was expected to follow.

The panel considered the Safeguarding and Child Protection Policy effective from 22 September 2023. The panel noted that the policy provided that safeguarding concerns

should be reported to the Designated Safeguarding Lead, Deputy Designated Safeguarding Lead, or a member of the senior leadership team.

The panel considered the evidence of Witness B that safeguarding concerns should be shared directly with the safeguarding team and the evidence of Witness A that safeguarding matters should be referred promptly to those with safeguarding responsibility.

The panel also considered Mr Wali's evidence that, upon receiving the email from Pupil A on 27 January 2024, he contacted Individual A and subsequently made a CPOMS entry later that day. The panel noted that Individual A was described in the evidence as [REDACTED] and a member of the senior leadership team.

The panel carefully considered whether reporting the matter to Individual A amounted to compliance with the safeguarding procedures. The panel noted Witness B's evidence that Individual A was not a member of the safeguarding team. However, the panel also noted the safeguarding policy, which permitted concerns to be reported to a member of the senior leadership team.

The panel was satisfied that Mr Wali raised the safeguarding concern with Individual A and subsequently recorded the matter on CPOMS. Whilst the panel considered that referring the matter directly to the safeguarding team may have been preferable, it was not satisfied that the evidence established that Mr Wali failed to follow the safeguarding procedures as alleged.

Having considered the oral, written and documentary evidence, including the CPOMS entry dated 27 January 2024, the panel was satisfied that Mr Wali did not send an email that he received from Pupil A directly to a member of the Academy's Safeguarding Team however was not satisfied that it was proven, on the balance of probabilities, that Mr Wali, in failing to do so, did not follow the training and/or recommended actions from the meeting of 29 January 2024.

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

b. On or around 8 February 2024, you did not upload the email that Pupil A had sent you onto CPOMs.

The panel noted that Mr Wali denied allegation 2(b). Whilst he accepted that he did not upload the email itself to CPOMS, he maintained that he had recorded the substance of its contents and did not accept that his actions amounted to a failure to follow safeguarding procedures and/or recommended actions.

The panel noted that Mr Wali denied that his conduct in allegation 2(b) amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Witness A. In his written statement, Witness A stated that safeguarding concerns should be recorded fully and accurately on CPOMS and shared with the safeguarding team. He explained that staff were required to ensure that relevant information was properly documented so that safeguarding concerns could be appropriately assessed and acted upon.

The panel also considered the oral evidence and written statement of Witness B. In her witness statement, Witness B stated that, on 8 February 2024, Mr Wali made a CPOMS entry in relation to Pupil A but did not upload the email itself, instead providing an overview of its contents. She stated that the full email should have been uploaded to CPOMS in accordance with the guidance she had previously provided to Mr Wali.

The panel noted Witness B's evidence, as set out in her witness statement and confirmed in oral evidence, that safeguarding procedures required staff to record concerns in full and to provide complete information to the safeguarding team. She explained that, in her view, providing only a summary, rather than the full email, did not comply with those procedures.

In her oral evidence, Witness B confirmed that the purpose of requiring the full email to be uploaded was to ensure that safeguarding staff had access to all relevant information and could properly assess the level of risk and determine the appropriate response.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Mr Wali. Mr Wali acknowledged that, on or around 8 February 2024, he did not upload the email sent by Pupil A onto CPOMS and instead recorded a summary of its contents. In his oral evidence, Mr Wali stated that he believed, at the time, that recording the substance of the email on CPOMS was sufficient. He accepted, however, that he should have uploaded the full email and that there was no reason why he could not have done so.

Mr Wali further accepted that, following the meeting with Witness B on 29 January 2024, he did not report all of the emails he received from Pupil A. However, he maintained that he was attempting to raise safeguarding concerns and did not deliberately withhold information from the safeguarding team.

The panel noted that Mr Wali accepted that, on or around 8 February 2024, he did not upload the email received from Pupil A onto CPOMS and instead recorded a summary of its contents.

The panel considered Witness B's evidence that staff were expected to provide complete information to the safeguarding team and that, in her view, the full email should have been uploaded to CPOMS. The panel also considered her evidence that she had advised Mr Wali during the meeting on 29 January 2024 to forward emails from Pupil A to the safeguarding team and to record concerns appropriately.

The panel carefully considered whether the evidence established that Mr Wali had been instructed, either through safeguarding training or during the meeting with Witness B on 29 January 2024, that he was required to upload the full email onto CPOMS. The panel noted that the note of the meeting did not expressly state that the full email must be uploaded to CPOMS, and that it had no contemporaneous written record clearly demonstrating that such an instruction had been given.

The panel also considered the evidence that Mr Wali had recorded information from the email on CPOMS and had not concealed the existence of the communication. Whilst the panel accepted that he did not upload the email itself, it was not satisfied that the evidence established that he had failed to follow safeguarding training and/or the recommended actions from the meeting in the manner alleged.

Having considered the oral, written and documentary evidence, including the CPOMS entry dated 8 February 2024, the panel was not satisfied on the balance of probabilities that Mr Wali failed to follow safeguarding training and/or the recommended actions from the meeting by not uploading the email itself onto CPOMS.

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

3. Your conduct referred to in paragraphs 1(a), 1(b) and/or 1(c) above was of a sexual nature.

The panel considered whether the conduct found proved at allegations 1(a) and 1(b) was of a sexual nature.

The panel noted that Mr Wali denied allegation 3. The panel also noted that Mr Wali denied that his conduct in allegation 3 amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Mr Wali. In his written statement, Mr Wali denied that his conduct towards Pupil A was of a sexual nature. He maintained that his actions were driven by concern for Pupil A's welfare and wellbeing.

In his oral evidence, Mr Wali stated that his intention throughout was to support Pupil A because he was concerned about her [REDACTED] and her personal circumstances. He accepted that he had failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries. However, he denied that the emails were sexual in nature.

Mr Wali acknowledged that comments within the email exchanges, including references to finding Pupil A a "*perfect boyfriend*", telling her that she "*meant a lot*" to him, and stating that he cared about her, were inappropriate in the context of a teacher-pupil relationship. He accepted that such comments could blur professional boundaries and be open to misinterpretation. Mr Wali maintained, however, that these comments were intended to reassure and support Pupil A and denied that they were sexual in nature.

Mr Wali further stated in his oral evidence that he now recognised that his use of informal language, engagement in discussions about personal matters, and the extent of his communications with Pupil A were inappropriate and capable of creating over familiarity and reliance. He accepted that these actions contributed to the safeguarding concerns that arose.

Mr Wali denied that he had sought to isolate Pupil A from other sources of support. He maintained that safeguarding concerns should have been reported through the appropriate channels and accepted that he had made mistakes in failing to do so. However, he maintained that his conduct, whilst inappropriate and unprofessional, was not of a sexual nature.

The panel considered whether the conduct found proved at allegations 1(a) and 1(b) was of a sexual nature. In doing so, it had regard to *section 78 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003* and the relevant case law.

The panel accepted that the email correspondence between Mr Wali and Pupil A was excessive, over familiar and crossed professional boundaries. The panel also accepted that a number of the emails contained inappropriate comments and expressions of personal support.

The panel considered in particular Mr Wali's comments that Pupil A "*meant a lot*" to him, that he cared about her, and that he would find her a "*perfect boyfriend*". The panel also considered the frequency of the communications and the discussions concerning Pupil A's personal circumstances and wellbeing.

However, the panel was not satisfied that the language used in the emails was sexual in nature. The panel noted that the emails contained no sexualised language, references to sexual activity, innuendo, or requests for a personal or intimate relationship.

The panel further considered whether, having regard to the nature, content and context of the communications, the emails were sexual in nature. Having considered all of the evidence, the panel was not satisfied that the language used, the content of the emails, or the surrounding circumstances were such that a reasonable person would regard the communications as sexual. Whilst the panel found that the communications were over familiar and inappropriate within the context of a teacher-pupil relationship, it did not find that they were, by their nature, sexual or that because of their nature they may be sexual and because of its circumstances or the purpose of any person in relation to them they were sexual.

Accordingly, having considered the oral, written and documentary evidence, together with the submissions of the parties and the authorities to which it was referred, the panel found allegation 3 not proved.

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

Having found allegations (1) (a) and (b) proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In doing so, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: The prohibition of teachers, which is referred to as “the Advice”.

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

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher’s professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils’ well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Wali, in relation to the facts found proved, involved a breach of Keeping Children Safe In Education (“KCSIE”).

The panel considered that Mr Wali was in breach of the following provision:

In Part 1, Paragraph 3: No single practitioner can have a full picture of a child’s needs and circumstances. If children and families are to receive the right help at the right time, everyone who comes into contact with them has a role to play in identifying concerns, sharing information and taking prompt action.

The panel also considered whether Mr Wali’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 none of these offences was relevant.

In determining whether Mr Wali's conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct, the panel had regard to the conduct found proved at allegations 1(a) and 1(b). The panel found that Mr Wali failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with a vulnerable pupil over a sustained period. The panel noted that he engaged in excessive and over familiar communications, assumed a role that went beyond that of a teacher, and encouraged Pupil A to look to him as a primary source of support.

The panel further noted emails in which Mr Wali appeared to discourage or minimise the involvement of safeguarding staff, including comments such as "*I'm not gonna tell her now. Relax*" and "*I will help you*". The panel considered that these communications risked encouraging Pupil A to place greater reliance on Mr Wali than on the Academy's safeguarding systems and those more appropriately responsible for her welfare. The panel considered that this represented a significant departure from the professional boundaries and safeguarding expectations placed upon teachers.

The panel acknowledged that Mr Wali was an Early Career Teacher at the relevant time. However, it did not consider that his relative inexperience excused the conduct found proved. The panel noted the evidence that he had received safeguarding training and considered that he should have understood the importance of following the Academy's safeguarding procedures.

The panel further found that Mr Wali engaged in discussions with Pupil A about highly personal matters, communicated with her in an over familiar manner, and made comments which disregarded the distinction between a professional teacher-pupil relationship. The panel found that this created a risk of dependency and reliance on Mr Wali, rather than encouraging Pupil A to engage with the appropriate safeguarding channels and those responsible for her welfare and support. By this conduct, the panel considered that Mr Wali potentially increased the level of risk to Pupil A.

The panel also noted that Mr Wali shared with Pupil A some of his own negative views about the Academy and safeguarding processes. In doing so, he risked undermining Pupil A's confidence in the systems and the professionals more appropriately responsible for supporting her and other vulnerable pupils.

The panel considered that maintaining appropriate professional boundaries and safeguarding pupils are fundamental aspects of a teacher's role. The conduct found proved represented a significant departure from those standards.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Wali 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 Wali was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Mr Wali'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 Wali's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice.

The panel found that none of these offences was relevant.

The panel considered that members of the public, parents and pupils would expect teachers to maintain appropriate professional boundaries and to raise concerns regarding vulnerable pupils through the appropriate safeguarding channels. The panel noted that Mr Wali engaged in excessive and over familiar communications with a vulnerable pupil and placed himself in a position which disregarded the distinction between a professional teacher-pupil relationship.

The panel further considered that the content of the communications, including Mr Wali presenting himself as a primary source of support and positioning himself as someone to whom Pupil A should turn rather than using the appropriate safeguarding channels, had the potential to undermine confidence in those systems. The panel considered that parents and members of the public would be concerned by such conduct and would expect teachers to maintain clear professional boundaries at all times.

The panel concluded that the conduct found proved would be likely to undermine public confidence in the profession and in the standards expected of teachers.

The panel was satisfied that a member of the public, having considered the nature of the conduct found proved, would be likely to regard it as conduct falling below the standards expected of a teacher and as capable of adversely affecting the reputation of the profession.

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.

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

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

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

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

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

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Wali, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of inappropriate and excessive communications with a child.

The panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Wali 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 Wali 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 Wali in the profession.

The panel took account of Mr Wali's personal circumstances and background, including his evidence regarding his journey into teaching and his commitment to supporting pupils from backgrounds similar to his own.

The panel considered whether there was a public interest in retaining Mr Wali in the profession. The panel considered that Mr Wali had the potential to make a positive contribution to the profession in the future. There was evidence before the panel that Mr Wali, who was an Early Careers Teacher at the time of the misconduct, nonetheless had shown ability to become an educator, and the professional references provided insight into his early progress.

The panel therefore concluded that there was a public interest in retaining Mr Wali in the profession, as no doubt had been cast upon his abilities as an educator and he remained capable of making a positive contribution to the profession.

The panel had found that Mr Wali's conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, and it considered that the conduct arose from seriously flawed professional judgement and a failure to maintain appropriate professional boundaries, rather than from any improper or exploitative motive. The panel found no evidence that Mr Wali intended to cause harm to Pupil A.

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the conduct found proved. It noted that maintaining appropriate professional boundaries and adhering to safeguarding procedures are fundamental responsibilities of the teaching profession. The panel also noted 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 considered that Mr Wali's conduct represented a significant departure from the standards expected of a teacher, particularly in relation to maintaining professional boundaries and adhering to safeguarding processes. The panel considered that his actions created a potential risk of harm to a vulnerable pupil and risked undermining the safeguarding measures that were in place to protect her.

The panel noted that it had not received evidence demonstrating that Pupil A had suffered actual harm as a result of Mr Wali's conduct, although it considered that there had been a potential risk of harm arising from the conduct found proved.

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 Wali.

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

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk; and
- 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).

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order could 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.

The panel accepted that Mr Wali's actions were deliberate and there was no evidence to suggest that Mr Wali was acting under extreme duress.

The panel did not consider that Mr Wali, as an Early Careers Teacher, had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct. However, the panel took account of the positive evidence regarding his abilities as an educator, including the additional responsibilities entrusted to him during his employment at the Academy, the evidence of his professional development and progression since qualifying as a teacher, and the positive, though limited, character references provided on his behalf.

The panel considered whether Mr Wali demonstrated any remorse or insight in relation to his actions. The panel considered that Mr Wali had said he reflected on the impact of his actions, including the potential risk of harm to a vulnerable pupil, the burden placed on safeguarding colleagues, and the potential to undermine public confidence in the profession. The panel also noted that Mr Wali provided evidence which shows he has taken steps to address his conduct, including engaging in personal reflection and therapy, and that he stated he had developed a clearer understanding of the importance of maintaining professional boundaries and adhering strictly to safeguarding protocols.

The panel found that Mr Wali had demonstrated some insight into his conduct. The panel noted that he made admissions to allegations 1(a) and 1(b), accepted and apologised for having failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries. He reflected that he had become over involved in matters which should have been dealt with through safeguarding processes, and acknowledged that his actions had the potential to create inappropriate reliance upon him.

The panel also noted that Mr Wali, prior to the hearing, had undertaken further training relating to safeguarding and professional boundaries, including courses on safeguarding children, professional boundaries and professional relationships with young people. The panel considered that his reflective statement demonstrated insight into the risks of emotional dependency, blurred professional boundaries, and the importance of following safeguarding procedures and escalating concerns appropriately.

The panel noted that Mr Wali had reflected on the importance of maintaining professional boundaries, the risk of emotional dependency and over reliance, the importance of safeguarding procedures, and the potential consequences of becoming too personally involved in a pupil's welfare. In particular, the panel noted Mr Wali's acknowledgment that

maintaining professional boundaries helps ensure relationships remain focused on the needs and welfare of the individual rather than becoming overly personal or emotionally dependent, and his recognition that poor boundary management can result in emotional dependency, blurred roles and a loss of professional objectivity. The panel considered that these reflections demonstrated insight into the failings identified in this case and reduced the risk of repetition.

The panel was satisfied that Mr Wali now recognised the seriousness of his failings and had taken meaningful steps to address the shortcomings identified in this case. The panel considered the risk of repetition to be low.

The panel considered the character references provided on behalf of Mr Wali. The panel noted character references from the following individuals:

- [REDACTED] – a friend of Mr Wali

“what reassures me about Jamil as an individual is the quality of his professional judgement as his attitude to undertaking tasks as simple as booking a game of football displays his level of professional behaviour to a high standard.” ...

- [REDACTED] – a friend of Mr Wali

“In terms of his character, I consider Jamil to be an honest and trustworthy person with strong integrity. He has always conducted himself respectfully in my presence and has shown a genuine willingness to help others where he can. He is someone who reflects on his actions and takes responsibility. Although I have not directly observed him in a teaching environment, I have seen his dedication, patience, and commitment in general life, which I believe would translate positively into his professional role.”

- [REDACTED] - a friend of Mr Wali

“During Jamil's time teaching at Kings Leadership Academy Liverpool, I heard nothing but positive things about his pupils, especially the challenging ones. He always strived to provide the best for all of his pupils, reflecting the same dedication and care he showed to everyone in his life, myself included. This is a direct result of his compassionate nature and his genuine passion for helping those around him succeed.”

Whilst the panel accepted that these references spoke positively about Mr Wali's character, compassion and commitment to helping others, the panel noted that they were predominantly from friends and were not written by individuals who had observed his conduct within a professional teaching environment. The panel therefore attached some, but limited, weight to this evidence when assessing his suitability to remain in the profession.

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.

Applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, the panel concluded that a recommendation for a prohibition order would not be proportionate or necessary in this case. Whilst the panel identified behaviours which engaged factors set out in the Advice that may indicate a prohibition order is appropriate, it considered that the overall circumstances of the case, including the level of insight demonstrated, the significant remedial steps taken, the low risk of repetition, the absence of any finding of conduct of a sexual nature, and the absence of evidence of actual harm to Pupil A, weighed against recommending prohibition.

The panel considered that the nature and severity of the conduct found proved were at the less serious end of the spectrum of cases that may justify a prohibition order. The panel was satisfied that the adverse findings of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, together with publication of the decision, were sufficient to mark the seriousness of the misconduct, and were sufficient to meet the objectives of: sending an appropriate message as to the standards of behaviour expected of teachers; upholding public confidence in the profession; and declaring and maintaining proper professional standards.

The panel considered that Mr Wali had demonstrated insight and remediation and by doing so, this reduced the potential risk to pupils, the public or the reputation of the profession. The panel concluded that a prohibition order would be disproportionate in all the circumstances of this case.

Accordingly, the panel determined that it would not be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

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

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

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Jamil Wali 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 Wali is in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Wali involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE).

The panel has found that the conduct of Mr Wali 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 or 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 Wali, 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 the light of the panel’s findings against Mr Wali, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of inappropriate and excessive communications with a child.”

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 including:

“The panel noted that Mr Wali had reflected on the importance of maintaining professional boundaries, the risk of emotional dependency and over reliance, the importance of safeguarding procedures, and the potential consequences of becoming too personally involved in a pupil's welfare. In particular, the panel noted Mr Wali's acknowledgment that maintaining professional boundaries helps ensure relationships remain focused on the needs and welfare of the individual rather than becoming overly personal or emotionally dependent, and his recognition that poor boundary management can result in emotional dependency, blurred roles and a loss of professional objectivity. The panel considered that these reflections demonstrated insight into the failings identified in this case and reduced the risk of repetition.”

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 panel further considered that the content of the communications, including Mr Wali presenting himself as a primary source of support and positioning himself as someone to whom Pupil A should turn rather than using the appropriate safeguarding channels, had the potential to undermine confidence in those systems. The panel considered that parents and members of the public would be concerned by such conduct and would expect teachers to maintain clear professional boundaries at all times.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of a teacher exchanging inappropriate and excessive emails with a pupil 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 or 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 Wali. The panel has commented:

“The panel did not consider that Mr Wali, as an Early Careers Teacher, had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct. However, the panel took account of the positive evidence regarding his abilities as an educator, including the additional responsibilities entrusted to him during his employment at the Academy, the evidence of his professional development and progression since qualifying as a teacher, and the positive, though limited, character references provided on his behalf.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Wali 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 view that “the nature and severity of the conduct found proved were at the less serious end of the spectrum of cases that may justify a prohibition order.”

I have taken into account the panel's finding that “Mr Wali's actions were deliberate and there was no evidence to suggest that Mr Wali was acting under extreme duress.” However, I have placed considerable weight on the panel's comments on the insight and remorse shown by Mr Wali and its view that the risk of repetition was low. The panel has said that “the overall circumstances of the case, including the level of insight demonstrated, the significant remedial steps taken, the low risk of repetition, the absence of any finding of conduct of a sexual nature, and the absence of evidence of actual harm to Pupil A, weighed against recommending prohibition.”

For these reasons, I have agreed with the panel and decided 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.



Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 29 July 2026

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