



Mr Anthony Hook: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

August 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	23
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	26

Professional conduct panel decision

Teacher: Mr Anthony Hook

Teacher ref number: 0050932

Teacher date of birth: 25 July 1960

TRA reference: 19462

Date of determination: 7 August 2026

Former employer: Wright Robinson College, Gorton, Manchester.

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 6 and 7 August 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Anthony Hook.

The panel members were Mrs Jane Brothwood (lay panellist – in the chair), Mr Francis Murphy (teacher panellist) and Ms Claire Lane (teacher panellist).

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

The presenting officer for the TRA was Brittany Buckell of Capsticks LLP, solicitors.

Mr Anthony Hook was not present and was not represented.

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

Allegations

The panel considered the allegation set out in the Notice of Proceedings dated 7 May 2026.

It was alleged that Mr Anthony Hook was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that whilst employed as a teacher at Wright Robinson College ("the School") he:

1. On various dates between 1 November 2018 and 25 January 2019:
 - a. placed his hand on Pupil A's shoulder on one or more occasions;
 - b. ran his fingers through Pupil A's hair on one or more occasions;
 - c. said to Pupil A "I like your lippy" or words to that effect;
 - d. ran his hands through and/ or played with Pupil B's hair on one or more occasions;
 - e. ran his hands through and/ or played with Pupil C's hair on one or more occasions;
 - f. sang a song to Pupil A about how much he loved her;
 - g. stated "you can come over to my house for a change" or words to that effect in response to Pupil B asking him to check their work;
 - h. made comment that "I will be your prom date" or words to that effect, on one or more occasions to Pupil B and/or Pupil C;
 - i. Wrote "I love Hooky" and/ or "I love Mr Hook" on Pupil C and/or Pupil R's exercise book and/ or planner.
2. On or about 25 January 2019, he put his hand on Pupil B's shoulder and/or walked Pupil B down the corridor.
3. On an unknown date, he:
 - a. played with and/ or touched Pupil L's hair on one or more occasions;
 - b. contacted Pupil L on social media as set out in Schedule 1.
4. On an unknown date between September 2016 and July 2019, he:
 - a. touched and/ or played with Pupil O's hair on one or more occasions;
 - b. said Pupil M was "beautiful" and/or that she had "beautiful hair" on one or more occasions.
5. His conduct at any or all of Particulars 1 to 4 was sexually motivated.

Schedule 1

[REDACTED]

In his response to the Notice of Proceedings dated 2 June 2026, Mr Hook admitted particulars 1, 2, 3 and 4 in full. He denied particular 5.

Mr Hook accepted that his admitted actions amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and 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, anonymised pupil list and list of key people – pages 5 to 9

Section 2: Notice of referral proceedings, response and Notice of Hearing – pages 10 to 53

Section 3: Statement of Agreed Facts – pages 54 to 59

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 60 to 498 (including CCTV footage provided separately)

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 499 to 501.

The panel also received in advance of the hearing the following:

- an anonymisation list which included pupils' names
- a bundle for preliminary application(s) which included various communications between the TRA and Mr Hook, including the Amended Notice of Referral and the Notice of Proceedings – pages 1 to 62.

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

- additional emails from the TRA to Mr Hook dated 29 October 2025 and 23 February 2026 – pages 1 to 3.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundles and viewed the CCTV footage, 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 May 2020 ("the Procedures").

Witnesses

No witnesses were called by the presenting officer.

Mr Hook was not in attendance, and no witnesses were called on his behalf.

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 2001, Mr Hook commenced employment as a Teacher of Mathematics at Wright Robinson College ("the School").

Between 2017 and 2019 the alleged conduct took place.

On 18 January 2019, concerns were reported to the School's Deputy Head Teacher, by a year 11 Learning Mentor on behalf of Pupil A.

On or about 1 February 2019, the alleged misconduct was reported to Manchester City Council's Designated Officer for Safeguarding ("LADO").

On 4 February 2019, Mr Hook was suspended from duty.

On 5 February 2019, concerns were reported to the Deputy Head Teacher by Pupil D.

On 7 February 2019, further alleged misconduct was reported to the LADO.

Between February 2019 and May 2020, the police undertook an investigation.
[REDACTED]

In May 2020, the police issued a press release. Further pupils came forward
[REDACTED].

raised new allegations about Mr Hook.

On or about 19 May 2020, the School started an investigation.

On 6 July 2020, a disciplinary hearing was held. Mr Hook ceased to be employed at the School.

On 19 August 2020, a referral was made to the TRA.

[REDACTED]

On 13 June 2023, an allegation about Mr Hook was referred to the TRA Professional Conduct Panel.

On 23 June 2025, an amended Notice of Referral was sent to Mr Hook.

On 5 July 2025, Mr Hook's amended response to the amended Notice of Referral was received.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact were as follows:

In the consideration of the case the panel accepted the legal advice provided. It had regard to Mr Hook's good character; he had had no previous TRA findings against him. In its consideration of the factual allegations the panel applied the civil standard of proof, the balance of probabilities.

1. On various dates between 1 November 2018 and 25 January 2019:

a. placed your hand on Pupil A's shoulder on one or more occasions;

The panel noted the following from the materials before it:

- Individual A, confirmed in a police statement dated 7 February 2019, that Pupil A had reported to her a few weeks previously that Mr Hook had put his arm around them.
- In their police interview on 17 February 2019, Pupil A stated that Mr Hook had put his hand onto their shoulder when they were walking down the hallway at School and when he had made the remark to them about their lip gloss. They had brushed his arm off. This had made them feel uncomfortable. They also stated that Mr Hook put his arm around them in the classroom, sometimes in front of the class, for example when they went to him to get work. This also made them feel uncomfortable. They said this happened about 10 times in total, sometimes once or twice in a day. This had taken place when other pupils were present.
- In his police interview on 8 February 2019 Mr Hook could not recall putting his hand around Pupil A's shoulders. He did not know if it might have happened or not.
- In the notes of the School's investigatory meeting with Mr Hook on 21 May 2020, Mr Hook is recorded as saying that he did not, to his knowledge, place his arm around Pupil A's shoulder.
- Mr Hook admitted the facts of particular 1a in his response to the Notice of Referral dated 5 July 2025, in his response to the amended Notice of Referral dated 17 February 2026, and, in his response to the Notice of Proceedings dated 2 June 2026.

- In the statement of agreed facts Mr Hook admitted that he had placed his hand on Pupil A's shoulder on one or more occasions.

Taking account of the evidence in support of particular 1a, which the panel found to be consistent with the admissions made by Mr Hook, the panel accepted the admissions made by Mr Hook and found particular 1a proven.

b. ran your fingers through Pupil A's hair on one or more occasions;

The panel noted the following from the materials before it:

- In their police interview on 17 February 2019, Pupil A stated that Mr Hook had touched their hair but "not that often". If it was a particular way, like curly, he would touch it and go "oh that's nice". They would say "thank you" and he would say "you're welcome".
- In his police interview on 8 February 2019 Mr Hook denied that he played with Pupil A's hair.
- In the notes of the School's investigatory meeting with Mr Hook on 21 May 2020 Mr Hook is recorded as saying that he did not play with Pupil A's hair.
- Mr Hook admitted the facts of particular 1b in his response to the Notice of Referral dated 5 July 2025, in his response to the amended Notice of Referral dated 17 February 2026, and, in his response to the Notice of Proceedings dated 2 June 2026.
- In the statement of agreed facts Mr Hook admitted that he ran his fingers through Pupil A's hair on one or more occasions.

Taking account of the evidence in support of particular 1b, which the panel found to be consistent with the admission made by Mr Hook, the panel accepted the admission made by Mr Hook and found particular 1b proven.

c. said to Pupil A "I like your lippy" or words to that effect;

The panel noted the following from the materials before it:

- Individual A, confirmed in a police statement dated 7 February 2019, that Pupil A had reported to her a few weeks previously that Mr Hook had put his arm around them and said "I love the lippy". The School's investigation report recorded that Pupil A had reported to Individual A that Mr Hook had said "how much he liked ..[their] lippy".
- In their police interview on 17 February 2019, Pupil A stated that sometime after they had been in his class for a few months, they had been walking down the corridor and Mr Hook had put his arm around them and looked at their lips and

said “I love your lippy today”. They had replied “thanks” and went off to their class. This made Pupil A feel uncomfortable and they took the lip gloss off until they were out of his class.

- In his police interview on 8 February 2019 Mr Hook accepted that “saying I like your lippy would be something I would definitely ... say ... that would be something very much in line with the way I am”. He said that looking back he was mindful that this “probably was not the wisest thing [he] ... could do ... it was just ... to have a nice chat”.
- Mr Hook had admitted the facts of particular 1c in his response to the Notice of Referral dated 5 July 2025, in his response to the amended Notice of Referral dated 17 February 2026, and, in his response to the Notice of Proceedings dated 2 June 2026.
- In the statement of agreed facts Mr Hook admitted that he said to Pupil A, “I like your lippy” or words to that effect.
- In his statement to the TRA Mr Hook stated that the comment he made about Pupil A’s “lipstick related solely to its unusual green colour, which stood out from the more typical cosmetic shades”. He said that his “intention was benign; however, ... [he accepted] that such remarks, even when innocuous, may be open to misinterpretation”.

Taking account of the evidence in support of particular 1c, which the panel found to be consistent with the admission made by Mr Hook, the panel accepted the admission made by Mr Hook and found particular 1c proven.

d. ran your hands through and/or played with Pupil B’s hair on one or more occasions;

The panel noted the following from the materials before it:

- Individual A, confirmed in a police statement dated 7 February 2019, that Pupil A had reported to her a few weeks previously that Pupil B said that Mr Hook would walk behind them [pupils] and play with their hair.
- The notes of the School’s investigatory interview with Pupil B records that Pupil B stated that Mr Hook plays with their hair, he “twirls it”.
- In his police interview on 8 February 2019 Mr Hook stated that he might have played with Pupil B’s hair, touching it or flicking it. There was no reason for this. He was just trying to make people happy which is all he ever tried to do. Mr Hook also stated it was possible that he may have twirled Pupil B’s hair.
- In their police interview on 17 February 2019, Pupil B stated that Mr Hook would walk past them in the classroom and move their hair into their face. They would

tell him to stop and he would say that he loved winding them up. They said that he did that “loads”. They also said that on one occasion, when he came back from the toilet, he started playing with their hair, and they demonstrated by pulling on their ponytail on the left side.

- In their police interview on 17 February 2019 Pupil A stated that Mr Hook touched people’s hair and that this included Pupil B.
- In his police interview on 4 April 2019 Mr Hook stated that he thought that he had touched Pupil B’s hair when they had it cut short.
- In the notes of the School’s investigatory meeting with Mr Hook on 21 May 2020, Mr Hook is recorded as saying that Pupil B had had their hair cut and he flicked it in an affirmative way. He said that there was no indication that they were bothered or upset. If there had been he would have stopped at once and apologised.
- Mr Hook had admitted the facts of particular 1d in his response to the Notice of Referral dated 5 July 2025, in his response to the amended Notice of Referral dated 17 February 2026, and, in his response to the Notice of Proceedings dated 2 June 2026.
- In the statement of agreed facts Mr Hook admitted that he ran his hands through and/or played with Pupil B's hair on one or more occasions.

Taking account of the evidence in support of particular 1d, which the panel found to be consistent with the admission made by Mr Hook, the panel accepted the admission made by Mr Hook and found particular 1d proven.

e. ran your hands through and/ or played with Pupil C’s hair on one or more occasions;

The panel noted the following from the materials before it:

- In their police interview on 17 February 2019 Pupil A stated that Mr Hook touched people’s hair and that this included Pupil C.
- In their police interview on 21 March 2019 Pupil C stated that Mr Hook would walk past them when they were sitting down and play with their hair. He used to do that to others too. They said it happened to them about twice or probably more times than that. They described it as “just weird”. They demonstrated what he did by running their fingers through their hair to the back of their head. They said that this took place when they were in Year 8 or 9. They said it did not happen when they were in Year 11.
- In his police interview on 4 April 2019 Mr Hook, when asked about touching Pupil C’s hair in Year 9, stated that he could not recall it, so could not say yes or no.

- In the notes of the School's investigatory interview with Mr Hook on 21 May 2020, he accepted that he had sat behind Pupil C and batted their hair from side to side. He said it was intended to be a light-hearted bit of fun.
- Mr Hook had admitted the facts of particular 1e in his response to the Notice of Referral dated 5 July 2025, in his response to the amended Notice of Referral dated 17 February 2026, and, in his response to the Notice of Proceedings dated 2 June 2026.
- In the statement of agreed facts Mr Hook admitted that he ran his hands through Pupil C's hair on one or more occasions and that he played with Pupil C's hair on one or more occasions.

The panel considered, on the basis of the evidence given by Pupil C in police interview as to when the hair touching took place, that this would put those events outside of the timescale specified in the opening section of particular 1 of the allegation.

On that basis the panel determined not to accept Mr Hook's admission to particular 1e and found particular 1e not proven.

f. sang a song to Pupil A about how much you loved her;

The panel noted the following from the materials before it:

- Individual A, confirmed in a police statement dated 7 February 2019, that Pupil A had reported to her a few weeks previously that Mr Hook had sung a song about how much he loved them in front of them. The school investigation report stated that Pupil A had reported that this took place in November 2018.
- In their police interview on 17 February 2019, Pupil A described that they and Pupil W were in Mr Hook's classroom when Mr Hook has asked them if they wanted to hear a song he had made for Pupil A. He had then sung the song which included the words "I love you", words which he had kept repeating with some other words then added. This went on for about three minutes. He had asked Pupil A if they liked it with a smile on his face and they just nodded. Pupil A said they felt a bit uncomfortable and weird. They found it a "bit weird" from him as their teacher.
- In his police interview on 8 February 2019 Mr Hook stated that he had no idea about this alleged matter. He said he honestly did not know about it. He denied writing a song for Pupil A.
- In the School's investigatory interview with him on 21 May 2020, Mr Hook said that he did not sing a love song to Pupil A but he briefly sang a made-up nonsense song "more generally".

- Mr Hook had admitted the facts of particular 1f in his response to the Notice of Referral dated 5 July 2025, in his response to the amended Notice of Referral dated 17 February 2026, and, in his response to the Notice of Proceedings dated 2 June 2026.
- In the statement of agreed facts Mr Hook admitted that he sang a song to Pupil A about how much he loved them.

The panel found Pupil A's account of this event compelling as their recall of it appeared very specific and detailed.

Taking account of the evidence in support of particular 1f, which the panel found to be consistent with the admission made by Mr Hook, the panel accepted the admissions made by Mr Hook and found particular 1f proven.

g. stated "you can come over to my house for a change" or words to that effect in response to Pupil B asking you to check their work;

The panel noted the following from the materials before it:

- Individual A, confirmed in a police statement dated 7 February 2019, that Pupil A had reported to her a few weeks previously that when Pupil B had asked him to check their work he had turned around and said "Come over to my house for a change".
- In his police interview on 8 February 2019 Mr Hook denied that he had said to Pupil B "you can come over to my house for a change".
- In their police interview on 17 February 2019, Pupil A stated that on an occasion when Pupil B asked Mr Hook to check their work he had said "you come over to my house". This was said in front of the class. Pupil B looked at everyone; Mr Hook had laughed. Pupil B said something like "I have never been to your house and you have never been to mine".
- In their police interview on 17 February 2019 Pupil B stated that they asked Mr Hook for assistance and he said "why don't you come to my house then". Everyone in the class heard. They thought he meant for them to come to his desk but they were not sure about this. This happened a few days before Mr Hook was suspended.
- In their police interview on 21 March 2019, Pupil C stated that Pupil B was sitting at their desk, raised their hand, and asked Mr Hook to come over and help them with a question. He walked over and made a remark to the effect that he was sick of having to come over to Pupil B and said "you need to come over to my house". The class, who were present, all looked at Pupil B who was laughing about it.

- In the School's investigatory interview with him on 21 May 2020 Mr Hook said that he had no recollection of ever saying this or words of that nature.
- Mr Hook had admitted the facts of particular 1g in his response to the Notice of Referral dated 5 July 2025, in his response to the amended Notice of Referral dated 17 February 2026, and, in his response to the Notice of Proceedings dated 2 June 2026.
- In the statement of agreed facts Mr Hook admitted that he said to Pupil B, "you can come to my house for a change" or words to that effect, in response to Pupil B asking him to check their work.

The panel considered that there was an ambiguity about the meaning of the expression detailed in particular 1g, whether it meant Mr Hook's physical home or his desk in his classroom. The panel was unable to explore this issue in the absence of live witness evidence. Taking this into account the panel considered that it was appropriate for it to adopt the meaning most favourable to Mr Hook which was that he was referring to his desk in his classroom.

Taking account of the evidence in support of particular 1g, which the panel found to be consistent with the admission made by Mr Hook, the panel accepted the admissions made by Mr Hook and found particular 1g proven.

h. made comment that "I will be your prom date" or words to that effect, on one or more occasions to Pupil B and/or Pupil C;

The panel noted the following from the materials before it:

- Individual A, confirmed in a police statement dated 7 February 2019, that Pupil A had reported to her a few weeks previously that Mr Hook asked Pupil B and Pupil C to be his prom date. The School's investigation report recorded that Pupil A had said to Individual A that Mr Hook frequently tells particular year 11 pupils, girls, "I will be your prom date".
- The notes of the School's investigatory interview with Pupil B on 4 February 2019 records that Pupil B stated Mr Hook asked them if they were going to the prom and said "You can be my prom date".
- In his police interview on 8 February 2019 Mr Hook stated that he recalled saying to Pupil C that they were going to be his prom date but that it was only a bit of fun. He said he thought that he had "that kind of relationship" and it was "fun, that was all". On reflection he appreciated that perhaps it was not the wisest thing to do. He had known Pupil C [REDACTED] Mr Hook stated that he definitely asked Pupil B about going to the prom but he did not think that he had asked them to be his prom date.

- In their police interview on 17 February 2019 Pupil B stated that Mr Hook said to them (and to a few others) “you are my prom date”. They said the class was talking about the prom and he had said “all you can be my prom date” and then he switched to different pupils, girls, including to Pupil C. telling Pupil C “you can be my prom date”. He said it to Pupil B “like twice, three times”.
- In their police interview on 21 March 2019 Pupil C said that before the prom that year Mr Hook would say to Pupil C I want to see you on the prom date and “you’re my prom date aren’t you”. People would look at them and laugh about it. He repeated this the following day. The prom was coming up and they did not feel at ease; they did not think it was right.
- In the School’s investigatory interview with him on 21 May 2020 Mr Hook accepted that he had made this remark to year 11 students as a bit of fun. He said it was said in a light-hearted manner and in no way could be mistaken as an actual offer. He believed his comments had been misunderstood.
- In their police statement Pupil P dated 15 July 2021, Pupil P recalled Mr Hook asking Pupil C to go to the prom with him. Pupil P said that Pupil C would laugh it off but Pupil P could see that they were uncomfortable about it.
- Mr Hook had admitted the facts of particular 1h in his response to the Notice of Referral dated 5 July 2025, in his response to the amended Notice of Referral dated 17 February 2026, and, in his response to the Notice of Proceedings dated 2 June 2026.
- In the statement of agreed facts Mr Hook admitted that he said to Pupil B, “I will be your prom date” or words to that effect on one or more occasions. Mr Hook also admitted that he said to Pupil C “I will be your prom date” or word to that effect on one or more occasions.

The panel noted that Mr Hook appeared to have frequently made remarks of the nature identified in this particular and that the remarks did not appear to be directed solely to an individual pupil or pupils, although they were directed to Pupil B and C. It appeared to the panel that Mr Hook’s conduct in this particular was consistent with his evidence of his general demeanour and approach to pupils.

Taking account of the evidence in support of particular 1h, which the panel found to be consistent with the admission made by Mr Hook, the panel accepted the admission made by Mr Hook and found particular 1h proven.

i. Wrote “I love Hooky” and/ or “I love Mr Hook” on Pupil C and/or Pupil R’s exercise book and/or planner.

The panel noted the following from the materials before it:

- The notes of the School's investigatory interview with Pupil R on 4 February 2019 recorded that Pupil R stated Mr Hook had written on the back of their planner, on the whiteboard page, "I love Hooky", with love being a love heart. They wiped it off when they got home. It made them feel scared and they told their mum.
- Individual A confirmed in a police statement dated 7 February 2019, that Pupil A had reported to her a few weeks previously that Mr Hook had written "I love Mr Hook" in Pupil R and Pupil C's books.
- In their police interview on 17 February 2019 Pupil A stated that Pupil R had told Pupil A that Mr Hook had written something in their planner and had then showed this to Pupil A. Pupil A saw, written in big writing on the front of the planner, "I love Mr Hooky".
- In his police interview on 8 February 2019 Mr Hook recalled that he had written in Pupil R's planner, "on the plastic wallet bit", "R loves Hooky" and that he may well have used a heart. He probably used a board pen to do this. He said that he and Pupil R thought it was funny.
- In the School's investigatory interview with him on 21 May 2020 Mr Hook accepted that he had written "I love Hooky" (the word love being a heart symbol) on a planner once only. It said it was intended as a bit of fun.
- Mr Hook had admitted the facts of particular 1i in his response to the Notice of Referral dated 5 July 2025, in his response to the amended Notice of Referral dated 17 February 2026, and, in his response to the Notice of Proceedings dated 2 June 2026.
- In the statement of agreed facts Mr Hook admitted that he wrote "I love Hooky" and/or "I love Mr Hook" on Pupil C's and on Pupil R's exercise book and/or planner.

On the basis of this evidence and Mr Hook's admission, which it found consistent with the evidence, the panel found proven that the wording alleged in particular 1i had been written by Mr Hook in Pupil R's planner.

The panel found that there was insufficient evidence before it for it to be satisfied to the required, civil standard, that Mr Hook had written the alleged wording in Pupil R's exercise book or in Pupil C's planner and/or exercise book. The panel therefore did not accept Mr Hook's admission to having written the wording alleged in Pupil R's exercise book or in Pupil C's planner and/or exercise book.

The panel therefore found particular 1i proven but only on this more limited basis.

In summary, the panel found particulars 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1f, 1g 1h and 1i proven. It found particular 1e not proven.

2. On or about 25 January 2019 you put your hand on Pupil B's shoulder and/or walked Pupil B down the corridor.

The panel noted that Mr Hook had admitted particular 2.

The panel noted the following from the materials before it:

- Pupil B in their police interview on 17 February 2019 said that they had been away from school for a few days and Mr Hook has spoken to them in another room about the importance of them attending because of their exams. They walked out. In consequence they were “in a mood” for the rest of the lesson. In the corridor Mr Hook had put his arm around them, which they said the police had “got” on the CCTV from the School.
- In his police interview on 8 February 2019 Mr Hook stated that he had probably placed his arm on their shoulder as affirmation. He was trying to create a bond. It was not sexual; he was a “tactile person” and that is how he works. On reviewing the CCTV footage during the police interview, he accepted that he had his hand on Pupil B's shoulder. He said it was a friendly act. He said he was probably being overly friendly and overfamiliar but there was no other reason for that action.
- In his police statement of 7 February 2019, Individual B, produced the CCTV footage of the School corridor on 25 January 2019. He identified within it Mr Hook and Pupil B as the student on whose shoulder Mr Hook had his hand.
- In the School's investigatory interview with Mr Hook on 21 May 2020, Mr Hook accepted that he put his hand on Pupil B's shoulder as they walked down the corridor in conversation.
- Mr Hook had admitted the facts of particular 2 in his response to the Notice of Referral dated 5 July 2025, in his response to the amended Notice of Referral dated 17 February 2026, and, in his response to the Notice of Proceedings dated 2 June 2026.
- In the statement of agreed facts Mr Hook admitted that on or about 25 January, then identified as 2020 but since amended to 2019, he had put his hand on Pupil B's shoulder and that he walked Pupil B down the corridor.

The panel had sight of the CCTV footage and noted that it showed Mr Hook with his hand on Pupil B's shoulder walking down a school corridor. Another pupil was also with them. The panel did not consider that it showed that Mr Hook had walked Pupil B down the corridor. He did not appear to be steering or guiding Pupil B or, for example, taking them out of a situation. Instead, the panel considered that Pupil B was willingly walking alongside Mr Hook. They appeared to be walking together and having a conversation.

On the basis of its viewing and interpretation of the CCTV material as detailed above, the panel found particular 2 not proven to the required, civil standard, with regard to the

section of particular 2 that read “and/or walked Pupil B down the corridor”. It did not accept Mr Hook’s admission to this part of particular 2.

However, the panel accepted the admission made by Mr Hook to his having put his hand on Pupil B’s shoulder which it found to be consistent with the evidence before it. The panel found this section of particular 2 proven.

The panel found particular 2 proven on this limited basis.

3. On an unknown date, you:

a. played with and/or touched Pupil L’s hair on one or more occasions;

The panel noted the following from the materials before it:

- In their police statement dated 21 September 2020 Pupil L, by that time an ex-pupil, recounted that Mr Hook would play with their hair on days that were a little more relaxed such as Christmas. He would twirl it in his fingers or try to plait it. The pupils would show him how to plait their hair and he would try and just laugh about it, because he could not do it. He would also softly tug Pupil L’s hair from behind in the corridor to let them know he was there.
- In his police interview on 24 February 2021, Mr Hook initially denied ever touching Pupil L’s hair, either playing with it, plaiting it or tugging at it. However, he later confirmed that that this was the case “as far as ...[he could] recall”.
- Mr Hook had admitted the facts of particular 3 in his response to the Notice of Referral dated 5 July 2025, in his response to the amended Notice of Referral dated 17 February 2026, and, in his response to the Notice of Proceedings dated 2 June 2026.
- In the statement of agreed facts Mr Hook admitted that he played with and/or touched Pupil L’s hair on one or more occasions.

The panel considered that the conduct alleged in particular 3a was consistent with Mr Hook’s conduct on other occasions and with other pupils.

Taking account of this evidence, the panel accepted the admission made by Mr Hook which it found to be consistent with the evidence before it. The panel found particular 3a proven.

b. contacted Pupil L on social media as set out in Schedule 1.

Schedule 1

[REDACTED]

The panel noted the following from the materials before it:

- In his police interview on 8 February 2019 Mr Hook had stated that he had a Facebook account called Pythagoras Hook which he never really used and had not used for two years.
- In their police statement dated 21 September 2020 Pupil L, recounted that they had received a message from Mr Hook who had added them to a group called Pythagoras Hook. He had sent them a message and they responded. They provided a copy of the messages to the police. They confirmed that they had known Mr Hook “for all of my school life”. Pupil L indicated that they had been a [REDACTED] pupil at the School at the time of the messaging.
- From the content of the Facebook messages exchanged between Mr Hook and Pupil L, a copy of which was before the panel, the panel noted that the messages were dated on the second page within the message as 22 July 2017 at 22.48. The messaging included the messages from Mr Hook which comprised the wording in Schedule 1.
- In his police interview on 24 February 2021, when the messages were shown to him, Mr Hook said that he thought they were nice and it was a pleasant conversation. He was making sure that Pupil L was okay.
- Mr Hook had admitted the facts of particular 3b in his response to the Notice of Referral dated 5 July 2025, in his response to the amended Notice of Referral dated 17 February 2026, and, in his response to the Notice of Proceedings dated 2 June 2026.
- In the statement of agreed facts Mr Hook admitted that he contacted Pupil L on social media and admitted that he sent the messages in Schedule 1 to Pupil L through social media.

Taking account of this evidence, which the panel found to be consistent with the admission made by Mr Hook, the panel accepted the admission made by Mr Hook. The panel found particular 3b proven.

4. On an unknown date between September 2016 and July 2019, you:

a. touched and/or played with Pupil O’s hair on one or more occasions;

The panel noted the following from the materials before it:

- In their statement to the police of 12 December 2020, Pupil O had stated that Mr Hook would plait their hair. Pupil O recalled him doing this on three occasions.
- In his police interview on 24 February 2021 Mr Hook denied ever touching Pupil O’s hair or plaiting it.

- Mr Hook had admitted the facts of particular 4a in his response to the Notice of Referral dated 5 July 2025, in his response to the amended Notice of Referral dated 17 February 2026, and, in his response to the Notice of Proceedings dated 2 June 2026.
- In the statement of agreed facts Mr Hook admitted that he touched and/or played with Pupil O's hair on one or more occasions.

Taking account of this evidence, which the panel found to be consistent with the admission made by Mr Hook, the panel accepted the admission made by Mr Hook. The panel found particular 4a proven.

b. said Pupil M was “beautiful” and/or that she had “beautiful hair” on one or more occasions.

The panel noted the following from the materials before it:

- In their police statement of 5 October 2020, Pupil M stated that Mr Hook had made remarks of this nature to them when they were in Year 7 and Year 9. He would stand slightly to the back or side of them as they sat in class and say “you’re so beautiful, you’ve got beautiful hair”. They thought he was being nice but by year 9 started to realise he should not have done this and felt awkward and uncomfortable. Mr Hook told them, in Year 9, that they were beautiful and did not need to wear so much make-up. This made them feel uncomfortable. They asked to change sets partly because of feeling uncomfortable in Mr Hook’s class.
- In his police interview on 24 February 2021 Mr Hook stated that he did not remember ever saying to Pupil M that they were so beautiful or that they had beautiful hair.
- Mr Hook had admitted the facts of particular 4b in his response to the Notice of Referral dated 5 July 2025, in his response to the amended Notice of Referral dated 17 February 2026, and, in his response to the Notice of Proceedings dated 2 June 2026.
- In the statement of agreed facts Mr Hook admitted that had said Pupil M was “beautiful” and/or that they had “beautiful hair” on one or more occasions.

Taking account of this evidence which the panel found to be consistent with the admissions made by Mr Hook, the panel accepted the admissions made by Mr Hook. The panel found particular 4b proven.

5. Your conduct at any or all of Particulars 1 to 4 was sexually motivated.

The panel had regard to the definition of sexual motivation outlined to it in the legal advice which it had accepted.

The panel noted that Mr Hook had consistently denied any sexual motivation to his conduct.

In his police interview on 8 February 2019 Mr Hook indicated that from memory he had never had, and would never have, sexual contact with his pupils. He did not act as he did for sexual gratification but because he wanted, or had, a good, friendly, relationship with them. He was having some fun or was being light-hearted. He was a tactile person. He was “not trying to groom anybody”. He was trying to be nice to them and “boost” them.

In his police interview on 4 April 2019 Mr Hook again emphasised that in the way he spoke to pupils he was trying to be nice and have a sense of fun. When he spoke to pupils they would have been aware of his mood, if he was being funny or angry. He stated he was not looking for anything sexual and had no sexual inclinations towards these, or any other, students and never would.

In his police interview on 24 February 2021 Mr Hook again reiterated that there was no sexual intent in his conduct. He stated he was a tactile person and a “touchy feely kind of guy”. He would never ever sexually touch a child.

The panel noted that in the statement of agreed facts, that although Mr Hook had admitted that that he had no proper justification for his conduct, as found proven in particulars 1 to 4, that Mr Hook continued to deny that his conduct was sexually motivated.

Additionally, in his statement to the panel, Mr Hook stated that “there was no evidence whatsoever that I misused my position, authority or professional role to pursue, encourage or initiate any form of physical or inappropriate relationship with any pupil under my care or supervision”.

The panel noted that the conduct found proven had taken place in classrooms or corridors at the School and in the presence of other pupil(s). There appeared to be no attempt at concealment of the conduct which might indicate an ulterior motivation behind it. The panel also noted that there appeared to be nothing within the social media exchange which it had seen, which was more private in nature, that was indicative of any sexual motivation, such as flirtatious messages.

The panel considered that the conduct proven was consistent with Mr Hook, who had previously been in the armed forces, seeking to develop overfriendly relationships with the children under his care and supervision. He had sought to develop these relationships through what he perceived, and intended, to be fun and light-hearted remarks and conduct. The panel considered that Mr Hook had been seeking to support the pupils by the development of such an overfamiliar relationship with them rather than having any sexual motivation.

The proven particulars appeared to the panel to demonstrate a professional lacking in understanding and insight into the development and maintenance of appropriate

professional relationships between teachers and pupils rather than an individual acting in pursuit of sexual gratification or a future sexual relationship.

For these reasons the panel found particular 5 not proven.

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

Having found a number of the particulars of the allegation proven, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved particulars 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 noted that Mr Hook had admitted that his admitted conduct in particulars 1 to 4 amounted to unacceptable professional misconduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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

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

- A teacher is expected to demonstrate consistently high standards of personal and professional conduct.
 - 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

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

The panel considered that Mr Hook was in breach of the following provisions: (as they appear in the 2019 version of KCSIE and which have been unchanged in the various versions of KCSIE since 2016).

- All staff have a responsibility to provide a safe environment in which children can learn...

- All staff should be aware of systems within their school or college which supports safeguarding...

The panel also considered whether Mr Hook'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.

The panel considered that if looked at individually a number of the concerns raised by the individual sub-particulars of particulars 1 to 4, as found proven, may represent low level concerns. However, the panel considered that those particulars viewed cumulatively represented a repeated pattern of breach of professional boundaries. The panel considered that overall Mr Hook's misconduct represented a serious blurring of professional boundaries and a failure to safeguard the safety and well-being of pupils under his care and supervision. Professionals are required to maintain high standards and proper professional boundaries in their professional relationships with pupils. A failure to do so runs the risk of seriously negatively impacting on the safety and welfare of pupils, a risk which had materialised in this case. There was no justification for Mr Hook's actions.

The seriousness of Mr Hook's conduct was aggravated by his having previously been given a clear management instruction, in writing, in November 2015, not to touch students and staff at the School. This had followed complaints from pupils whom he taught and his admission to touching both male and female pupils on their arms and shoulders in order to encourage them to learn. He had been advised of the negative impact that this had on pupils. It appeared to the panel that he had failed to learn from, and failed to review and amend his conduct in light of, these earlier issues and had repeated conduct of the same nature.

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

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

As set out above in the panel's findings as to whether Mr Hook was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that none of these offences were relevant.

The findings of misconduct are serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher.

The panel considered that Mr Hook's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Hook'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 and protection of other members of the public and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Hook, which involved repeated breaches of professional boundaries with pupils which caused them harm, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils.

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 Hook 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 Hook in the profession.

The panel decided that there was a public interest consideration in retaining Mr Hook in the profession, since no doubt had been cast upon his abilities as an educator and he

had been considered a valued member of staff at the School over many years in a subject area where recruitment was challenging.

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the behaviour, noting that the Advice states that the expectation of both the public and pupils, is that members of the teaching profession maintain an exemplary level of integrity and ethical standards at all times.

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

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;

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.

In the light of the panel's findings the panel considered that Mr Hook's actions were deliberate.

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

The panel noted the admissions made by Mr Hook within the School and the TRA's processes.

The panel also noted that Mr Hook had a previous good record, having demonstrated high standards as an academic teacher.

However, the panel saw that Mr Hook had previously been the subject of management guidance about physical contact with pupils and had agreed to avoid such contact in the future. Despite this he had proceeded to undertake the various physical contacts with pupils detailed in the particulars and had consequently caused harm to pupils' health and wellbeing. The panel considered that the misconduct was not out of character, indeed, on Mr Hook's own account, he had indicated that many of the issues of concern had arisen because that was essentially the person that he was. This raised serious concerns for the panel that there remained a strong risk of repetition.

The panel had no supportive professional or personal references provided to it by, or on behalf of, Mr Hook although it noted the content of the police statement of Individual B. He referred to Mr Hook as having been employed at the School since 2001. Mr Hook had

been promoted temporarily to the position of Deputy Head of Faculty in 2004, and had obtained the position of Numeracy Co-ordinator in September 2006. Individual B also referred to Mr Hook as being “regarded as a good teacher based on the progress of his students”. Mr Hook was also described as a form teacher and a teacher who “gets on well with his colleagues”.

However, in addition to the concerns of repetition due to Mr Hook’s apparent inability to change his conduct despite an earlier management instruction, the panel was concerned that he continued to lack developed insight both into the seriousness of his conduct and its impact on pupils and the profession. Mr Hook had not demonstrated regret for the impact of his conduct on pupils. His primary focus appeared to be more on the impact of his conduct on himself.

Whilst the panel recognised that Mr Hook had undertaken some reflection on his actions and why they had taken place, he needed to continue to develop and deepen his insight. Further work on the strengthening of Mr Hook’s practice around understanding and maintaining proper professional boundaries was also needed in order to reduce the future risk to pupils and the profession to an acceptable level.

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 Hook of prohibition.

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Hook. Although the panel did not consider the case to be at the most serious end of the spectrum, it was serious which, together with the risk of repetition, were significant factors in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

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

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

None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel’s findings.

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 considered that Mr Hook had demonstrated, by his reflection and admissions, that he had started to develop some insight, although had not shown remorse for the impact of his actions. He needed to continue to develop his insight and strengthen his practice to address the risk of repetition. The panel's view was that a review period would be appropriate. It would allow Mr Hook an opportunity to properly address these issues and demonstrate that the risk of repetition had been reduced to an acceptable level.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all of the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provision for a review period of 2 years.

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 Anthony Hook should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of 2 years.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Hook 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

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Hook 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 Hook fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include failing to maintain professional boundaries by making physical contact with and inappropriate comments to pupils.

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 Hook, 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 Hook, which involved repeated breaches of professional boundaries with pupils which caused them harm, 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 remorse and insight, which the panel has set out as follows:

“However, in addition to the concerns of repetition due to Mr Hook’s apparent inability to change his conduct despite an earlier management instruction, the panel was concerned that he continued to lack developed insight both into the seriousness of his conduct and its impact on pupils and the profession. Mr Hook had not demonstrated regret for the impact of his conduct on pupils. His primary focus appeared to be more on the impact of his conduct on himself.”

In my judgement, the lack of remorse and full insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel has observed:

“The panel considered that Mr Hook’s conduct could potentially damage the public’s perception of a teacher.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of repeated breaches of professional boundaries 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 Hook himself. The panel has commented:

“The panel also noted that Mr Hook had a previous good record, having demonstrated high standards as an academic teacher.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Hook 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 findings that Mr Hook’s actions were deliberate and were repeated on multiple occasions despite management guidance that he had received to avoid physical contact with pupils. The panel was therefore concerned that there was a strong risk of repetition of this behaviour. The panel has said:

“Whilst the panel recognised that Mr Hook had undertaken some reflection on his actions and why they had taken place, he needed to continue to develop and deepen his insight. Further work on the strengthening of Mr Hook’s practice around understanding and maintaining proper professional boundaries was also needed in order to reduce the future risk to pupils and the profession to an acceptable level.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the panel’s finding that Mr Hook’s actions had “caused harm to pupils’ health and wellbeing.”

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

does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended a 2-year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments:

"The panel considered that Mr Hook had demonstrated, by his reflection and admissions, that he had started to develop some insight, although had not shown remorse for the impact of his actions. He needed to continue to develop his insight and strengthen his practice to address the risk of repetition. The panel's view was that a review period would be appropriate. It would allow Mr Hook an opportunity to properly address these issues and demonstrate that the risk of repetition had been reduced to an acceptable level."

I have considered whether a 2-year review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that I agree with the panel that allowing a 2-year review period is sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the harm caused to pupils by the breach of professional boundaries in this case, the lack of remorse and full insight and the risk this creates of repetition.

I have decided that a 2-year review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession.

This means that Mr Anthony Hook is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. He may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 17 August 2028, 2 years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If he does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Mr Hook remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

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

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

Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 11 August 2026

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