



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Ms Megan Taylor: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

July 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	4
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	7
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	11

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

Teacher: Ms Megan Taylor

Teacher ref number: 1854364

Teacher date of birth: 25 August 1996

TRA reference: 24331

Date of determination: 27 July 2026

Former employer: [REDACTED], Lincolnshire

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 27 July 2026 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Ms Megan Taylor.

The panel members were Mr John Martin (former teacher panellist – in the chair), Ms Eleanor Wilson (teacher panellist) and Ms Maxine Cole (lay panellist).

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

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

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 27 July 2026.

It was alleged that Ms Taylor was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:

1. On 27 March 2025, she was convicted at Lincoln Crown Court of Sexual Activity with a child by a person in a position of trust x5.

Ms Taylor admitted the facts of the allegation and further admitted that those admitted facts amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence, as set out in the statement of agreed facts signed by Ms Taylor on 8 February 2026.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Notice of meeting and notice of referral response – pages 3 to 5

Section 2: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 7 to 23

Section 3: TRA documents – pages 25 to 104

Section 4: Teacher documents – pages 106 to 107

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

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

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Ms Taylor on 8 February 2026 and subsequently signed by the presenting officer on 11 February 2026.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

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

Ms Taylor commenced employment at [REDACTED], Lincolnshire ("the School") on 1 June 2023 as a teacher of science.

On [REDACTED], the School received a telephone call informing them that Ms Taylor was in an inappropriate and sexual relationship with a pupil. The School contacted the police regarding the disclosure and Ms Taylor was later arrested.

On [REDACTED], Ms Taylor's employment at the School terminated.

On [REDACTED], [REDACTED] ("the Trust") made a referral to the TRA.

Ms Taylor was allegedly convicted at Lincoln Crown Court on 27 March 2025 of 5 counts of sexual activity with a child by a person in a position of trust.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

1. On 27 March 2025, you were convicted at Lincoln Crown Court of Sexual Activity with a child by a person in a position of trust x5.

The panel noted that Ms Taylor admitted allegation 1 as set out in the statement of agreed facts which she had signed and which was dated 8 February 2026.

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

The panel had been provided with a copy of the certificate of conviction from Lincoln Crown Court dated 11 July 2025, which set out that Ms Taylor had been convicted on 27 March 2025 at Lincoln Crown Court of 5 counts of sexual activity with a child by a person

in a position of trust. The panel took this as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction.

The panel noted that Ms Taylor was later sentenced at Lincoln Crown Court on 12 June 2025 to 18 months imprisonment and was required to sign the sex offenders register for 10 years.

The panel found allegation 1 proven.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

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

In doing so, the panel had regard to the Advice.

The panel first considered whether the conduct of Ms Taylor, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
 - not undermining fundamental British values, [...] the rule of law [...] liberty and mutual respect
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, [...]
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel noted that Ms Taylor's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting insofar as it had found that Ms Taylor had been convicted of sexual activity with a child by a person in a position of trust.

The panel considered it clear that the behaviour involved in committing the offences could have had an impact on the safety and/or security of pupils.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Ms Taylor's behaviour in committing the offences could affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community.

The panel noted that Ms Taylor's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed. The panel noted the guidance in the Advice that any offence which results in a term of imprisonment is likely to be a relevant offence.

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

This was a case concerning offences involving sexual activity and sexual communication with a child, which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel noted Ms Taylor's admission in the statement of facts that the offences constituted relevant offences.

The panel found no material evidence of any mitigating circumstances in Ms Taylor's case.

The panel also found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was clearly relevant to Ms Taylor's ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding that these convictions were for relevant offences was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

The panel found, in connection with all offences listed in the allegation they had found proven, that Ms Taylor had been convicted of relevant offences.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

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

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

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

In the light of the panel's findings against Ms Taylor, which involved 5 convictions for sexual activity with a child by a person in a position of trust, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

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

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Ms Taylor 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 Ms Taylor in the profession. The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above clearly outweighed any interest in retaining Ms Taylor in the profession, since her behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and she exploited her position of trust.

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the behaviour, noting that the Advice states that the expectation of both the public and pupils, is that members of the teaching profession maintain an exemplary level of integrity and ethical standards at all times. The panel noted that a teacher's behaviour that seeks to exploit their position of trust should be viewed very seriously in terms of its potential influence on pupils and be seen as a possible threat to the public interest.

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

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

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;

- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are ‘relevant matters’ for the purposes of the Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- an abuse of any trust, knowledge, or influence gained through their professional position in order to advance a romantic or sexual relationship with a pupil or former pupil;
- sexual misconduct, e.g. involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature and/or that use or exploit the trust, knowledge or influence derived from the individual’s professional position;
- failure in their duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk or failing to promote the safety and welfare of the children (as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE);
- violation of the rights of pupils.

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors. Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

Ms Taylor’s actions were clearly deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Ms Taylor was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation

The panel noted references in the transcript of the criminal trial to Ms Taylor’s previous good character. The panel however had no evidence before them to demonstrate that Ms Taylor had exceptionally high standards in her personal and professional conduct or that she had contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel noted that the Judge was satisfied that Ms Taylor’s behaviour was out of character but the panel had no evidence before it to reach a finding in that regard.

The panel found no meaningful evidence of insight or remorse on the part of Ms Taylor either from the references within the judgement in the criminal trial or elsewhere.

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 Ms Taylor 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 Ms Taylor. Her conviction for 5 counts of sexual activity with a child by a person in a position of trust, specifically a vulnerable [REDACTED] for whom she was responsible as their teacher, was a significant factor in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

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

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

These include:

- serious sexual misconduct e.g. where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons, particularly where the individual has used their professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons;
- any sexual misconduct involving a child.

The panel noted that Ms Taylor's case involved the above categories of the Advice. The panel also noted these were serious sexual offences involving a child and that Ms Taylor's actions as set out in the convictions were wholly incompatible with her working as a teacher.

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 reminded itself that it did not find any material evidence of insight or remorse on the part of Ms Taylor. The panel noted that it had no material evidence that Ms Taylor

recognised the impact of her actions on the School, or on the wider profession, or most concerningly on the child involved. The panel did not have any evidence before it that Ms Taylor understood, or felt remorse for, the harm she had caused to the child.

In relation to the risk of repetition of this manner of conduct by Ms Taylor, the panel did not have any evidence before them to reach an opinion and could only conclude that there remained the potential risk of repetition of the behaviours demonstrated.

The panel recognised that these were extremely serious criminal offences going to the very heart of a teacher's obligations and professional responsibilities. The panel again noted its view that the actions for which Ms Taylor had been convicted were wholly incompatible with her returning to practise as a teacher.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended without provisions for a review period.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

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

In this case, the panel has found the allegation proven and found that those proven facts amount to a relevant conviction.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Ms Taylor is in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others

- not undermining fundamental British values, [...] the rule of law [...] liberty and mutual respect
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, [...]
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Ms Taylor amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence as the conviction “...*was clearly relevant to Ms Taylor’s ongoing suitability to teach.*”

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of a conviction involving “...*sexual activity with a child by a person in a position of trust, specifically a vulnerable [REDACTED] for whom she was responsible as their teacher...*”

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself, whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of a relevant conviction, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Ms Taylor, 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 safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, “*In the light of the panel’s findings against Ms Taylor, which involved 5 convictions for sexual activity with a child by a person in a position of trust, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils...*” A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel’s comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, “*The panel found no meaningful evidence of insight or remorse on the part of Ms Taylor either from the references within the judgement in the criminal trial or elsewhere.*”

In my judgement, the lack of meaningful evidence of any 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 *“...considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Ms Taylor was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.”*

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

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

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of a relevant conviction, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Ms Taylor herself. The panel comment *“The panel noted references in the transcript of the criminal trial to Ms Taylor’s previous good character. The panel however had no evidence before them to demonstrate that Ms Taylor had exceptionally high standards in her personal and professional conduct or that she had contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel noted that the Judge was satisfied that Ms Taylor’s behaviour was out of character but the panel had no evidence before it to reach a finding in that regard.”*

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments concerning the lack of insight or remorse. The panel has said, *“The panel noted that it had no material evidence that Ms Taylor recognised the impact of her actions on the School, or on the wider profession, or most concerningly on the child involved. The panel did not have any evidence before it that Ms Taylor understood, or felt remorse for, the harm she had caused to the child.”*

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that Ms Taylor was the teacher of the child with whom she engaged in sexual activity.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Ms Taylor 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 any meaningful evidence of remorse or insight, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended that no provision should be made for a review period.

I have considered the panel's comments *"The panel recognised that these were extremely serious criminal offences going to the very heart of a teacher's obligations and professional responsibilities. The panel again noted its view that the actions for which Ms Taylor had been convicted were wholly incompatible with her returning to practise as a teacher."*

The panel also comment that *"In relation to the risk of repetition of this manner of conduct by Ms Taylor, the panel did not have any evidence before them to reach an opinion and could only conclude that there remained the potential risk of repetition of the behaviours demonstrated."*

The panel has also said that a prohibition without provision for a review period would be proportionate in this case.

I have considered whether allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the seriousness of the proven conduct and specifically that it relates to a child and for whom Ms Taylor was responsible as their teacher.

I agree with the panel that allowing for no review period is necessary to maintain public confidence and is proportionate and in the public interest.

This means that Ms Megan Taylor is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. Furthermore, in view of the seriousness of the allegation found proved against her, I have decided that Ms Taylor shall not be entitled to apply for restoration of her eligibility to teach.

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

Ms Taylor has a right of appeal to the High Court within 28 days from the date she is given notice of this order.

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

Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield

Date: 28 July 2026

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