



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Matthew Udall: 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	4
Documents	4
Witnesses	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: Mr Matthew Udall

Teacher ref number: 1961655

Teacher date of birth: 13 February 1993

TRA reference: 20964

Date of determination: 12 August 2026

Former employer: [REDACTED], Stratford upon Avon ("School")

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ("the panel") of the Teaching Regulation Agency ("the TRA") convened on 12 August 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Udall.

The panel members were Mr Adnan Qureshi (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Helen Knee (lay panellist) and Mrs Georgina Bean (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Harry Taylor of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Alexander Barnfield of Capstick LLP solicitors.

Mr Udall was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegation set out in the notice of proceedings dated 14 May 2026.

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

1. On 12 July 2024, he was convicted of:
 - a) Cause/incite a girl under 13 to engage in sexual activity – no penetration, and
 - b) Attempt to observe a person doing a private act.

In the absence of a response from Mr Udall, the allegations are not admitted.

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 3 to 5

Section 2: Notice of Proceedings and Response – pages 6 to 31

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency Witness Statements – pages 32 to 64

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency Documents – pages 65 to 75

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

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

Witnesses

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

Witness A – [REDACTED]

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

Mr Udall started working as a teacher of science at the School on 1 September 2020. On 30 June 2022 Mr Udall gave a pen to Pupil A for them to take home and use to write in a journal. He also encouraged them to change their clothes before writing in the journal. Mr Udall had not told Pupil A that the pen contained a secret video camera that was recording at the time. After Pupil A had taken the pen home, they noticed that there was a camera lens on the pen and told a friend. Pupil A told another teacher about the camera pen, which was then reported to the headteacher. On 1 July 2022 the School notified the LADO.

On 2 July 22 Mr Udall was arrested and released on bail whilst the police investigation continued. On 5 July 2022 the School suspended Mr Udall. On 12 July 2022, Mr Udall was dismissed from the School.

On 20 August 2024 Mr Udall received a conviction in relation to the above and he was sentenced to imprisonment, after pleading guilty.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

1. On 12 July 2024, you were convicted of:

a) Cause/incite a girl under 13 to engage in sexual activity – no penetration, and

b) Attempt to observe a person doing a private act.

The panel has been provided with a certificate of conviction dated 12 July 2024, confirming Mr Udall's conviction of:

1. Cause/incite a girl under 13 to engage in sexual activity – no penetration; and
2. Attempt to observe a person doing a private act.

The certificate of conviction confirmed that Mr Udall was sentenced to 31 months' imprisonment on 20 August 2024. Mr Udall was given a notification of requirement to register with the police indefinitely and that he would be [REDACTED].

The panel found the certificate of conviction to be conclusive evidence that this allegation was proven.

For the reason above, the panel found the allegation proved.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

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

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

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

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Udall 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
- 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 the individual’s actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting. Mr Udall used his position of a teacher, whom Pupil A trusted, to try and persuade them to get undressed in private, in view of the pen. Mr Udall did not tell Pupil A the pen had a video camera in it. The panel had particular regard to the sentencing remarks of the Judge, which explained that Mr Udall had planned this event and his words to Pupil A were: “Get changed completely. Get changed. Try and refresh your brain. Sit down. Shut your room. Say to your mum, look I just want to answer these questions on my own. Please don’t disturb me for 10 minutes. When you’re done, pop these in your bag so they’re out the way and then bring them

back to me tomorrow and we'll discuss them." At that point, the video camera was switched on and was recording.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety and/or security of pupils and/or members of the public.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Udall's behaviour in committing the offence 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 Mr Udall's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed.

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

This was a case concerning an offence involving sexual activity, voyeurism, and controlling or coercive behaviour which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel considered that the offence was serious. It was calculated and prepared in advance. Mr Udall sought to conceal what he had asked Pupil A to do by telling them to exclude their parent. Mr Udall used his position as a teacher to manipulate Pupil A into getting undressed in front of a secret video camera. By any observation, this was a serious offence and one which resulted in Mr Udall's imprisonment.

The panel received no evidence to demonstrate Mr Udall's teaching record, nor was it provided with evidence of any mitigation.

The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Udall's ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding that this conviction was for a relevant offence was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

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

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be made, the panel had to consider whether it would be an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it would be in the public interest to do so. Prohibition

orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

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

The panel found that Mr Udall had been given a conviction of a relevant offence that involved trying to secretly video record a pupil whilst they were getting changed.

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the seriousness of the offence.

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

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Mr Udall 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 Udall in the profession. The panel had not been provided with evidence of Mr Udall's ability as an educator, and the panel was therefore unable to conclude that there was a public interest in retaining Mr Udall in the teaching profession. The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Udall in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and he sought to exploit his position of trust.

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

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

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

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of the Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- sexual misconduct, e.g. involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature and/or that use or exploit the trust, knowledge or influence derived from the individual's professional position;
- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing, or publishing any indecent photograph or image, or indecent pseudo photograph or image, of a child, or permitting such activity, including one-off incidents;
- 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 the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, the panel went on to consider whether there were mitigating factors. Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

There was evidence that Mr Udall's actions were deliberate.

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

The panel had not been provided with evidence to persuade it that Mr Udall had or had not previously demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or had contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel was also not provided with any evidence relating to Mr Udall's character. The panel was therefore unable to determine whether Mr Udall's conduct was out of character.

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 Udall 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 Udall. The seriousness of the offence and the fact that it was premeditated 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.

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;
- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or indecent pseudo photograph or image of a child, including one off incidents.

The panel found the above list to be relevant because Mr Udall was convicted for using his position as a teacher to try to influence a pupil into getting undressed in front of a video recorder hidden inside a pen he had given to the pupil, without telling the pupil about the hidden video recorder. The panel noted that there was no indication Mr Udall had succeeded in his attempt, but his intentions were clear from the conviction he received. He had bought the pen in advance of giving it to Pupil A with the intention of creating an indecent video of Pupil A undressing. The panel was also of the view that Mr

Udall's actions were sexually motivated and had the potential to cause serious harm to the pupil. In the sentencing remarks, the Judge commented on the adverse effect Mr Udall's actions had had on Pupil A. The panel was not provided with any evidence to rebut the suggestion that Pupil A had suffered harm as a result of Mr Udall's actions.

Similarly, the panel was not provided with any evidence to demonstrate that Mr Udall had shown insight and remorse in relation to his conduct. His communications to the TRA in advance of these proceedings expressed his desire to move on with his life, but they did not detail the extent of his awareness, if any, of the harm he had caused to Pupil A. The panel was therefore unable to say with any degree of certainty that there was a low risk of Mr Udall repeating his actions, particularly if he was allowed to work in the teaching profession.

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

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 allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to a relevant conviction.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Udall 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
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach...

- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a conviction for the relevant offences of causing or inciting a girl under 13 to engage in sexual activity and attempting to observe a person doing a private act. The conviction resulted in a sentence of imprisonment of 31 months.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of a relevant conviction, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Mr Udall, 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:

“The panel found that Mr Udall had been given a conviction of a relevant offence that involved trying to secretly video record a pupil whilst they were getting changed.

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the seriousness of the offence.”

A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

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

“Similarly, the panel was not provided with any evidence to demonstrate that Mr Udall had shown insight and remorse in relation to his conduct. His communications to the TRA in advance of these proceedings expressed his desire to move on with his life, but they did not detail the extent of his awareness, if any, of the harm he had caused to Pupil A. The panel was therefore unable to say with any degree of certainty that there was a low risk of Mr Udall repeating his actions, particularly if he was allowed to work in the teaching profession.”

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

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

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

I am particularly mindful of the finding of a conviction for offences involving sexual activity and voyeurism 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 Mr Udall himself. The panel has commented:

“The panel had not been provided with evidence to persuade it that Mr Udall had or had not previously demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or had contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel was also not provided with any evidence relating to Mr Udall’s character. The panel was therefore unable to determine whether Mr Udall’s conduct was out of character.”

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments concerning the seriousness of the offence and that it was premeditated. The panel has said:

“The panel considered that the offence was serious. It was calculated and prepared in advance. Mr Udall sought to conceal what he had asked Pupil A to do

by telling them to exclude their parent. Mr Udall used his position as a teacher to manipulate Pupil A into getting undressed in front of a secret video camera. By any observation, this was a serious offence and one which resulted in Mr Udall's imprisonment."

I have also placed considerable weight on the panel's comments on the lack of evidence of insight and remorse on the part of Mr Udall and the consequent risk that he might repeat the behaviour.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Mr Udall has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

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

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

I have considered the panel's comments:

"The 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;
- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or indecent pseudo photograph or image of a child, including one off incidents.

The panel found the above list to be relevant because Mr Udall was convicted for using his position as a teacher to try to influence a pupil into getting undressed in front of a video recorder hidden inside a pen he had given to the pupil, without telling the pupil about the hidden video recorder. The panel noted that there was no indication Mr Udall had succeeded in his attempt, but his intentions were clear

from the conviction he received. He had bought the pen in advance of giving it to Pupil A with the intention of creating an indecent video of Pupil A undressing. The panel was also of the view that Mr Udall's actions were sexually motivated and had the potential to cause serious harm to the pupil. In the sentencing remarks, the Judge commented on the adverse effect Mr Udall's actions had had on Pupil A. The panel was not provided with any evidence to rebut the suggestion that Pupil A had suffered harm as a result of Mr Udall's actions."

I have considered whether not allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate response to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the serious nature of the offences of which Mr Udall was convicted, the lack of evidence of insight and remorse, and the risk of repetition.

I consider therefore that allowing for no review period is necessary to maintain public confidence and is proportionate and in the public interest.

This means that Mr Matthew Udall 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 allegations found proved against him, I have decided that Mr Udall shall not be entitled to apply for restoration of his eligibility to teach.

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

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



Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 13 August 2026

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