



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr William Schaper: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

September 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	12
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	16

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

Teacher: Mr William Schaper

Teacher ref number: 25168

Teacher date of birth: 6 February 1977

TRA reference: 9853085

Date of determination: 15 September 2026

Former employer: Eltham College Junior School, London

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 15 September 2026 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr William Schaper.

The panel members were Mr Richard Young (lay panellist – in the chair), Dr Louise Wallace (lay panellist) and Mrs Nicola Anderson (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Jermel Anderson of Blake Morgan 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 Mr William Schaper that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr William Schaper provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer Ms Jessica Etherington, Mr William Schaper or his representative Ms Sarah-Jane Varley of Richard Nelson LLP.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 8 June 2026.

It was alleged that Mr William Schaper was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst working as a General Subjects Teacher at Eltham College Junior School ('the School'):

1. From in or around December 2024, to in or around January 2025, on one or more occasions, he:

a) Accessed and/or attempted to access pornographic websites on a School device and/or whilst present on School grounds and/or during School hours;

b) Attempted to conceal his access and/or attempted access to pornographic websites on a School device and/or whilst present on School grounds and/or during School hours by manually deleting his browser internet history.

2. From in or around 2018, he stored sexually explicit content in his School Outlook 365 account.

3. On or around 17 January 2025, he initially denied that he had accessed pornographic websites on a School device and/or whilst present on School grounds and/or during School hours.

4. His conduct at paragraph 1(a) and/or 2 was sexual.

5. His conduct at paragraph 1(b) and/or 3 above was:

a) Dishonest; and/or

b) Lacking in integrity.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology and key person list – pages 5 to 7

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 9 to 23

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts and PO representations – pages 25 to 29

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 31 to 137

Section 5: Notice of meeting – pages 139 to 140

In addition, the panel considered a bundle of 23 pages comprised of representations from Mr Schaper's representative, a reflective statement, character references and other contextual material.

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

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 Mr Schaper on 8 May 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 Mr William Schaper 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.

Mr Schaper commenced employment at the School on 1 September 2003. On 13 January 2025, a test conducted on the School's internet filtering and monitoring system

identified some potential inappropriate material as accessed by Mr Schaper. The matter was subsequently investigated, and Mr Schaper attended a meeting with the Acting Headteacher of the School to discuss matters on 17 January 2025, where he initially denied accessing the alleged material. The School held a disciplinary hearing on 24 January 2025. Mr Schaper was subsequently referred to the TRA by the School on 6 February 2025.

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:

You are guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that whilst working as a General Subjects Teacher at Eltham College Junior School ('the School')

1. From in or around December 2024, to in or around January 2025, on one or more occasions, you:

a) Accessed and/or attempted to access pornographic websites on a School device and/or whilst present on School grounds and/or during School hours;

The panel noted that Mr Schaper admitted this allegation in full. It additionally considered that it had sight of the witness statement of [REDACTED]. It additionally had sight of the full investigative report as conducted by the school including the minutes of meetings as relevant.

The panel was satisfied that the evidence that it had sight of provided a robust account, demonstrating the process that was undertaken by the School which made clear that Mr Schaper had accessed pornographic websites on a School device on multiple occasions at different times throughout the day which encompassed School hours. The internet activity report as provided within the School's report made evident the websites that were visited, the location of access, the device used and the time and the panel considered that this was a thorough explanation of Mr Schaper accessing pornographic websites within School and during the School day as alleged.

The panel accordingly found allegation 1a) proved.

b) Attempted to conceal your access and/or attempted access to pornographic websites on a School device and/or whilst present on School grounds and/or during School hours by manually deleting your browser internet history.

When considering this allegation, the panel had regard to the fact that Mr Schaper had admitted it. It additionally had regard to the School's investigative report and whilst not relying upon it wholesale, it noted that it made clear that Mr Schaper had by his own admission clicked on pornographic links and then subsequently sought to conceal this fact, taking advice from an unidentified individual on how to do this.

The panel accordingly found allegation 1b) proved.

2. From in or around 2018, you stored sexually explicit content in your School Outlook 365 account.

The panel noted that this allegation was admitted by Mr Schaper. It also was cognisant of the fact that within the investigative report, it had sight of a technical explanation whereby it was confirmed that Mr Schaper's School Outlook 365 account had been used to store pornographic and sexual material from 2018. It noted that the report was detailed in this regard and referred to several different websites. The panel accordingly determined that it could accept Mr Schaper's admission.

The panel therefore found allegation 2 proved.

3. On or around 17 January 2025, you initially denied that you had accessed pornographic websites on a School device and/or whilst present on School grounds and/or during School hours.

The panel acknowledged that Mr Schaper had accepted this allegation in full. It additionally noted that it had sight of the witness statement of Witness A [REDACTED] at the relevant time. It also noted that it had sight of the minutes of the meeting on 17 January 2025. The panel noted that this material was hearsay evidence for the purposes of these proceedings and therefore, took care when considering it.

The panel considered that whilst not a verbatim account, the notes of the meeting of 17 January 2025 supported the position that Mr Schaper had initially denied accessing pornographic material on a School device when he was confronted in relation to this. The panel noted that this record was wholly consistent with Mr Schaper's admission to the allegation. It also noted that it had sight of a WhatsApp message whereby Mr Schaper made a partial admission to the Acting Headteacher that he had accessed pornographic material, further supporting the allegation.

The panel accordingly found allegation 3 proved.

4. Your conduct at paragraph 1(a) and/or 2 was sexual.

The panel noted that this allegation was admitted by Mr Schaper. Additionally, when considering this allegation, the panel was cognisant of the definition of sexual as found within s79 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003:

“(a) whatever its circumstances or any person’s purpose in relation to it, it is because of its nature sexual, or

(b) because of its nature it may be sexual and because of its circumstances or the purpose of any person in relation to it (or both) it is sexual.”

The panel recognised that the allegation directly pertained to Mr Schaper’s access and storing of pornographic materials. It considered that this material as detailed within the investigative report and as admitted by Mr Schaper was inherently sexual by its nature. The panel determined that accessing and storing material which is pornographic is sexual by its very nature.

The panel accordingly found allegation 4 proved.

5. Your conduct at paragraph 1 (b) and/or 3 above was:

a) Dishonest; and/or

When considering this allegation, the panel noted that it was accepted by Mr Schaper. The panel additionally had regard to the legal test in relation to dishonesty as found within the decision of *Ivey v Genting Casinos* [2017] UKSC 67 at paragraph 74:

“When dishonesty is in question the fact-finding tribunal must first ascertain (subjectively) the actual state of the individual's knowledge or belief as to the facts. The reasonableness or otherwise of the belief is a matter of evidence (often in practice determinative) going to whether he held the belief, but it is not an additional requirement that his belief must be reasonable; the question is whether it is genuinely held. When once his actual state of mind as to knowledge or belief as to facts is established, the question whether his conduct was honest or dishonest is to be determined by the fact-finder by applying the (objective) standards of ordinary decent people. There is no requirement that the defendant must appreciate that what he has done is, by those standards, dishonest.”

The panel accordingly first considered Mr Schaper's state of mind in relation to his concealment as found proved. The panel noted that per the minutes of the meeting on 17 January 2025, Mr Schaper had stated that he "*wouldn't do this sort of thing*" and had provided a complex and misleading account which was directly contrary to the forensic findings of the School investigation. Whilst the panel acknowledged that it could not rely wholesale upon the minutes of this meeting as a non-verbatim account of the interaction, it noted that it also had sight of WhatsApp messages that Mr Schaper provided to the Acting Headteacher on evening of 17 January 2025 where he directly confessed to accessing pornographic material and by implication admitting that he had been dishonest in the earlier meeting. The panel accordingly determined that it could draw the inference that Mr Schaper had intentionally been dishonest when concealing his access to pornographic material and when directly asked about it.

The panel then considered the matter in relation to the standards of ordinary decent people. The panel determined that a situation where a teacher had dishonestly concealed his access to pornographic material on School devices and then had misled the Acting Headteacher when confronted about it would be considered dishonest conduct by ordinary decent people.

The panel accordingly found allegation 5a) proved.

b) Lacking in integrity

The panel acknowledged that this allegation was admitted by Mr Schaper. It additionally noted that by virtue of the findings made and the evidence that had been presented, Mr Schaper had acted in a way that contrary to the policies and procedures that were in place and the general standards expected of him. It noted that Mr Schaper had engaged in dishonest concealment in relation to accessing pornographic material through School devices and had misled a senior colleague when confronted in this regard. The panel acknowledged that Mr Schaper was not expected to be a paragon of virtue. It however considered that behaviour as found proved whereby he had acted contrary to the expected standards and had disregarded the policies that were in place were an explicit indication of his conduct lacking in integrity.

The panel accordingly found allegation 5b) proved.

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

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

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

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

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Schaper 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
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils’ well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions.
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was not satisfied that the conduct of Mr Schaper in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education (“KCSIE”).

The panel was not satisfied that the conduct of Mr Schaper in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Working Together to Safeguard Children.

The panel also considered whether Mr Schaper’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 the fact that Mr Schaper had accessed pornographic material via a School device on multiple occasions, had sought to conceal his behaviour, and had acted in a manner that was contrary to School policy were all factors which were directly

relevant to the question of whether the conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct. The panel acknowledged that Mr Schaper had advanced the position that no children ever walked in on him when he was accessing the material, and it noted that this was not disputed. The panel however did not consider that this detracted from the potential safeguarding risks associated with accessing material of a pornographic nature on a School device and within the education environment.

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

In relation to whether Mr Schaper'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 Schaper'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 Schaper was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found that none of these offences were relevant.

The panel noted that the Advice is not intended to be exhaustive and there may be other behaviours that panels consider to be "conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute". It again considered that Mr Schaper's dishonest concealment of his behaviour and deliberate disregard for School policy to be relevant, particularly due to the fact that this conduct occurred on multiple occasions.

The panel considered that Mr Schaper's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher. The panel had sight of a reflections letter as provided by Mr Schaper, within which he indicated that at the relevant time he was experiencing difficult personal circumstances. Whilst having regard to these circumstances, the panel did not consider that they significantly affected the potential for the conduct as found proved to have an impact on the public perception of the teaching profession. Notably, Mr Schaper

had accessed highly inappropriate material via a School device and within the School environment and had then been dishonest about this fact.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Schaper'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 maintenance of public confidence in the profession
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Schaper which involved the deliberate concealment of his use of School resources to access pornographic material there was a strong public interest consideration in relation to the declaration and upholding of proper standards of conduct within the teaching profession. The panel was of the view that the conduct as found proved was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

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

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 Schaper in the profession. The panel noted that Mr Schaper had a long record as a teacher and that there was evidence of him being involved in extracurricular activities. It also noted that within his witness statement, Witness A, [REDACTED] had been complimentary about Mr Schaper's abilities as an educator. The panel noted that no doubt had been cast upon his abilities as an educator and that he is able to make a valuable contribution to the profession, indicating that there is a public interest in him remaining within the teaching profession. The panel however considered that any public interest in retaining Mr Schaper within the profession was limited when weighed against the other public interest findings as above.

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 Schaper.

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;
- sexual misconduct;
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions...;

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, it determined that Mr Schaper's actions were deliberate and that he was not acting under duress.

The panel noted that Mr Schaper had provided representations advising that he had been adversely affected [REDACTED] at the relevant time. The panel also noted that the evidence of Witness A confirmed that these concerns had been raised with the School. The panel however formed the view that the evidence in relation to the impact that these circumstances had upon Mr Schaper was limited and therefore was incapable of wholly or significantly mitigating the conduct as found proved.

The panel noted that Mr Schaper was not previously subject to regulatory or disciplinary findings and noted that he had provided a character reference which stated the conduct was "out of character". Whilst the panel took this into consideration, it noted that the reference did not make it clear that the referee was entirely aware of the allegations that Mr Schaper was facing and therefore, it considered that this limited its reliability. The panel also had regard for the fact that Mr Schaper had engaged with the TRA's process.

Whilst noting that Mr Schaper appeared to have some insight, the panel considered that this was limited and that he did not appear to recognise the potential impact of his conduct upon the teaching profession, this included him directly misleading a senior professional colleague. It was additionally noted that as set out in Mr Schaper's reflection letter as presented to the panel, his recognition of the significance of his dishonesty and his actions appears to have taken place recently; the panel accordingly considered that his insight was likely still developing.

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 Schaper 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 Schaper. The repeated nature of the conduct as found proved as well as Mr Schaper's dishonesty were significant factors in making that determination. 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 whilst Mr Schaper had shown some insight, this was still developing and he likely needed more time to properly engage with his conduct and the significance of it.

The panel considered that the risk of repetition was engaged within this matter. It noted that Mr Schaper had indicated that he had undertaken rehabilitative steps and it considered this to be a positive sign. It however noted that the evidence provided in support of this was limited in scope and did not properly demonstrate what actions were to be or had been undertaken by Mr Schaper. The panel considered that it would have been beneficial to see a detailed statement of the relevance, precise nature and the

impact of the support that Mr Schaper had received and how this would be likely to reduce the risk of repetition.

The panel noted that whilst Mr Schaper had taken rehabilitative steps, it was apparent that he had on at least two separate occasions in his life been negatively impacted by circumstances which then led him to engage in the conduct as found proved in this matter. The panel accordingly formed the view that it considered that the risk of repetition remained present in circumstances where he cannot be said to have properly demonstrated that action has been taken to prevent this occurring in future.

When considering the level of risk in this matter, the panel noted that Mr Schaper had stated that he did not “believe” that he would engage in this behaviour again within his reflection letter. It considered that this was not wholly persuasive regarding the ongoing risk when considered against the fact that Mr Schaper’s behaviour amounted to reckless disregard to School policy and the general standards expected of him. Notably, the panel considered that Mr Schaper had opted to use a School device to access this material, when he would have had the ability to use a personal device and it considered that this particular decision making was indicative of an attitudinal concern that was not properly assuaged by his reflections.

The panel was careful to consider the dishonesty as found proved in a nuanced manner and determined that it was at the lower end of the spectrum of the potential dishonesty, with Mr Schaper partially admitting to his dishonesty with regard to the meeting on 17 January 2025 within a few hours. Similarly, whilst the panel made a finding of sexual misconduct, it determined that this conduct was at the lower end of the scale and had not caused direct sexual harm to pupils or colleagues.

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 the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a review period.

The panel accordingly concluded that a review period of two years was appropriate and proportionate in this case.

A period of two years will afford Mr Schaper sufficient time and opportunity, should he wish to do so, to take steps to fully rehabilitate and remediate his conduct and demonstrate that he has gained further insight into the nature, effect and implications of his conduct.

In the view of the panel, a period beyond two years would be disproportionate.

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 all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr William Schaper should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of two years.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Schaper 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
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions.
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel finds that the conduct of Mr Schaper fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include findings of both sexual conduct and dishonesty.

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 and 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 Schaper, 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, *"...Mr Schaper had advanced the position that no children ever walked in on him when he was accessing the material, and it noted that this was not disputed. The panel however did not consider that this detracted from the potential safeguarding risks associated with accessing material of a pornographic nature on a School device and within the education environment."*

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, *"Whilst noting that Mr Schaper appeared to have some insight, the panel considered that this was limited and that he did not appear to recognise the potential impact of his conduct upon the teaching profession, this included him directly misleading a senior professional colleague."*

The panel has also commented that Mr Schaper's insight was, in its view, 'likely still developing'. In my judgement, the lack of 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 observe *"...that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Schaper were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession"*.

I am particularly mindful of the findings of sexual conduct and dishonesty in this case and the impact that such findings have 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 and 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 Schaper himself. The panel comment *"...Mr Schaper was not previously subject to regulatory or disciplinary findings and noted that he had provided a character reference which stated the conduct was "out of character"."*

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Schaper 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 risk of repetition. The panel has said, "*...the risk of repetition was engaged within this matter. It noted that Mr Schaper had indicated that he had undertaken rehabilitative steps and it considered this to be a positive sign. It however noted that the evidence provided in support of this was limited in scope and did not properly demonstrate what actions were to be or had been undertaken by Mr Schaper.*"

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that Mr Schaper acted dishonestly when questioned about his conduct, albeit the panel notes that Mr Schaper partially admitted the dishonesty 'within a few hours'.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Schaper 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 full 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 a two-year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments that a two-year review period was appropriate in this case, and that a longer review period would be disproportionate.

I have considered whether a two-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. I have considered the circumstances in this case, and in particular the elements of sexual conduct, dishonesty and Mr Schaper's developing insight.

Taking all of the factors into account, I agree with the panel that a two-year review period is sufficient to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

This means that Mr William Schaper 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 24 September 2028, two 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 Schaper remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr Schaper 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 black ink, appearing to read "S. Blomfield". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield

Date: 17 September 2026

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