



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Miss Rosie Hillyard: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

July 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	6
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	11
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	14

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

Teacher: Miss Rosie Hillyard

TRA reference: 19502

Date of determination: 15 July 2026

Former employer: Oakhyrst Grange School, Surrey

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 13 July 2026 to 15 July 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Miss Rosie Hillyard

The panel members were Ms Geraldine Baird (lay panellist – in the chair), Ms Gill Lyon (teacher panellist) and Mr Phillip Trendall (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mrs Luisa Gibbons of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP Solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mrs Heather Anderson of Browne Jacobson LLP solicitors.

Miss Hillyard was not present but was represented by Mr Chris Segovia of LawyersforTeachers.

The hearing took place in private and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 18 March 2026, as amended pursuant to a case management hearing direction dated 26 June 2026.

It was alleged that Miss Hillyard was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that whilst employed at Oakhyrst Grange School:

1. She engaged in inappropriate physical contact with Individual A and/or whilst Individual A was holding Child A on or around 22 July 2019, in that she;
 - i. hit Individual A
 - ii. scratched Individual A;
2. [REDACTED];
3. She failed to notify the designated safeguarding lead and/or make a referral to children's social care and/or the police and/or other relevant agencies when abuse and/or neglect and/or harmful practices were identified in relation to Child B on or around 13 June 2019;
4. She failed in her duty of care towards Child A and/or Child B by exposing one or more children to risk and/or failing to promote the safety and welfare of one or more children in or around June/July 2019.

Pursuant to a preliminary application, allegation 2 was discontinued. Allegations 3 and 4 were renumbered as allegations 2 and 3.

Miss Hillyard admitted allegation 1i and allegation 3 (formerly allegation 4) in respect of Child A only. Miss Hillyard denied allegation 1ii and allegation 2 (formerly allegation 3). Miss Hillyard did not admit that she was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Anonymised Person List – page 5

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 6 to 19

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 20 to 42

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 43 to 160

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 161 to 193

The panel was also provided with the case management decisions of 12 April 2024 and 26 June 2026.

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

Email from a TRA Hearings Delivery Officer dated 18 March 2026 with instructions regarding despatch by special delivery and proof of postage by special delivery; and

MG11 witness statement of Witness A, which was paginated as 160a.

The former was relevant to the panel's consideration of whether to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Miss Hillyard, and it was fair to admit the document in order to establish whether Miss Hillyard had been properly notified of the hearing.

The MG11 witness statement was referred to in the TRA witness statement of Witness A and was therefore relevant, it being a statement made at a time contemporaneous to the events in issue. Miss Hillyard's representative did not object to the admission of the MG11 witness statement and it was fair to admit the document as it was relevant to the consistency of Witness A's evidence.

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

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

Witnesses

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

Witness A; and

Witness B – [REDACTED] at the relevant time.

The following witness was called to give evidence on behalf of Miss Hillyard following the panel's findings of fact and decision on unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute:

Witness C – [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.

Miss Hillyard was employed as an art teacher at Oakhyrst Grange School (“the School”) from 1 September 2016.

On or around 22 July 2019, the School was informed by the LADO of safeguarding concerns. A risk assessment was undertaken and Miss Hillyard was permitted to continue to work at the school with supervision at 20-minute intervals.

Miss Hillyard resigned from her position on 5 May 2020. By this time, due to the Covid 19 pandemic, only key worker children were attending school, and Miss Hillyard had been furloughed as she was not required to work. Miss Hillyard ceased to be employed at the School on 31 August 2020.

The School referred Miss Hillyard to the TRA on 4 September 2020.

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:

Whilst employed at Oakhyrst Grange School:

- 1. You engaged in inappropriate physical contact with Individual A and/or whilst Individual A was holding Child A on or around 22 July 2019, in that you;**

- i. hit Individual A**

This allegation was admitted by Miss Hillyard. The panel was provided with a redacted [REDACTED] dated 27 March 2020 (“the Judgment”). The panel accepted the conclusions reached in the Judgment as prima facie evidence in support of the allegation. The correctness of the conclusion reached by the Judge was not challenged by Miss Hillyard.

[REDACTED]. The Judge found that [REDACTED] drank too much alcohol during the course of the day, [REDACTED]. It was found that Individual A was holding Child A and Miss Hillyard attacked Individual A physically by hitting him, and shouting loudly. [REDACTED]. The police were called and Miss Hillyard was arrested.

It was noted by the Judge that Miss Hillyard had accepted the facts and that it would have been emotionally harmful for Child A to witness this incident, and to have been held by Individual A while Miss Hillyard attacked him.

The panel was provided with police records from which it could be seen that Individual A refused to support a prosecution. It was recommended that there be no further action given that there was no corroborating evidence and no realistic prospect of conviction.

The panel accepted the findings made in the Judgment and found this allegation proven.

3. You failed in your duty of care towards Child A and/or Child B by exposing one or more children to risk and/or failing to promote the safety and welfare of one or more children in or around June/July 2019.

Miss Hillyard admitted this allegation with respect to Child A, but denied it with respect to Child B.

[REDACTED]. The panel considered that on the day of the incident, Miss Hillyard made some poor choices, which exposed Child A to risk. She drank too much alcohol, then she engaged in an argument with Individual A in the presence of Child A. She then hit Individual A after he had picked Child A up, and it could reasonably be foreseen that this may have caused Child A harm. Each of Miss Hillyard's decisions exposed Child A to risk, and she failed to promote the safety and welfare of Child A.

The panel therefore found this allegation proven with respect to Child A.

With respect to Child B, the panel again accepted the conclusions reached in the Judgment as prima facie evidence of the alleged facts. [REDACTED].

[REDACTED].

The panel therefore found this allegation not proven with respect to Child B.

The panel found the following particulars of the allegations against you not proved, for these reasons:

- 1. You engaged in inappropriate physical contact with Individual A and/or whilst Individual A was holding Child A on or around 22 July 2019, in that you;**
- ii. scratched Individual A;**

Miss Hillyard denied this allegation.

There was no reference to Miss Hillyard having scratched Individual A in the Judgment.

Witness A stated that, following Miss Hillyard's arrest, he took four pictures of Individual A who stated he had injuries from the incident. Those photographs depicted red marks to Individual A's upper right shoulder and upper back which appeared to be scratches. However, Witness A had not witnessed the incident, and the evidence of Individual A was hearsay.

The police records included a "Text Entry". Witness A explained in oral evidence that this was a record of an entry made in a pocketbook and that another police officer had made that entry. Witness A explained that such an entry would usually be signed by the person the police officer was speaking with. The signature in this record had been redacted, but the contents of the Text Entry appeared to suggest that it was more probable than not an account given by Individual A. In the Text Entry the note records that Individual A referred to having moved and turned around to protect Child A. He stated, "I think I was being hit to my back at this point as I have a large scratch across my right shoulder". Individual A then stated, "I do not want to provide a statement to police as I do not want to attend court in relation to this matter."

The panel did not consider that it could be satisfied that this evidence was demonstrably reliable, nor did it have any means of testing its reliability, Individual A had refused to provide a statement, so there was no account supported by a statement of truth. Although the photographs showed that Individual A had sustained scratches, the panel was unable to test when those scratches had occurred, or how they had occurred. [REDACTED]. The panel therefore considered that it was entirely possible that the scratches were unrelated to the incident. The panel considered that there was insufficient evidence for it to find that it was more probable than not that Miss Hillyard had scratched Individual A.

The panel found this allegation not proven.

2. You failed to notify the designated safeguarding lead and/or make a referral to children's social care and/or the police and/or other relevant agencies when abuse and/or neglect and/or harmful practices were identified in relation to Child B on or around 13 June 2019;

Miss Hillyard denied this allegation.

The panel considered the state of Miss Hillyard's knowledge at the time in order to assess whether she was in possession of information that would have indicated that she had an obligation to make any of the referrals alleged.

[REDACTED].

In circumstances where Miss Hillyard was told that it was an accident, [REDACTED], there was no information available to Miss Hillyard at the time that would have indicated that a referral to an agency was required.

The panel found this allegation not proven.

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

Having found allegation 1i and 3 proven (in respect of Child A only), 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 Miss Hillyard in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Miss Hillyard 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
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including..., the rule of law... mutual respect...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

[REDACTED].

Nevertheless, the panel was satisfied that Miss Hillyard failed to have regard to the rights of Individual A or Child A when she hit Individual A whilst he was holding Child A. She failed to demonstrate mutual respect towards them both.

Furthermore, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Miss Hillyard in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education (“KCSIE”). The panel noted that “Children” includes everyone under the age of 18. Miss Hillyard did not ensure that her approach was child centred and she breached the requirement to consider, at all times, what was in the best interests of the child. The panel noted that safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children is defined as protecting children from maltreatment and ensuring that [REDACTED]. Hitting Individual A whilst he was holding

Child A did not protect Child A from maltreatment, and her actions were inconsistent with the provision of safe and effective care.

[REDACTED].

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

The panel also considered whether Miss Hillyard'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, even if there is no conviction.

The panel found that behaviours associated with the offences of violence and [REDACTED] were relevant.

The panel noted that the allegations found proven took place outside the education setting. The panel noted that misconduct outside of the education setting will amount to unacceptable professional conduct only if it affects the way the person fulfils their teaching role or if it may lead to pupils being exposed to or influenced by the behaviour in a harmful way. The panel recognised that the conduct was not a low-level concern as it was above the harm threshold that would lead to an investigation into an allegation as set out in Section 1 of Part four of KCSIE, since Miss Hillyard behaved in a way that may have harmed Child A.

This was, however, an isolated incident. [REDACTED].

[REDACTED]. Whilst Miss Hillyard's actions were unacceptable, they related wholly to the circumstances at the time, and the panel did not consider that her actions affected the way that she fulfils her teaching role. The panel also did not consider that, in those circumstances, her actions may lead to pupils being exposed to or influenced by the behaviour in a harmful way. Witness B, in oral evidence, confirmed that her teaching role was unaffected. Her actions took place [REDACTED], and whilst the aftermath occurred in public when the police attended, there was no suggestion that any pupils were present, or would know what had occurred.

For these reasons, the panel was not satisfied that Miss Hillyard was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Miss Hillyard'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 Miss Hillyard conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice, albeit she had not been convicted.

As set out above in the panel's findings as to whether Miss Hillyard was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that behaviours associated with the offences of violence and [REDACTED] were relevant.

The findings of misconduct are serious. Teachers' Standards and KCSIE were breached as referred to above and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher. The panel considered that the public with full knowledge of the circumstances in which the misconduct occurred may sympathise with the position that Miss Hillyard was in but would still regard her actions in hitting Individual A whilst he was holding a child as being reprehensible. It would therefore have a negative impact on the public's perception of her as a teacher, therefore bringing the teaching profession into disrepute.

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

For these reasons, the panel found that Miss Hillyard'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 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 a punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found one of them to be relevant in this case, namely, maintenance of public confidence in the profession. The panel did not consider the protection of other members of the public to be relevant since this was an isolated incident which occurred 7 years ago with no repeat of it since.

The panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be weakened if conduct such as that found against Miss Hillyard were not treated with 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 Miss Hillyard in the profession. The panel decided that there was a public interest consideration in retaining the teacher in the profession, since no doubt had been cast upon her abilities as an educator and she is able to make a valuable contribution to the profession.

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

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

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;
- 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);
- actions or behaviours that...undermine fundamental British values of... the rule of law... and mutual respect...

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.

There was no evidence that Miss Hillyard's actions were not deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Miss Hillyard was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation. [REDACTED].

Miss Hillyard did have a previously good history. There was no evidence that Miss Hillyard had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both her personal and professional conduct or that she had contributed significantly to the education sector. However, Witness C, [REDACTED] provided an extremely positive reference for Miss

Hillyard and attended the hearing to give oral evidence. He explained that they work at a special needs school for students of secondary school age, who have social, emotional and mental health issues, and that many of the student have additional needs associated with neuro-diverse conditions. In his written reference, he described Miss Hillyard as “very much a team player”. He stated that she has responsibility for careers and has shown a great passion in helping pupils develop a positive growth mindset. He stated that she helped them to realise they can have a future when they leave the school, particularly given that many of the pupils have challenging home lives which negatively impacts on their outlook for the future. In oral evidence, Witness C referred to the subjects taught by Miss Hillyard, i.e. careers and PSHE as being difficult, sensitive areas for the children, and he described her energy in engaging the children and her approachability. He also explained that she has now begun to teach art as well. He stated that he had been working in the special needs environment for approximately 30 years and that Miss Hillyard is “up there with some of the best teachers I have worked with”. He explained that if Miss Hillyard was prohibited, he would find it difficult to replace her with someone who is so willing to “get stuck in” and with the positive attitude needed. He explained that she had devoted her career to education for a reason and that is to help others.

Witness C stated that in the time he has known Miss Hillyard he has had no reason to worry, question or talk with her regarding her conduct in school with either pupils or staff. He stated that “throughout this time, her interactions have all been positive, she is a good team member, teacher and role model to my pupils”. The panel considered that the risk of repetition was low. The conduct found proven was an isolated incident that occurred 7 years ago, involving particularly stressful and emotional circumstances with no evidence of any repetition. [REDACTED].

The panel noted that Miss Hillyard had made appropriate admissions in this case. She has accepted that her actions would have been emotionally harmful to Child A, and it was apparent she accepted this from the Judgment. She accepted that she had hit Individual A whilst he was holding Child A and that such behaviour is wrong. Miss Hillyard did not attend the hearing, and the panel was unable to test her insight.

Witness C was asked whether they had discussed Miss Hillyard’s reflections regarding what had occurred. [REDACTED].

[REDACTED]. In those circumstances, the panel understood Witness C’s comment that this remains raw for Miss Hillyard and that she may find it difficult to discuss this.

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, the recommendation of no prohibition order would be both a proportionate and an appropriate response. Given that the nature and severity of the behaviour were at the less serious end of the possible spectrum and, having considered the mitigating factors that were present, the panel determined that a recommendation for a prohibition order would not be appropriate in this case. The panel had regard to the length of time since this conduct and the period in which this case has been under consideration. The panel considered that, in those circumstances, a prohibition order would appear to be more punitive in nature, than it being a measure necessary to protect the public interest. The panel considered that the publication of the adverse findings it had made was sufficient to uphold the maintenance of confidence in the profession.

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 sanction.

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

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

The panel has recommended that the findings of conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, in respect of Miss Rosie Hillyard, should be published and that such an action is proportionate and in the public interest.

In particular, the panel has found that Miss Hillyard 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
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including..., the rule of law... mutual respect...
- 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 Miss Hillyard, involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE).

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding that the behaviours associated with violence and [REDACTED] were relevant.

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 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 Miss Hillyard, 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 that Miss Hillyard acted in a way which may have harmed Child A. However, the panel has also found that it *"...did not consider that, in those circumstances, her actions may lead to pupils being exposed to or influenced by the behaviour in a harmful way."*

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on mitigating factors. The panel has set out that there was no evidence that Miss Hillyard's actions were not deliberate, and that she was not acting under extreme duress at the time. However, the panel also find that *"The conduct found proven was an isolated incident that occurred 7 years ago, involving particularly stressful and emotional circumstances with no evidence of any repetition."*

The panel has also commented that *"...Miss Hillyard had made appropriate admissions in this case. She has accepted that her actions would have been emotionally harmful to Child A, and it was apparent she accepted this from the Judgment. She accepted that she had hit Individual A whilst he was holding Child A and that such behaviour is wrong. Miss Hillyard did not attend the hearing, and the panel was unable to test her insight."*

Despite the panel being unable to test Miss Hillyard's insight, it considered the risk of repetition of the behaviour was low.

In my judgement, the lack of evidence of full insight means that there may be some risk of the repetition of this behaviour. I have therefore given this element some weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe *"that public confidence in the profession could be weakened if conduct such as that found against Miss Hillyard were not treated with seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession."*

I am particularly mindful of the findings of violence in this case, and the impact this may 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 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 Miss Hillyard herself. She has subsequently secured work teaching following the incident. The panel comment *"Miss Hillyard did have a previously good history. There was no evidence that Miss Hillyard had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both her personal and professional conduct or that she had contributed significantly to the education sector."*

I have also taken account of the positive evidence provided to the panel by Witness C regarding Miss Hillyard's contribution to the profession in her current teaching role.

A prohibition order would prevent Miss Hillyard from teaching and continuing in that work. A prohibition order would also clearly deprive the public of her contribution to the profession for the period that it is in force.

I have placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that the conduct was at the less serious end of the possible spectrum, and that *"The panel considered that, in those circumstances, a prohibition order would appear to be more punitive in nature, than it being a measure necessary to protect the public interest. The panel considered that the publication of the adverse findings it had made was sufficient to uphold the maintenance of confidence in the profession."*

For these reasons, I have concluded that a prohibition order is not proportionate or in the public interest. I consider that the publication of the findings made would be sufficient to send an appropriate message to the teacher as to the standards of behaviour that were not acceptable and that the publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession.

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 July 2026

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