



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Alastair Grandison: Professional conduct panel hearing outcome

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

October 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	12
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	15

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

Teacher: Mr Alastair Grandison

Teacher ref number: 040257

Teacher date of birth: 3 March 1975

TRA reference: 21787

Date of determination: 13 October 2026

Former employer: St Dominic's School, Godalming

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ("the panel") of the Teaching Regulation Agency ("the TRA") convened on 4 March 2026 and 12-13 October 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Alastair Grandison.

The panel members were Ms Mona Sood (lay panellist – in the chair), Ms Elizabeth Kitcatt (teacher panellist) and Ms Amanda Godfrey (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Lara Small of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Tom Lambert of QEB Hollis Whiteman.

Mr Grandison was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Hearing dated 16 December 2025.

It was alleged that Mr Grandison was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that, while employed as a teacher at St Dominic's School, Malthouse Lane, Godalming, Surrey, GU8 ('the School'):

1. On 5 November 2022 he sent to Colleague A via email and/or Instagram:
 - a. One or more of the messages as set out in Schedule 1; and/or
 - b. Up to 13 sexually explicit photographs.
2. On 13 October 2022 he sent to Colleague D one or both of the following messages via WhatsApp:
 - a. 'So has anyone ever said to you that it's a massive shame that [REDACTED]
 - b. 'Actually I like it when you get serious and tell me off'

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology, anonymised person/pupil list and list of key people – pages 4 to 6

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 7 to 35

Section 3: TRA witness statements and documents – pages 36 to 475

Section 4: Teacher documents – pages 476 to 479

In addition, in advance of the hearing, the panel received:

- A Service Bundle – 58 pages in length – pages 480 to 538
- A CMH decision document dated 26 February 2026 – pages 539 to 546

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of these documents in advance of the hearing. The panel also received and read in advance of the reconvened hearing on 12 October 2026, an updated Service Bundle of 67 pages in length.

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

Witnesses

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

Colleague D [REDACTED]

Colleague A [REDACTED]

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.

On 6 June 2022 Mr Grandison commenced employment at St Dominic’s School (‘the School’).

On 13 October 2022, Mr Grandison allegedly sent inappropriate messages via WhatsApp to Colleague D.

On 5 November 2022, Mr Grandison allegedly sent inappropriate messages to Colleague A via email and/or Instagram, including 13 sexually explicit photographs.

On 9 November 2022, Mr Grandison was suspended.

On 3 April 2023, the matter was referred to the TRA.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

1. On 5 November 2022 you sent to Colleague A via email and/or Instagram:

a. One or more of the messages as set out in Schedule 1; and/or

b. Up to 13 sexually explicit photographs.

The panel noted that Mr Grandison admitted the facts of allegations 1(a) and 1(b) in the response to the notice of referral dated 18 July 2024. Nevertheless, the panel considered the evidence before it.

The panel had sight of screenshots of messages sent by Mr Grandison to Colleague A on Instagram, which were accompanied by redacted photographs. The panel noted the following messages, which reflected those as set out in Schedule 1:

[REDACTED]

The panel considered the contents of Mr Grandison's written statement that he sent to the School by email on 14 December 2022. In this statement, the panel noted that Mr Grandison admitted that *"on the 5th November I sent indecent pornographic images to Colleague A via Instagram and an email to him via my work email account."* The panel noted that the screenshots of the messages sent from Mr Grandison to Colleague A as set out in Schedule 1 began at "Saturday 18:10", which the panel considered was on Saturday, 5 November 2022.

In his statement, Mr Grandison stated [REDACTED].

The panel noted that in Mr Grandison's email dated 14 December 2022, he stated *"I was asked about sending an Instagram message to Colleague A with [REDACTED] I was asked if I can see that this could be classed as gross indecency. I can see how some people might find that type of humour offensive."*

The panel had sight of redacted photographs sent by Mr Grandison to Colleague A in Instagram messages on 5 November 2022. In conjunction with this, the panel considered the oral evidence of Colleague A, in which Colleague A was taken to the written descriptions of 26 photographs that Mr Grandison had sent to Colleague A, which was appended to the School's investigation report. In his oral evidence, Colleague A confirmed that all of the descriptions of the photographs were accurate. These descriptions included:

[REDACTED]

The panel considered the witness statement of Colleague A dated 4 July 2025. Colleague A stated that on Friday 4 November 2022, [REDACTED]. Colleague A stated that the day after this, on Saturday 5 November 2022, he received a series of Instagram messages from Mr Grandison. He stated that the messages made him feel uncomfortable and panicked and that the messages were not typical of their in-person conversations. Colleague A stated that he was embarrassed by the messages and photograph attachments and further stated that the images he received were sexually explicit and he did not want them on his phone.

The panel noted that in Mr Grandison's email statement to the School dated 14 December 2022, he accepted that his actions in sending 13 indecent images to Colleague A were *"unsolicited."*

The panel considered the witness statement of Witness C, who stated that Mr Grandison had sent Colleague A *"a series of 13 explicit images (breasts and vagina) [REDACTED]. The chat included a picture of [REDACTED], and misogynistic comments about disciplining [REDACTED] and training [REDACTED] for anal sex"*.

The panel considered that photographs of [REDACTED] breasts and vagina (even if covered by a hand) with an inserted butt plug are sexually explicit photographs.

Given Mr Grandison's own admission and in light of the evidence before it as detailed above, the panel considered it was more likely than not that on 5 November 2022 Mr Grandison sent to Colleague A via Instagram all of the messages as set out in Schedule 1 and up to 13 sexually explicit photographs.

The panel found allegations 1(a) and 1(b) proven.

2. On 13 October 2022 you sent to Colleague D one or both of the following messages via WhatsApp:

a. 'So has anyone ever said to you that it's a massive shame that you're [REDACTED]

b. 'Actually I like it when you get serious and tell me off'

The panel noted that Mr Grandison admitted the facts of allegations 2(a) and 2(b) in the response to the notice of referral dated 18 July 2024. Nevertheless, the panel considered the evidence before it.

The panel considered a screenshot of a transcript that set out the messages Colleague D and Mr Grandison had exchanged on WhatsApp between 10 October and 13 October 2022.

The panel noted that on 13 October 2022 at 00:37am Mr Grandison sent a message to Colleague D stating *"So has anyone ever said to you that it's a massive shame that you're [REDACTED]."*

The panel further noted that on 13 October 2022 at 12:27pm Mr Grandison sent a message to Colleague D stating *"Yikes! Actually, I like it when you get serious and tell me off. Not sure why exactly..."*. The panel noted that the timing of this message was during school working hours. The panel noted that at 09:17am that same day Colleague D had messaged Mr Grandison stating that she needed to get some work done.

The panel noted that Mr Grandison wrote in a message to Colleague D at 08:51am on 13 October 2022 *“thank you for being so tolerant of such an un-PC and quite probably offensive sense of humour.”* The panel considered this to demonstrate that Mr Grandison was aware at the time that his comments to Colleague D were offensive.

The panel considered the oral evidence and written statement of Colleague D, who stated that [REDACTED] they had exchanged personal phone numbers for this purpose as they did not have work phone numbers to exchange. In Colleague D’s evidence, she confirmed that she had only exchanged her mobile number with Mr Grandison entirely for work purposes.

Colleague D stated that the messages Mr Grandison was sending were not typical of their usual in-person interactions. She stated that he messaged her at night, and on the 13 October 2022 she received two concerning messages, stating *“so has anyone ever said to you that it’s a massive shame that you’re [REDACTED]”,* and *“actually, I like it when you get serious and tell me off.”*

Colleague D stated that [REDACTED] this comment made her *“skin crawl”*. She explained that she reported the comment to her line manager on the same day.

The panel noted that Colleague D stated in her witness statement that *“the messages were certainly unsolicited.”*

The panel considered the witness statement of Witness C dated 13 June 2025 in which she stated that Mr Grandison *“[REDACTED] Colleague D who reported inappropriate text messages that left her feeling uncomfortable.”*

Based on the available evidence, the panel was satisfied Mr Grandison did send Colleague D messages via WhatsApp on 13 October 2022 stating ‘So has anyone ever said to you that it’s a massive shame that you’re [REDACTED] and ‘Actually I like it when you get serious and tell me off’.

The panel found allegations 2(a) and 2(b) proven.

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

Having found all of the allegations proven, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to unacceptable professional conduct.

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 Grandison, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Grandison 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
 - ...building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position.
 - 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.

The panel agreed with Witness C's assessment in her evidence that Mr Grandison's actions in sending the highly inappropriate messages and sexually explicit [REDACTED] to colleagues were in breach of School policies and expectations. The panel noted the following in particular:

- The School's Dignity at Work Policy: *"examples of unacceptable behaviour that are covered by this policy include: unwelcome jokes or comments of a sexual nature...or about a person's...sexual orientation; the open display of pictures...with sexual overtones e.g. pornographic imagery."*
- Staff Code of Conduct: *"your activities outside work, including how you represent yourself and the organisation online, should not adversely affect the organisation....the following may result in disciplinary action: use of social media...that contravenes these principles."*
- The School's Positive Behaviour Policy: *"Staff...need to constantly re-examine and reflect upon their own values, attitudes and behaviours in order to appreciate the messages that they are giving pupils/students."*
- The School's IT Acceptable Use Policy: *"You must not: access, download, send or receive any data (including images), which OHC&AT considers offensive in any way, including sexually explicit, discriminatory, defamatory...material."*

The panel considered that Mr Grandison had breached his proper professional boundaries by sending these messages unsolicited to two separate colleagues on two separate occasions.

The panel noted that none of the allegations involved pupils. However, the panel also noted that Mr Grandison had attempted to justify his behaviour in sending the inappropriate messages as simply his sense of humour. The panel noted Mr Grandison stated in his email statement to the School dated 14 December 2022: *"I'm new to the school and I was trying too hard to make friends and get colleagues to like me by being funny."* The panel

considered that Mr Grandison was in breach of the following provision of KCSIE dated 1 September 2022:

- *“Downplaying certain behaviours, for example dismissing sexual harassment as “just banter”, “just having a laugh”, “part of growing up” or “boys being boys” can lead to a culture of unacceptable behaviours, an unsafe environment for children and in worst case scenarios a culture that normalises abuse leading to children accepting it as normal and not coming forward to report it.”*

The panel also considered whether Mr Grandison’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 Mr Grandison’s behaviour in sharing sexually explicit photographs [REDACTED] to a colleague had the hallmarks of the offence of revenge pornography (sharing private, sexual materials, either photos or videos, of another person without their consent). The panel had seen no evidence within the bundle that [REDACTED] had consented to the sharing of these sexually explicit images [REDACTED] with Mr Grandison’s colleagues. The panel noted that the list on page 12 of the Advice was a non-exhaustive list and that the panel was not required to make a finding as to whether such an offence had been committed or not; merely that Mr Grandison’s behaviours were associated with such an offence.

The panel noted that some of the allegations took place outside the education setting, insofar as some of the messages were sent outside of School working hours and on social media. However, despite this, the panel considered that Mr Grandison’s conduct was relevant to his position as a teacher, because he had exchanged these messages with two separate work colleagues, neither of whom the panel had any evidence of a prior existing personal friendship with Mr Grandison outside of work. The panel noted that Mr Grandison accepted that the messages he sent were unsolicited. Colleague D had confirmed in her evidence the only reason she provided Mr Grandison with her mobile phone number was for professional purposes. The panel also noted that some of the messages Mr Grandison sent to Colleague D on 13 October 2022 were sent during working hours and whilst Mr Grandison was aware that Colleague D was working.

The panel further noted that following Mr Grandison’s exchange of inappropriate messages with Colleague D on 13 October 2022, Witness C had met with Mr Grandison and gave him an informal warning for his behaviour and clear expectations were set out about contact and conduct with colleagues moving forward. Despite this, only a short time later, Mr Grandison then continued to send highly inappropriate messages to another colleague, Colleague A on 5 November 2022. The panel concluded that Mr Grandison would and

should have been aware that his behaviour in doing so contravened School policy and the expectations as made clear to him by Witness C.

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

In relation to whether Mr Grandison'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. The panel considered that Mr Grandison's actions, as found proved in sending the sexually explicit photographs and inappropriate messages to colleagues, to fall very far short of role model behaviour.

In considering the issue of disrepute, the panel also considered whether Mr Grandison'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 Grandison was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found that Mr Grandison's behaviour as found proven had the hallmarks of the offence of revenge pornography (sharing private, sexual materials, either photos or videos, of another person without their consent).

The findings of misconduct are serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher. The panel considered the content of the messages Mr Grandison sent to Colleague A to be highly offensive, discriminatory and derogatory towards women.

The panel considered that Mr Grandison's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher. Taking the panel's experience into account, the panel considered that the ordinary public bystander would not expect a teacher to behave in the way Mr Grandison did when he repeatedly sent highly offensive derogatory messages and sexually explicit photographs to colleagues on an unsolicited basis.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Grandison'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; and
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct within the teaching profession.

The panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Grandison 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 Grandison 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 Grandison in the profession. Mr Grandison provided no evidence as to his ability as an educator. The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Grandison in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.

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 considered Mr Grandison's behaviour in sending sexually explicit photographs to a colleague on an unsolicited basis and highly inappropriate messages was serious (albeit the panel noted that teachers are not to be held as paragons of virtue so the panel factored this into its consideration).

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 Grandison.

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; and
- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour. The panel considered this to be relevant in light of the contents of Mr Grandison's messages which were highly offensive and degrading towards women and the impact of Mr Grandison's messages on his colleagues, Colleague A and Colleague D who both described being affected.

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 Mr Grandison's actions were not deliberate.

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

There was no evidence before the panel that Mr Grandison had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or had contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel considered that Mr Grandison's actions in sending the messages to Colleague A and Colleague D were out of character in terms of his interactions with them. Colleague D stated in her oral evidence that the tone of the messages Mr Grandison sent her were *"a step further in terms of familiarity"* and it was *"a new development"*. Colleague A stated in his witness statement dated 4 July 2025 that *"No messages were exchanged on Instagram or elsewhere until the messages that were received on the 5 November 2022."*

The panel considered whether there were any mitigating circumstances which explained Mr Grandison's behaviour. The panel noted that Mr Grandison's reasons for sending the messages were inconsistent over the passage of time. The panel noted that in Mr Grandison's written statement sent by email to the School on 14 December 2022 he suggested the reason for sending the messages was his sense of humour. The panel further noted that in this written statement, Mr Grandison attempted to qualify his behaviour by stating that his behaviour in sharing the sexually explicit photographs [REDACTED] was not technically illegal at that time. In his disciplinary hearing on 28 February 2023, Mr Grandison then stated that he sent the messages because he was drunk on alcohol in

combination with anti-depressants, but Mr Grandison had not mentioned this beforehand. The panel noted that it had no substantiating medical evidence before it for Mr Grandison at the time of the events in October and November 2022, nor any corroborating evidence of alcohol misuse. The panel was therefore unconvinced by these mitigating circumstances offered by Mr Grandison, given the lack of corroboratory evidence and the inconsistent nature of the reasons provided.

The panel considered whether Mr Grandison had shown remorse for his actions. The panel noted the following extracts from Mr Grandison's mitigation statement he provided to the School during his disciplinary hearing on 28 February 2023:

- *"I am truly ashamed of my behaviour that weekend and it was totally out of character."*
- *"I am not seeking to provide excuses for my actions, merely to provide an explanation for why I behaved in a manner which is so completely out of character."*
- *"Yes I've made some stupid mistakes and errors of judgment".*

However, the panel considered it disappointing that Mr Grandison had not provided a mitigation statement to the TRA and the email Mr Grandison sent to the TRA dated 20 February 2026 evidenced a blatant disregard for both the regulator and the importance of these regulatory proceedings. In summary, the panel concluded that there was only limited evidence of any genuine remorse by Mr Grandison.

The panel considered whether Mr Grandison had shown insight into his actions, including the effect his actions had on others and whether there was any risk of repetition. The panel noted that Mr Grandison stated in his disciplinary hearing on 28 February 2023 that *"I felt so ashamed of my actions towards my colleagues and could not understand how I had behaved that way."* The panel noted that Mr Grandison had apologised to Colleague D following the messages he sent to her on 13 October 2022. However, Colleague D described in her oral evidence that the apology felt *"a little bit insincere...I don't know how genuine it was"* or if it was simply done to *"tick a box"*. The panel therefore considered there to be only limited evidence of insight about the impact his actions had had on his colleagues. The panel had insufficient evidence (given the lack of genuine remorse or insight) to determine the risk of Mr Grandison repeating this conduct in future.

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 Grandison 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 Grandison. The highly offensive, degrading comments coupled with sexually explicit photographs which Mr Grandison sent to Colleague A on an unsolicited basis, were significant factors in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

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

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

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

The Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate.

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

Although the panel considered the content of the messages Mr Grandison sent to Colleague A in particular to be morally reprehensible, the panel was mindful that teachers are not expected to be paragons of virtue. Despite the lack of demonstrable insight or remorse before the panel, the panel noted that the messages were sent by Mr Grandison across a relatively short period of time, and that no pupils were harmed or at risk of harm.

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 considered it would be proportionate to provide Mr Grandison with a further opportunity to demonstrate genuine remorse and insight to a panel at a future date. The panel concluded that a proposed review period of five years would be proportionate in the circumstances of this case.

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 Alastair Grandison should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of five years.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Grandison 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
 - ...building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position.
 - 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.

The panel has found that the conduct of Mr Grandison fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include sending inappropriate messages and sexually explicit photographs to a colleague.

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 Grandison, 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 noted that none of the allegations involved pupils. However, the panel also noted that Mr Grandison had attempted to justify his behaviour in sending the inappropriate messages as simply his sense of humour. The panel noted Mr Grandison stated in his email statement to the School dated 14 December 2022: *“I’m new to the school and I was trying too hard to make friends and get colleagues to like me by being funny.”* The panel considered that Mr Grandison was in breach of the following provision of KCSIE dated 1 September 2022:

- *“Downplaying certain behaviours, for example dismissing sexual harassment as “just banter”, “just having a laugh”, “part of growing up” or “boys being boys” can lead to a culture of unacceptable behaviours, an unsafe environment for children and in worst case scenarios a culture that normalises abuse leading to children accepting it as normal and not coming forward to report it.”*

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. The panel has found that “there was only limited evidence of any genuine remorse by Mr Grandison.” The panel has also found “there to be only limited evidence of insight about the impact his actions had had on his colleagues. The panel had insufficient evidence (given the lack of genuine remorse or insight) to determine the risk of Mr Grandison repeating this conduct in future.” In my judgement, the lack of full insight and remorse means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

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

“The panel considered that Mr Grandison’s conduct could potentially damage the public’s perception of a teacher. Taking the panel’s experience into account, the panel considered that the ordinary public bystander would not expect a teacher to behave in the way Mr Grandison did when he repeatedly sent highly offensive derogatory messages and sexually explicit photographs to colleagues on an unsolicited basis.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of sending sexually explicit photographs to a colleague in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

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

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of unacceptable professional conduct 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 Grandison himself. The panel has observed that "Mr Grandison provided no evidence as to his ability as an educator."

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Grandison 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 Mr Grandison's conduct. The panel has said:

"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 Grandison. The highly offensive, degrading comments coupled with sexually explicit photographs which Mr Grandison sent to Colleague A on an unsolicited basis, 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."

I have also placed considerable weight on the panel's finding that Mr Grandison had demonstrated only limited insight and remorse into his conduct.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Mr Grandison 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 insight and remorse, 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 five-year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments:

"Although the panel considered the content of the messages Mr Grandison sent to Colleague A in particular to be morally reprehensible, the panel was mindful that teachers are not expected to be paragons of virtue. Despite the lack of demonstrable

insight or remorse before the panel, the panel noted that the messages were sent by Mr Grandison across a relatively short period of time, and that no pupils were harmed or at risk of harm.

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 considered it would be proportionate to provide Mr Grandison with a further opportunity to demonstrate genuine remorse and insight to a panel at a future date. The panel concluded that a proposed review period of five years would be proportionate in the circumstances of this case.”

I have considered whether a five-year review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a shorter review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the serious nature of the misconduct, the lack of full insight and remorse, and the risk of repetition.

I consider therefore that a five-year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

This means that Mr Alastair Grandison 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 2031, five 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 Grandison remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr Grandison 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: 15 October 2026

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