Teaching Regulation Agency

Mr Andrew Wilson: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

November 2026

Contents

Introduction 3

Allegations 4

Summary of evidence 6

Documents 6

Witnesses 6

Decision and reasons **7**

Findings of fact 8

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State 20

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State 24

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

Teacher:	Mr Andrew Wilson
Teacher ref number:	0608841
Teacher date of birth:	19 November 1981
TRA reference:	24702
Date of determination:	6 November 2026
Former employer:	Oldham Council Music Services, Oldham

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ("the panel") of the Teaching Regulation Agency ("the TRA") convened on 2 to 6 November 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Andrew Wilson.

The panel members were Mr Peter Ward (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Melissa West (teacher panellist) and Mrs Lucy Conley (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Jermel Anderson of Blake Morgan LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Harry Perkin, Counsel of 3 Raymond Buildings, Counsel, instructed by Kingsley Napley LLP solicitors.

Mr Andrew Wilson was present and was not represented. He was assisted by Mr Martin Jones of Hugh James LLP who was appointed as special counsel for the purposes of cross examination.

The hearing took place in public save that portions of the hearing were heard in private and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of hearing dated 18 August 2026 and amended during this hearing.

It was alleged that Mr Andrew Wilson was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that whilst employed as a Music Teacher at Oldham Council Music Services, part of the Local Authority:

1. Between around June 2010 and March 2011, in relation to Pupil A he;

    a. Sent messages of an inappropriate nature to Pupil A as follows, words to the effect of:

        i. “my lovely sexy piccolo players comin Friday”;

        ii. “stop playing all coy!”;

        iii. “Well I think u look nice in photos”;

        iv. “u a bad girl”;

        v. “Must be just me with a dirty mind then”;

        vi. “No getting drunk tho I know u get really flirty wen pissed”;

        vii. “u donthave photos up cos ure always snoggin boys faces off!”;

        viii. “have fun message me later wen ure back and all sweaty!”;

        ix. “ure gorgeous”;

        x. “Just needs a good rub down ull have pulled something”;

        xi. “Do u want sex references in it?”;

        xii. “Hellloooooooo u got credit yet gorgeous??”;

        xiii. “U looked bloody gorgeous tonight”;

        xiv. “I love you!!!! Xxx”;

        xv. “You should play hookie from school on a fri afternoon and come and mess around with me”;

        xvi. “Well u looked bloody gorgeous”;

        xvii. “cos im like old decrepid and mainly minging and ure beautiful!!”;

        xviii. “I get the best cuddles eva!! U can b the judge if u want!!”;

        xix. “r u a daddys girl??”;

        xx. “night [Pupil A], care for u more than u will ever know XXXXX”

b. Asked Pupil A to leave school to go and see him at his home;

c. Hugged Pupil A and/or kissed the top of her head.

2. Between around 2009 and 2014, he sent inappropriate messages to Pupil Q including;

a. Comments about her being a “blond bombshell” or words to that effect;

b. Stating “can I not text you now that you’ve got a boyfriend?”.

3. Between around 2009 and 2012, he sent inappropriate messages to Pupil R including;

a. Sending messages late at night;

b. Commenting on Pupil R’s appearance;

c. Referring to Pupil R’s [REDACTED] dress;

d. Stating “oh, if we go somewhere hot then I could see you in a bikini” or words to that effect.

4. On or around 10 February 2022, he made comments of an inappropriate nature to Colleague A in that he said:

a. “you looked hot in your bikini”, or words to that effect;

b. “I’d rate you an 8 out of 10”, or words to that effect.

5. On or around 17 March 2022, he made comments of an inappropriate nature to Colleague A in that he said “before you leave let’s have a quickie in the music cupboard”, or words to that effect.

6. His conduct at paragraphs 1 - 5 above was sexually motivated and/or sexual in nature.

Mr Wilson made admissions to the sub-particulars of Allegation 1.a. in full. Mr Wilson denied allegation 1.b, allegation 1.c, allegation 2.a, allegation 2.b, Allegation 3.a, allegation 3.b, allegation 3.c, allegation 3.d, allegation 4.a, allegation 4.b, allegation 5 and allegation 6. Mr Wilson made no admissions as to whether the conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct 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: Chronology, key person list and anonymised person list – pages 5 to 8

Section 2: Notice of hearing and response – pages 10 to 18

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 20 to 50

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency exhibits – pages 52 to 349

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 351 - 370

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

Section 6: Additional documents – page 371 - 382

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:

Pupil A, [REDACTED];

Pupil R, [REDACTED];

Pupil Q, [REDACTED];

Colleague A, [REDACTED]

Mr Wilson also gave oral evidence before the panel.

In addition to the above witnesses, the panel considered the hearsay accounts of several witness, including:

Witness F, [REDACTED];

Witness G , [REDACTED];

Witness H, [REDACTED];

Witness I, [REDACTED];

Witness J, [REDACTED].

Where reference is made to these witnesses the panel was sure to treat the evidence with caution, due to the fact that it is hearsay evidence. The relevant legal considerations are detailed where their evidence is relied upon as below.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

Mr Wilson worked with the Stockport Music Service between 2009 - 2019 and was Conductor of the Wind Orchestra Band. He was also employed as a Music Teacher at Oldham Local Authority Music Service, engaged at several schools between 1 April 2010 and 30 September 2024.

It was alleged that between 2009 and 2014, he variously engaged in inappropriate communication with Pupil R, Pupil Q and Pupil A, students who were [REDACTED].

Through his employment, Mr Wilson was placed at several schools simultaneously. He allegedly made inappropriate comments to a Colleague A, [REDACTED], on 10 February 2022 and on 17 March 2022.

A disciplinary hearing was held in relation to the concerns regarding Colleague A on 11 October 2022.

On 30 April 2024, Mr Wilson was arrested following Pupil A reporting concerns to the police regarding communications between herself and Mr Wilson which occurred between 2010 and 2011. No charges were brought against Mr Wilson following the police investigation. The police then referred Mr Wilson to the Oldham LADO in September 2024.

Mr Wilson was subsequently referred to the TRA by Oldham Council in November 2024.

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. **Between around June 2010 and March 2011, in relation to Pupil A you;**

    a. **Sent messages of an inappropriate nature to Pupil A as follows, words to the effect of:**

        i. **“my lovely sexy [REDACTED] players comin Friday”;**

        ii. **“stop playing all coy!”;**

        iii. **“Well I think u look nice in photos”;**

        iv. **“u a bad girl”;**

        v. **“Must be just me with a dirty mind then”;**

        vi. **“No getting drunk tho I know u get really flirty wen pissed”;**

        vii. **“u donthave photos up cos ure always snoggin boys faces off!”;**

        viii. **“have fun message me later wen ure back and all sweaty!”;**

        ix. **“ure gorgeous”;**

        x. **“Just needs a good rub down ull have pulled something”;**

        xi. **“Do u want sex references in it?”;**

        xii. **“Hellllooooooo u got credit yet gorgeous??”;**

        xiii. **“U looked bloody gorgeous tonight”;**

        xiv. **“I love you!!!! Xxx”;**

        xv. **“You should play hookie from school on a fri afternoon and come and mess around with me”;**

        xvi. **“Well u looked bloody gorgeous”;**

        xvii. **“cos im like old decrepid and mainly minging and ure beautiful!!”;**

xviii. "I get the best cuddles eva!! U can b the judge if u want!!";

xix. "r u a daddys girl??";

xx. "night [Pupil A], care for u more than u will ever know XXXXX"

When considering this allegation, the panel was cognisant of the fact that it had been admitted by Mr Wilson. It however considered it appropriate to consider whether the admission was supported by the other evidence that it had been presented with.

The panel noted that it had been presented with all of the messages as referenced within the sub-particulars and that Pupil A had confirmed through her evidence that they were sent to her by Mr Wilson. The panel additionally noted that these messages were sent via Facebook messenger.

The panel was satisfied that it was more likely than not that all of these messages were sent. It additionally formed the view that they were inappropriate by virtue of their nature, given that they were neither suitable, nor appropriate messages for a teacher to send to a pupil.

The panel accordingly found allegation 1.a. proved.

b. Asked Pupil A to leave school to go and see you at your home;

The panel acknowledged that Mr Wilson denied this allegation. It was also mindful that within the Facebook messages that it had sight of, whilst Mr Wilson appeared to be inviting Pupil A to meet him outside of school, no explicit mention was made of going to his home.

When considering the other evidence in relation to this case, the panel noted that during her oral evidence, Pupil A stated that she did not know where Mr Wilson's home was but was candid in her account that it was "what my belief was" in relation to there being an invitation to Mr Wilson's home. The panel noted that it was accepted by both parties that there had been an exchange of text messages between the parties but that these had not been exhibited as they were no longer available. The panel accordingly considered that it would be appropriate in the circumstances to draw an inference about the substantive nature of the messages.

During oral evidence, Pupil Q gave an account that Pupil A had told her that Mr Wilson had invited her to his home and that she had been shown a text message to this effect by Pupil A. Pupil Q also provided an account within her witness statement that Pupil A had stated to her, "oh no he's invited me round". The panel considered that Pupil Q had been consistent in relation to this issue throughout the accounts she had given in relation to

this matter. It additionally noted that Pupil R had also said she had seen the text message on the phone.

The panel considered in the circumstances that it would be appropriate to draw an inference as to the presence of a text message from Mr Wilson, explicitly inviting Pupil A to his home. In circumstances where Pupil A had recalled such an event, where there was no denial as to the exchange of text messages, and there was compelling corroboration as to the presence of such a message, the panel determined that it was more likely than not that such an invitation was sent via text.

The panel accordingly found Allegation 1.b. proved.

c. Hugged Pupil A and/or kissed the top of her head.

The panel noted that Pupil A's account in relation to this incident was detailed. It was noted by the panel that during both her oral and written evidence, Pupil A had described an incident where Mr Wilson had approached her in an empty corridor within the school environment and hugged her and kissed the top of her head. She described this in detail during her oral evidence which the panel considered to be compelling. The panel further noted that Pupil A's oral evidence was consistent with her witness statement that was prepared for these proceedings and the account that she gave to the police.

Mr Wilson denied this allegation. It was his assertion that the corridor would have been busy at the time as suggested and therefore, it would not be plausible. The panel however considered that this was not contrary to Pupil A's position. Notably, Pupil A had stated that she was concerned that "someone may see" what had happened, suggesting that it may have indeed taken place within a busy environment.

It was the panel's position given Pupil A's compelling account, and her consistency throughout her accounts, it could place significant reliance upon her account. The panel determined that it was more likely than not that Mr Wilson had hugged Pupil A and/or kissed the top of her head as described.

The panel therefore found Allegation 1.c. proved.

2. Between around 2009 and 2014, you sent inappropriate messages to Pupil Q including;

b. Stating "can I not text you now that you've got a boyfriend?".

When considering this allegation, the panel acknowledged that it had not been presented with the alleged text message. It was Pupil Q's evidence that the text message was no longer available due to the passage of time since it was sent. Mr Wilson denied the

exchange, stating that he was unaware of Pupil Q's relationship and would not have made this remark. Mr Wilson additionally asserted that he did not have Pupil Q's phone number.

The panel noted that Pupil Q had stated that she had received this message from Mr Wilson and was clear in her recollection. The panel considered it notable that Pupil Q had given a consistent account in relation to this message during her oral evidence that was concurrent with her written evidence. It considered that she was a compelling witness in this regard.

The panel considered the plausibility of Mr Wilson knowing of the relationship as a pertinent factor in its consideration. It noted that Mr Wilson had stated during his oral evidence that at the time he was trying to be the "cool teacher". It further noted that by his own account, Mr Wilson had said that he had been "overfamiliar with pupils". Pupil Q had said that her relationship with Pupil W was "general knowledge" and that Mr Wilson, would have known about it due to the closeness of [REDACTED]. The panel additionally noted that Mr Wilson had given evidence that there were approximately 30 members of [REDACTED], which it considered was further indication that he would likely have known of the relationship. The panel also noted that it had sight of Mr Wilson discussing relationships with other pupils, it accordingly did not consider that it would be implausible for Mr Wilson to have also entered into such a discussion with Pupil Q.

In the circumstances where Mr Wilson had been an overfamiliar teacher, the panel did not consider it plausible that there was no knowledge of the relationship. It additionally considered that Pupil Q had been consistent in her accounts in relation to this message. The panel accordingly considered it more likely than not that the message was sent. It determined that a message of this nature would not be appropriate or suitable in the circumstances.

The panel accordingly found Allegation 2.b. proved.

3. Between around 2009 and 2012, you sent inappropriate messages to Pupil R including;

a. Sending messages late at night;

The panel noted that this allegation was initially denied by Mr Wilson. An exhibit was shown during Pupil R's evidence, containing the screenshot of a Facebook messenger exchange with an account with the name "Facebook User". Pupil R asserted that these messages had come from Mr Wilson's account, but it showed as "Facebook User" as he had subsequently deleted it. Whilst the messages that were sent to Pupil R were not visible, likely due to the account deletion, the timestamps remained present. The

timestamps as present showed that “Facebook User” had sent messages at the following times:

- 03/12/2009, 21:37
- 23/01/2011, 22:24

Mr Wilson subsequently conceded that he had therefore sent messages late at night to Pupil R. The panel formed the view that any messages sent late at night by a teacher in this context could not be considered appropriate in the circumstances.

The panel, having had sight of the messages, and having noted Mr Wilson’s acknowledgement, accordingly, found Allegation 3.a. proved.

b. Commenting on Pupil R’s appearance;

Pupil R gave an account that Mr Wilson had sent her text messages commenting on her appearance, often pre and post rehearsal and that within those messages, Mr Wilson would call her “gorgeous”. Pupil R gave oral evidence before the panel, that she would have her phone propped up on her music stand during rehearsals. Pupil R also gave evidence that the messages had “flattered” her and were about her appearance.

Mr Wilson denied sending the messages and asserted that it would not have been possible to send messages of this nature during rehearsals as he would have been teaching. He also gave evidence that there was a rule which prohibited pupils from having their phones out during lessons.

Pupil R agreed that there was a rule prohibiting pupils from having their phones out during rehearsals. She however stated that her phone was concealed as it was on her music stand.

Having considered the evidence, the panel considered Pupil R’s account to be compelling. It noted that she had been consistent as to the nature of the messages that she had received from Mr Wilson. The panel also noted that Pupil R gave evidence that Mr Wilson had made comments about her appearance when seeing her in person. The panel considered that this evidence was compelling and was consistent with the written account that Pupil R had provided to the TRA. Whilst there was no allegation that Mr Wilson had made comments about Pupil R’s appearance in person, the panel considered this evidence to be relevant to the question of whether he had made comments about her appearance via message. In circumstances where Mr Wilson had made comments about Pupil R’s appearance in person, the panel considered it plausible that this would also take place via message. It therefore concluded that it was more likely than not that Mr Wilson had sent Pupil R text messages commenting upon her appearance.

The panel determined that messages that commented upon the appearance of a pupil could not be considered appropriate in the circumstances.

The panel accordingly found allegation 3.b. proved.

d. Stating "oh, if we go somewhere hot then I could see you in a bikini" or words to that effect.

When considering this allegation, the panel noted that per the evidence of Pupil R, the subtext of this discussion was that it was connected to a discussion about [REDACTED]. Mr Wilson gave evidence that there had never been plans for [REDACTED], and that he would have been privy to such a discussion. He therefore suggested that this subject was not one that would have arisen. Pupil Q gave evidence that her recollection was that whilst there was [REDACTED].

The panel noted that Pupil R had been consistent in both her written and her oral accounts as to her recollection that Mr Wilson had made the comment via text message pertaining to seeing her in a bikini if [REDACTED].

When considering this allegation, the panel noted that Pupil Q's witness statement referred to having been "told" about this interaction, but during oral evidence she gave an account that she had "seen" the text in question. Whilst this inconsistency was noted, the panel considered that the unreliability of memory was likely a factor; regardless it considered that it corroborated Pupil R's account somewhat insofar as there appeared to be at least some suggestion that Pupil Q was aware of the text at the relevant time. It additionally noted that Pupil A's account was that she was aware that Mr Wilson had "asked Pupil R for bikini photos from her holidays". It noted that this was substantively different with the substance of the message as reported by Pupil R. The panel however considered that in the circumstances it still lent itself to there being some discussion pertaining to bikinis.

In circumstances where Pupil R had given a consistent account regarding the messaging and it was partially corroborated by two witnesses; the panel considered it to be more likely than not that the message was sent by Mr Wilson. The panel additionally had regard to Pupil Q's evidence that whilst no official tour was organised, the prospect of one was something that was discussed and therefore, it did not consider that the absence of a formally organised tour meant that the discussion did not take place.

It was the view of the panel, that messages referring to seeing a pupil wearing a bikini could not be considered appropriate in the circumstances.

The panel therefore found Allegation 3.d proved.

4. On or around 10 February 2022, you made comments of an inappropriate nature to Colleague A in that he said:

a. "you looked hot in your bikini", or words to that effect;

The panel noted that Colleague A gave evidence that this comment was made following Mr Wilson having looked at her Facebook account and seen a photograph of her at a local spa. Mr Wilson denied making the comment. Mr Wilson's recollection was that they had discussed the Facebook photos showing Colleague A in the spa, but that he had made the remark: "I nearly spat my tea out" and then had said nothing further. Colleague A acknowledged that this conversation had taken place, but recalled that Mr Wilson had also commented that she looked hot in her bikini.

The panel observed that within Oldham Music Service's disciplinary investigation report, Colleague A provided an account which was consistent with her witness statement and oral evidence. It also noted that three hearsay witnesses, Witness H, Witness I and Witness J who were referred to within the report, all corroborated the account as provided by Colleague A, commenting that she had relayed the incident directly to them. Whilst it noted that these accounts were hearsay evidence for the purposes of these proceedings, the panel determined that it could afford them significant weight, due to the fact that they corroborated the evidence of Colleague A, and each other.

The panel noted that Colleague A's oral evidence was consistent with the written accounts within the disciplinary investigation report. It also noted that Colleague A and Mr Wilson appeared to have had a positive prior relationship. Notably, Mr Wilson had provided a screenshot detailing an exchange between them prior to the alleged incident which was indicative of a positive relationship between them. The panel therefore did not consider it plausible in the circumstances that any ulterior motive could be inferred in relation to Colleague A's initial complaint.

The panel determined that a comment of this nature to a colleague could not be construed as appropriate in the circumstances.

The panel accordingly found Allegation 4.a. proved.

b. "I'd rate you an 8 out of 10", or words to that effect.

It was Colleague A's recollection that on the same day as the incident as detailed at Allegation 4.a, Mr Wilson had commented to Colleague A that he would rate her an 8 out of 10. Mr Wilson denied making the comment.

As with Allegation 4.a, the panel had regard to Colleague A's relationship with Mr Wilson and the fact that there was contemporaneous material showing the complaint and the fact that it was corroborated by others.

Notably, Colleague A sent an email, on 23 March 2023, detailing this incident in addition to the incident as alleged at Allegation 4.a. and the incident as alleged at Allegation 5. The panel further observed that as with Allegation 4.a, Witness H, Witness I and Witness J gave evidence within the disciplinary investigation report, setting out that the incident had been reported to them by Colleague A. Whilst the panel was careful to treat these hearsay accounts with caution, it again afforded them significant weight due to their corroboration with each other and with the evidence of Colleague A.

The panel however considered that as with Allegation 4.a, Colleague A's consistent, compelling and corroborated account was reliable in circumstances where no plausible ulterior motive could be identified. This was reinforced by the comment that Colleague A made at the end of her written complaint, where she stated "I don't like to get people in trouble but I feel this behaviour is highly inappropriate with in any work setting".

The panel determined that a comment of this nature to a colleague could not be construed as appropriate in the circumstances.

The panel accordingly found Allegation 4.b. proved.

5. **On or around 17 March 2022, you made comments of an inappropriate nature to Colleague A in that you said "before you leave let's have a quickie in the music cupboard", or words to that effect.**

As with Allegation 4, Allegation 5 was denied by Mr Wilson. Within her account, Colleague A had asserted that Mr Wilson had hugged or touched her when making the remark and whilst this element of the incident was not alleged, the panel considered it material to the credibility of any evidence surrounding it. Mr Wilson's evidence was that at the time where this incident would have been said to have happened, his hands would have been full as he would have been holding his trumpet case and laptop, meaning he could not have touched her. He also denied making the remark.

The panel acknowledged that Colleague A had sent an email setting out the details of the incident stating, "I was walking up the corridor going to the ladies toilet and he was walking down the corridor towards the entrance. As we passed he said he would miss me and hugged me, whisperering [sic] "let's have a quicke [sic] in the music cupboard before you go". The panel considered this to be wholly consistent with her witness statement and oral evidence in relation to the alleged incident.

The panel had particular regard for the fact that Witness H had asserted that Colleague A had reported the incident to her directly, as did Witness I and Witness J. Whilst these were hearsay witnesses, their corroboration and consistency meant that panel afforded these accounts significant weight.

The panel considered that in circumstances where Colleague A had given a consistent and compelling account that was commensurate with her contemporaneous account, it was more likely than not that Mr Wilson had made the remark as alleged towards her.

The panel determined that a comment of this nature to a colleague could not be construed as appropriate in the circumstances.

The panel accordingly found Allegation 5 proved.

6. His conduct at paragraphs 1 - 5 above was sexually motivated and/or sexual in nature.

When considering this allegation, the panel was mindful to consider the appropriate definitions. It considered that sexual motivation required consideration of whether the act or communication could be said to be done either in pursuit of sexual gratification or in pursuit of a future sexual relationship. The panel also considered that in relation to what may amount to being sexual in nature, an assessment was required which considered whether something is sexual. This assessment would involve a consideration of whether whatever its circumstances or any person's purpose in relation to it, the conduct is because of its nature sexual, or 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 considered each particular it had found proved in turn when addressing the question of whether they were sexual, or sexually motivated, or both, or neither.

Allegation 1

The panel considered this allegation as a whole. The panel considered that the inherent nature of the messages sent to Pupil A, inviting her to his home, and hugging or kissing her, were all acts or communications that were sexual by their nature. It additionally considered that conduct of this nature was sexually motivated, insofar as it was either for sexual gratification, or more plausibly, in pursuance of a future sexual relationship. It was the view of the panel that persistent messaging of a sexual nature, an invitation to the home, and a hug or a kiss, was all conduct that contextually allowed it to draw the inference that Mr Wilson’s behaviour was sexually motivated.

Allegation 2.b

The panel did not consider this allegation to be sexually motivated or sexual in nature. The panel considered that the comment pertaining to Pupil Q's boyfriend could not be said to be sexual by its very nature or to be sexually motivated with no further context and to draw such a conclusion would require significant speculation.

Allegation 3

The panel did not consider that any of the sub-particulars of Allegation 3 that it had found proved were either sexual in nature or sexually motivated. Whilst communicating with Pupil R in this manner was inappropriate, there was nothing apparently sexual, nor could the inference be drawn as to Mr Wilson's motive that would properly allow a finding of sexual motivation.

Allegation 4

The panel did not consider that its findings in regard to Allegation 4 could be properly construed as either sexual in nature or sexually motivated. Notably, the comments were brief and there was no wider context that appeared to indicate a sexual motive, nor did anything appear to be particularly sexual about them.

Allegation 5

The panel considered that the remark made to Colleague A was sexual in nature by virtue of its substance. The panel however did not consider that it could properly draw the inference that Mr Wilson's remarks were sexually motived. Whilst the comment may have been sexual and was inappropriate, the context did not lend itself to it appearing to have been made with a sexual motive.

The panel accordingly found Allegation 6 proved regarding Allegation 1 which was considered to be both sexual in nature and sexually motivated. Allegation 5 was also found to be sexual in nature.

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

2. **Between around 2009 and 2014, you sent inappropriate messages to Pupil Q including;**

    a. **Comments about her being a "blond bombshell" or words to that effect;**

The panel noted that through her evidence Pupil Q appeared to be unclear as to which

platform this message was said to have been sent on. Notably, Pupil Q gave evidence that she had arrived at class, having [REDACTED]. Mr Wilson gave evidence that on an occasion after Pupil Q had dyed her hair he had called her "[REDACTED]" whilst reprimanding her for [REDACTED]. When cross examined on this point, Pupil Q gave evidence that she "might have got this wrong" in relation to the nature of the message.

The panel considered that the message "blonde bombshell" was substantively different than a verbal comment of "[REDACTED]". Given Pupil Q's lack of clarity and her acceptance that she may have been mistaken, the panel did not consider the evidence in support of the allegation to be compelling in the circumstances.

The panel accordingly found Allegation 2.a. not proved.

3. **Between around 2009 and 2012, you sent inappropriate messages to Pupil R including;**

    c. **Referring to Pupil R's [REDACTED] dress;**

The panel noted Pupil R had given evidence within her witness statement that she may have "convoluted memory" and accepted that she may have "misremembered" these messages, noting that it could have pertained to Pupil A. The panel was cognisant of the unreliability of memory, but in circumstances where such a lack of clarity existed, it did not consider that it could properly rely upon Pupil R's account in relation to this allegation.

The panel accordingly found Allegation 3.c not proved.

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

Having found allegation 1.a, allegation 1.b, allegation 1.c, allegation 2.b, allegation 3.a, allegation 3.b, allegation 3.d, allegation 4.a, allegation 4.b and allegation 5 and allegation 6 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 Wilson, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards, in relation to the conduct post 1 July 2011 as found within Allegation 4, Allegation 5 and Allegation 6.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Wilson 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
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel noted that much of the conduct took place prior to the coming into force of the Teachers' Standards. Accordingly, the panel had regard to its knowledge and experience of teaching standards at the time of the conduct. Having done so it considered that the need to treat pupils with dignity, observe proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position, and having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being were all standards that were present at the relevant time that Mr Wilson had breached.

The panel also considered whether Mr Wilson 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 the offences of sexual activity and sexual communication with a child were relevant.

The panel considered that persistent sexual and sexually motivated communication with a pupil was conduct that fell far below the standard expect of Mr Wilson. The panel further considered that inappropriate communications with other pupils and inappropriate communication with a colleague, some of which was sexual in nature, was all conduct that was indicative of Mr Wilson falling significantly short of the standard expected of him.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Wilson amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

In relation to whether Mr Wilson 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 Wilson'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 Wilson was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found that the offences of sexual activity and sexual communication with a child were relevant.

The panel considered that Mr Wilson's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher. It noted that the pupils were in a position of vulnerability and that Mr Wilson had failed to properly consider the power dynamic that was present when engaging in the conduct. It additionally noted that colleagues should be treated with dignity, and a failure to do this was behaviour that could seriously harm the way the education profession is perceived by the public.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Wilson'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 safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and protection of other members of the public;
- 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 Wilson which involved inappropriate and sexually motivated communication with a pupil, there was a strong public interest consideration in relation to all of the above considerations.

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of inappropriate communication with pupils.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Wilson 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 Wilson 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 Wilson in the profession. The panel considered that whilst no doubt had been cast upon his ability as an educator, the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Wilsonin 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 noted that a teacher's behaviour that seeks to exploit their position of trust should be viewed very seriously in terms of its potential influence on pupils and be seen as a possible threat to the public interest.

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

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;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;

- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- sexual misconduct;
- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour;

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 did not consider that Mr Wilson's actions were not deliberate. It also did not consider that it had seen any evidence that he was acting under duress.

The panel noted that Mr Wilson did have a previous good record and had not previously been subject to any regulatory or disciplinary findings. It also noted that by his account, he was a very inexperienced teacher when his communication with Pupil A first began. He also advanced that he had not been given proper safeguarding training. The panel however considered that any lack of safeguarding training needed to be considered in the context of the reality that he was a qualified teacher at the relevant time and therefore would have received some training in relation to safeguarding. It additionally noted that Mr Wilson had stated that he received some safeguarding training in 2012 and therefore, some of the conduct as found proved occurred after this.

The panel noted that Mr Wilson had wholly cooperated with the disciplinary investigation and the TRA's investigation process. It also had regard to a character reference that he had provided which was taken into account, though it noted that the reference did not make clear that the referee was aware of the nature of the proceedings that Mr Wilson faced. It accordingly considered that it could only afford it limited weight in the circumstances. It also had regard for the fact that it had seen evidence that Mr Wilson had sought to obtain other witness evidence but that this had been unsuccessful.

The panel noted that Mr Wilson had made multiple expressions of regret and remorse and that he had given an account that he was "appalled" to read back through his exchanges with Pupil A. The panel however considered that this demonstration of remorse was limited and was not reflective of Mr Wilson having wholly developed insight. The panel considered that Mr Wilson had at times seemed deflective during his evidence and had in some way directed the cause of the conversation being sexual towards Pupil A. The panel considered this to be indicative of his lack of appreciation of the seriousness of the conduct.

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 Wilson 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 Wilson. The persistent nature of the sexually motivated communications with Pupil A was a significant factor in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

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

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

One of these characteristics was engaged by the panel's findings:

- any sexual misconduct involving a child;

As set out in the panel's findings, Mr Wilson had engaged in sexually motivated behaviour towards Pupil A which included sending her sexual messages, inviting her to his home and hugging and/or kissing her.

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 Mr Wilson had not properly demonstrated insight with regard to the seriousness of the conduct. It noted that whilst he was remorseful and had said that he recognised the nature of the concerns, at no point did he appear to acknowledge

the impact that his actions had upon Pupil A. It additionally considered that his deflection, whereby he suggested Pupil A was responsible for the subject matter of the conversation becoming sexual, was reflective of his lack of insight.

When considering the risk of repetition, the panel was cognisant of the fact that the conduct as found proved took place over a significant period of time. It considered that whilst Mr Wilson may have been an inexperienced teacher when he first engaged in misconduct towards Pupil A in 2009, this was not the case by the time he had been inappropriate towards Colleague A in 2022. The panel additionally considered that his behaviour was persistent and sustained in all regards and noted the added seriousness insofar as some of the messages to pupils were conducted online and away from the school environment. It further noted some messages to pupils were sent very late at night and into the early hours of the morning. Taking all of these matters into consideration, the panel considered that the risk of repetition remained high.

Mr Wilson had shown limited insight in relation to his conduct. He was found to have engaged in persistent and prolonged inappropriate behaviour. The panel was not satisfied that the pattern of behaviour identified would not occur again, should Mr Wilson be permitted to re-enter the teaching profession.

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

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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 some 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 found some of the allegations not proven. I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Wilson 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
- 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 Wilson fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of sexually motivated communication with a pupil.

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 Wilson, 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, *"There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of inappropriate communication with pupils."* A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

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

> *"The panel noted that Mr Wilson had made multiple expressions of regret and remorse and that he had given an account that he was "appalled" to read back through his exchanges with Pupil A. The panel however considered that this demonstration of remorse was limited and was not reflective of Mr Wilson having wholly developed insight. The panel considered that Mr Wilson had at times seemed deflective during his evidence and had in some way directed the cause of the conversation being sexual towards Pupil A."*

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 Wilson were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession."*

I am particularly mindful of the finding of sexually motivated communication with a pupil 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 Wilson himself. The panel comment

> *"…Mr Wilson did have a previous good record and had not previously been subject to any regulatory or disciplinary findings. It also noted that by his account, he was a very inexperienced teacher when his communication with Pupil A first began. He also advanced that he had not been given proper safeguarding training. The panel however considered that any lack of safeguarding training needed to be considered in the context of the reality that he was a qualified teacher at the relevant time and therefore would have received some training in relation to safeguarding. It additionally noted that Mr Wilson had stated that he received some safeguarding training in 2012 and therefore, some of the conduct as found proved occurred after this."*

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Wilson 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 insight and remorse. The panel has said *"…that Mr Wilson had not properly demonstrated insight with regard to the seriousness of the conduct. It noted that whilst he was remorseful and had said that he recognised the nature of the concerns, at no point did he appear to acknowledge the impact that his actions had upon Pupil A. It additionally considered that his deflection, whereby he suggested Pupil A was responsible for the subject matter of the conversation becoming sexual, was reflective of his lack of insight."*

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that Mr Wilson subsequently engaged in inappropriate conduct towards Colleague A in 2022, a considerable time after the conduct with Pupil A occurred, indicating a sustained willingness to engage in this type of behaviour.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Wilson 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 serious circumstances in this case, that is also 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 that no provision should be made for a review period.

The panel has identified that the Advice indicates 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. In this case, the characteristic of sexual misconduct involving a child is relevant.

I have considered the panel's comments *"Mr Wilson had shown limited insight in relation to his conduct. He was found to have engaged in persistent and prolonged inappropriate behaviour. The panel was not satisfied that the pattern of behaviour identified would not occur again, should Mr Wilson be permitted to re-enter the teaching profession."*

The panel has also said that it considered the risk of repetition remained high.

In light of the elements of this case, including the seriousness of the proven conduct, and the panel's assessment of the risk of repetition, I have considered whether allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, these

factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession.

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

This means that Mr Andrew Wilson is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England.

Furthermore, in view of the seriousness of the allegations found proved against him, I have decided that Mr Wilson shall not be entitled to apply for restoration of his eligibility to teach.

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

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



Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield

Date: 10 November 2026

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