



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Adam Jones: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome**

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

**August 2023**

## **Contents**

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Allegations</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Summary of evidence</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Documents</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Statement of agreed facts</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Decision and reasons</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Findings of fact</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State</b>	<b>10</b>

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

<b>Teacher:</b>	Mr Adam Jones
<b>Teacher ref number:</b>	15/84664
<b>Teacher date of birth:</b>	20/11/1992
<b>TRA reference:</b>	19875
<b>Date of determination:</b>	25 August 2023
<b>Former employer:</b>	Malet Lambert School, Hull

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened by virtual means on 25 August 2023 to consider the case of Mr Adam Jones.

The panel members were Ms Jackie Hutchings (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Kulvinder Sandal (teacher panellist) and Mr Carl Lygo (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Shanie Probert of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP solicitors.

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Jones that the allegation be considered without a hearing. Mr Jones provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted the conviction of a relevant offence. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, Ms Laura Vignoles of Kingsley Napley LLP, or Mr Jones.

The meeting took place in private.

## **Allegations**

The panel considered the allegation set out in the notice of meeting dated 5 June 2023.

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

1. On 6 October 2021, he was convicted of two counts of making indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children, contrary to s.1(1)(a) of the Protection of Children Act 1978.

The panel noted that Mr Jones had admitted the allegations and further admitted that he was convicted of a relevant offence.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section 1: Chronology and List of Key People – pages 3 to 4

Section 2: Initial Letter to the Teacher, Notice of Referral, Response and Notice of Meeting – pages 5 to 18b

Section 3: Statement of Agreed Facts and Presenting Officer Representations – pages 19 to 22

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency Documents – pages 23 to 67

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

### **Statement of agreed facts**

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Jones on 22 May 2023.

## **Decision and reasons**

The panel carefully considered the case and reached a decision.

In advance of the meeting, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Jones for the allegation to be considered without a hearing. The panel had the ability to direct that the case be

considered at a hearing if required in the interests of justice or in the public interest. The panel did not determine that such a direction was necessary or appropriate in this case.

Mr Jones was employed as a teacher by Malet Lambert School (“the School”) from 2018. On 25 February 2021, Mr Jones was arrested by Humberside Police following an allegation of taking or making or distributing indecent photographs or pseudo photographs of children. On 26 February 2021, Humberside Police referred Mr Jones to the TRA.

On 1 June 2021, Mr Jones resigned from his position at the School.

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

**You have been convicted of a relevant offence, namely:**

- 1. On 6 October 2021, you were convicted of two counts of making indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children, contrary to s.1(1)(a) of the Protection of Children Act 1978.**

The allegation was admitted by Mr Jones in the statement of agreed facts that he signed on 22 May 2023.

The statement of agreed facts also confirmed the following facts: Mr Jones had used Snapchat to download indecent images of children which led to his arrest on 25 February 2021. In his police interview, Mr Jones admitted possession of indecent photographs of children. Mr Jones also admitted being sexually interested in females aged 13 years and upwards. Mr Jones also attended an interview with the School in which he; (a) admitted accessing child pornography on Snapchat, (b) stated that he was interested in children aged 13-17 years, (c) stated that images of younger children had been shared with him but he had not looked at them, and/or (d) stated that in his view, what he was doing was completely separate to work. On 6 October 2021, Mr Jones indicated that he intended to plead guilty to two offences contrary to s.1(1)(a) of the Protection of Children Act 1978. The charges related to: 10 Category A images; and/or 87 Category C images. Mr Jones was convicted on 6 October 2021.

On 17 November 2021, Mr Jones was sentenced at Humber Magistrates’ Court to a community order with a rehabilitation activity requirement of 20 days to be completed before 16 May 2023. Mr Jones was also placed on the sex offenders’ register for a period of 5 years.

The panel has seen the memorandum of conviction and accepted it as conclusive proof of the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the convictions. The panel has also seen an extract of the police national computer record confirming the conviction.

The panel found this allegation proven.

## **Findings as to a conviction of a relevant offence**

Having found the allegation proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to convictions of a relevant offence.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Jones in relation to the facts it found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that by reference to Part 2, Mr Jones was in breach of the following standards:

Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by

- treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
- having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
- not undermining fundamental British values, including ... the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect ...

Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach.

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

The panel noted that the individual's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting. Whilst the panel noted that Mr Jones had stated that he had not committed the offending behaviour during his working hours at the School, the offence committed was a serious offence that involved children. The panel noted that Mr Jones had admitted being sexually interested in young females aged 13 years upwards and considered that this was harmful to children in an education setting.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence would have been likely to have had an impact on the safety and/or security of children, pupils and/or members of the public.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Jones' behaviour in committing the offence would be likely to

affect public confidence in the teaching profession, if Mr Jones was allowed to continue teaching.

The panel noted that Mr Jones' behaviour did not lead to a sentence of imprisonment, which was indicative that the offence was at the less serious end of the possible spectrum. However, the panel noted that the magistrates' court still found it necessary to impose a community order, a victim surcharge, and to impose that Mr Jones was placed on the sex offenders' register, as opposed to a discharge.

This was a case concerning an offence involving any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or indecent pseudo photograph or image of a child.

The Advice indicates that a conviction for any offence that relates to or involves such offences is likely to be considered "a relevant offence".

These were particularly serious offences. Mr Jones admitted that he was sexually interested in young females from age 13 years upwards. The panel noted that Mr Jones had pleaded guilty to the offences with which he was charged.

The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to his convictions was relevant to Mr Jones' fitness to be a teacher. The panel considered that a finding that this conviction was for a relevant offence was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

## **Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State**

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

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order is appropriate, the panel had to consider the public interest, the seriousness of the behaviour and any mitigation offered by Mr Jones and whether a prohibition order is necessary and proportionate. Prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

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

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of making indecent images of children and Mr Jones' sexual interest in young females aged 13 upwards.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Jones 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 Jones was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Jones 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 took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a panel will likely consider a teacher's behaviour to be incompatible with being a teacher if there is evidence of one or more of the factors that begin on page 15. In the list of such factors, those that were relevant in this case were:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;

- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are "relevant matters" for the purposes of the Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosure;

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

- sexual misconduct, for example, involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature ...;

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

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

- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour.

The panel considered Mr Jones to have a deep-seated attitude given the number of images found, some of which were in the highest category, that he had engaged in the



offending on more than one occasion, and that he had admitted having a sexual interest in females aged 13 upwards.

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, taking account of the public interest and the seriousness of the behaviour and the likely harm to the public interest were the teacher be allowed to continue to teach, the panel went on to consider the mitigation offered by the teacher and whether there were mitigating circumstances.

Mr Jones' actions were deliberate.

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

There is no evidence as to whether Mr Jones has a history of any previous convictions. There is no evidence of his disciplinary record prior to this matter, nor any evidence of Mr Jones having demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both his personal and professional conduct or of having contributed significantly to the education sector. It is apparent from the investigation report that Mr Jones had engaged in this activity over more than one time period.

No testimonial statements were adduced for the panel to consider.

The panel noted from the investigation report in the bundle that during an investigatory interview at the School in May 2021, Mr Jones had admitted to accessing child pornography online since April 2020. The panel also noted that Mr Jones had entered a guilty plea in response to the charges against him, which was taken into account when he was sentenced. However, the panel noted that there was no other mitigating evidence other than Mr Jones' guilty plea.

The panel observed that there was no expression of remorse apparent from the summary of Mr Jones' interview with the School. Mr Jones stated that in his view, his actions were completely separate to work. The panel also noted that Mr Jones had accepted that he would no longer be able to be a teacher, or work with children or anyone classed as vulnerable again.

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 a 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 Jones 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 Jones. The seriousness of the offending 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 cases involving certain conduct where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period. These cases include any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or indecent pseudo photograph or image of a child. The panel found that Mr Jones was responsible for such activity, specifically in making indecent images of children.

Given the seriousness of Mr Jones' offending, the panel was concerned that it had seen no evidence of Mr Jones' remediation, nor that he had demonstrated such insight that might have afforded the panel assurance that he would not engage in similar behaviours in the future. In particular, the panel took into account Mr Jones' admission that he was sexually interested in young females aged between 13 to 17 years old. The panel also took into account that the relevant offence involved indecent images of the worst category (Category A), as confirmed in the memorandum of conviction.

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

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Jones is in breach of the following standards:

Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by

- treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
- having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
- not undermining fundamental British values, including ... the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect ...

Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach.

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

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Jones, involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE) and/or involved breaches of Working Together to Safeguard Children.

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of making indecent images of children and sexual interest in young females aged 13 upwards.

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 that may 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 Jones, 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/safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, "The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found

a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely, the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, the protection of other members of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession, and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of making indecent images of children and Mr Jones' sexual interest in young females aged 13 upwards." 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 observed that there was no expression of remorse apparent from the summary of Mr Jones' interview with the School. Mr Jones stated that in his view, his actions were completely separate to work. The panel also noted that Mr Jones had accepted that he would no longer be able to be a teacher, or work with children or anyone classed as vulnerable again." In my judgement, the lack of remorse means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils.' I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, "The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Jones' behaviour in committing the offence would be likely to affect public confidence in the teaching profession, if Mr Jones was allowed to continue teaching." I am particularly mindful of the finding of a conviction involving indecent images of children in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

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

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of a relevant offence, 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 Jones himself and the panel comment "There is no evidence as to whether Mr Jones has a history of any previous convictions. There is no evidence of his disciplinary record prior to this matter, nor any evidence of Mr Jones having demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both his personal and professional conduct or of having contributed significantly to the education sector. It is apparent from the investigation report that Mr Jones had engaged in this activity over more than one time period."

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Jones 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 lack of insight or remorse. The panel has said, "The panel noted from the investigation report in the bundle that during an investigatory interview at the School in May 2021, Mr Jones had admitted to accessing child pornography online since April 2020. The panel also noted that Mr Jones had entered a guilty plea in response to the charges against him, which was taken into account when he was sentenced. However, the panel noted that there was no other mitigating evidence other than Mr Jones' guilty plea."

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding that "The panel considered Mr Jones to have a deep-seated attitude given the number of images found, some of which were in the highest category, that he had engaged in the offending on more than one occasion, and that he had admitted having a sexual interest in females aged 13 upwards."

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Jones 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 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.

I have considered the panel's comments "Given the seriousness of Mr Jones' offending, the panel was concerned that it had seen no evidence of Mr Jones' remediation, nor that he had demonstrated such insight that might have afforded the panel assurance that he would not engage in similar behaviours in the future. In particular, the panel took into account Mr Jones' admission that he was sexually interested in young females aged between 13 to 17 years old. The panel also took into account that the relevant offence involved indecent images of the worst category (Category A), as confirmed in the memorandum of conviction."

In this case, factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the seriousness of the findings and the lack of remorse.

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 Adam Jones 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 Jones 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 Jones has a right of appeal to the King's Bench Division of the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this order.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S Buxcey', with a horizontal line underneath.

**Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey**

**Date: 30 August 2023**

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