



National College for  
Teaching & Leadership

# **Mr Jamie Kenneth David Barron: Professional conduct panel outcome**

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

**June 2016**

## Contents

A. Introduction	3
B. Allegations	4
C. Preliminary applications	4
D. Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Witnesses	5
E. Decision and reasons	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	13
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	16

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

**Teacher:** Mr Jamie Kenneth David Barron

**Teacher ref number:** 1280391

**Teacher date of birth:** 22 December 1986

**NCTL case reference:** 14708

**Date of determination:** 27 June 2016

**Former employer:** Kings School, Bruton

### **A. Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the National College for Teaching and Leadership (“the National College”) convened on 27 June 2016 at Ramada Hotel, The Butts, Coventry, CV1 3GG to consider the case of Mr Jamie Barron.

The panel members were John Elliott (lay panellist – in the chair), Mike Carter (teacher panellist) and Esther Maxwell (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Isabelle Mitchell of Eversheds LLP.

The presenting officer for the National College was Ms Kayleigh Brooks of Browne Jacobson LLP.

As this was a meeting, the parties were not present.

The meeting took place in private, save for the announcement of the panel’s decision, which was announced in public and recorded.

## **B. Allegations**

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 8 June 2016.

It was alleged that Mr Barron was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that whilst employed at Kings School Mr Barron:

1. Socialised with one or more pupils outside of school hours, including at the boarding house;
2. Made inappropriate comments to pupils about another member of staff;
3. Formed an inappropriate relationship with one or more pupils including Pupil A;
4. Sent one or more inappropriate emails to one or more pupils including:
  - a. Sending an email in code to Pupil A;
5. Filmed Pupil A during a school concert;
6. Gave undue attention to Pupil A during a school concert;
7. Engaged in inappropriate physical contact with Pupil A on or around 13 June 2015;
8. Initiated meetings with Pupil A and Pupil B outside of school;
9. Bought food for Pupil A and Pupil B;
10. Took a selfie with Pupil A and Pupil B;
11. Held a 1:1 meeting with Pupil A with the classroom door closed on;
  - a. Saturday 17 October 2015;
  - b. Sunday 18 October 2015;
12. The conduct at 11 was in breach of school policy.

In the Statement of Agreed Facts, Mr Barron admitted the facts of the allegations and that they amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct which may bring the profession into disrepute.

## **C. Preliminary applications**

Whilst there were no preliminary applications, the panel considered at the outset whether the allegations should be considered at a public hearing which the parties would be

entitled to attend, or a private meeting without the parties present. The panel considered the interests of justice and given that the facts of the allegation have been admitted, that Mr Barron and the presenting officer had requested a meeting and the panel had the benefit of Mr Barron's representations, the panel was of the view that justice would be adequately served by considering this matter at a meeting.

The panel carefully considered the public interest. The panel noted that if the case proceeded in a meeting, there would be a public announcement of the panel's decision. The panel also had in mind that if a hearing were convened, there would be a cost to the public purse, which may not be justified if the matter could be determined in a meeting. The panel also had regard to the delay that would be caused by convening a hearing and considered it to be in the public interest to reach a final determination in this matter without further delay. The panel therefore decided to proceed with a meeting, but noted that it could, at any stage of the meeting, reconsider this issue.

## **D. Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section 1: Chronology, anonymised pupil list and list of key people – pages 2 to 5

Section 2: Notice of referral, response and notice of meeting – pages 7 to 11b

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 13 to 19

Section 4: NCTL documents – pages 21 to 82

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 84 to 89

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents in advance of the hearing.

### **Witnesses**

The matter was convened as a meeting and no oral evidence was heard.

## **E. Decision and reasons**

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

The panel confirms that it has read all the documents provided in the bundle in advance of the hearing.

Mr Barron was employed as an English teacher and resident tutor at King's School, Bruton ("the School") from 1 September 2012.

On 27 February 2014 the second deputy head and investigating officer met with Mr Barron to discuss professional boundaries following concerns about his closeness with his tutor group and socialising with them in the communal areas of the boarding house outside school hours. During this meeting advice was given.

A further meeting took place on 22 January 2015 between the second deputy head and Mr Barron following reports of Mr Barron's over-familiarity with Pupil A and Pupil B, including Mr Barron making comments to the pupils about another member of staff.

In June 2015 further concerns were raised with the headmaster regarding Mr Barron's relationship with Pupil A and Pupil B, specifically related to taking a selfie, the giving of gifts, exchanging coded emails, physical contact with Pupil A and conduct during school concerts. As such, on 17 June 2015 an internal investigation into these issues commenced and an investigation meeting with Mr Barron took place on 18 June 2015. On 26 June 2015 a disciplinary hearing was held and Mr Barron received a final written warning.

In October 2015 further concerns were raised by staff members concerning one to one meetings that had taken place between Mr Barron and Pupil A in his classroom with the door closed. A further internal investigation commenced on 22 October 2015 and a meeting was held with Mr Barron.

On 27 October 2015 a disciplinary hearing was held and on 28 October 2015 Mr Barron resigned.

## **Findings of fact**

Our findings of fact are as follows:

The panel has found the following particulars of the allegations against Mr Barron proven, for these reasons:

### **Whilst employed at Kings School Mr Barron:**

#### **1. Socialised with one or more pupils outside of school hours, including at the boarding house;**

Mr Barron admitted this allegation in the Statement of Agreed Facts signed by him on 20 April 2016 (pages 13 to 17). This admission is consistent with the evidence in the papers, for example an email from one teacher which records the discussion he had with Mr Barron concerning the teacher's uneasiness about the closeness Mr Barron had with his

tutor group, which included Mr Barron playing cards in the common room on Saturday evening (page 48).

The panel was therefore satisfied that this allegation was proven.

## **2. Made inappropriate comments to pupils about another member of staff;**

Mr Barron admitted this allegation in the agreed Statement of Agreed Facts signed by him on 20 April 2016 (pages 13 to 17). This admission is consistent with the evidence in the papers, for example a report from one teacher which records that Mr Barron had been gossiping with two pupils about not being “overly fond” of another member of staff (page 50).

The panel was therefore satisfied that this allegation was proven.

## **3. Formed an inappropriate relationship with one or more pupils including Pupil A;**

Mr Barron admitted this allegation in the agreed Statement of Agreed Facts signed by him on 20 April 2016 (pages 13 to 17). In light of the panel’s findings in respect of allegations 4 to 10 (below), which have been found proven the panel was satisfied that this allegation was proven.

## **4. Sent one or more inappropriate emails to one or more pupils including:**

### **a. Sending an email in code to Pupil A;**

Mr Barron admitted this allegation in the agreed Statement of Agreed Facts signed by him on 20 April 2016 (pages 13 to 17). This admission is consistent with the evidence in the papers, for example the panel has seen copies of the coded emails that were sent (pages 62 and 63).

The panel was therefore satisfied that this allegation was proven.

## **5. Filmed Pupil A during a school concert;**

Mr Barron admitted this allegation in the Statement of Agreed Facts signed by him on 20 April 2016 (pages 13 to 17). This admission is consistent with Mr Barron’s admission during his interview dated 18 June 2015 as part of the School’s internal disciplinary procedure (page 55).

The panel was therefore satisfied that this allegation was proven.

## **6. Gave undue attention to Pupil A during a school concert;**

Mr Barron admitted this allegation in the Statement of Agreed Facts signed by him on 20 April 2016 (pages 13 to 17). This admission is consistent with the evidence in the papers,

for example a report dated 22 June 2015 from a housemaster that Mr Barron was giving Pupil A his entire attention during the school concert (page 60).

The panel was therefore satisfied that this allegation was proven.

#### **7. Engaged in inappropriate physical contact with Pupil A on or around 13 June 2015;**

Mr Barron admitted this allegation in the Statement of Agreed Facts signed by him on 20 April 2016 (pages 13 to 17). This admission is consistent with the evidence in the papers, for example the report dated 22 June 2015 from a housemaster that Mr Barron had “a little wrestle in the corridor” with Pupil A (page 61).

The panel was therefore satisfied that this allegation was proven.

#### **8. Initiated meetings with Pupil A and Pupil B outside of school;**

Mr Barron admitted this allegation in the Statement of Agreed Facts signed by him on 20 April 2016 (pages 13 to 17). This admission is consistent with Mr Barron’s admission during his interview dated 18 June 2015 as part of the School’s internal disciplinary procedure, including Mr Barron’s comment that “I have asked if they [Pupil A and Pupil B] want to come [into town] sometimes” (page 57).

The panel was therefore satisfied that this allegation was proven.

#### **9. Bought food for Pupil A and Pupil B;**

Mr Barron admitted this allegation in the Statement of Agreed Facts signed by him on 20 April 2016 (pages 13 to 17). This admission is consistent with Mr Barron’s admission during his interview dated 18 June 2015 as part of the School’s internal disciplinary procedure (page 57).

The panel was therefore satisfied that this allegation was proven.

#### **10. Took a selfie with Pupil A and Pupil B;**

Mr Barron admitted this allegation in the Statement of Agreed Facts signed by him on 20 April 2016 (pages 13 to 17). This admission is consistent with Mr Barron’s admission during his interview dated 18 June 2015 as part of the School’s internal disciplinary procedure (page 57).

The panel was therefore satisfied that this allegation was proven.



## **11. Held a 1:1 meeting with Pupil A with the classroom door closed on:**

### **a. Saturday 17 October 2015**

Mr Barron admitted this allegation in the Statement of Agreed Facts signed by him on 20 April 2016 (pages 13 to 17). This admission is consistent with the evidence in the papers, for example the report from a teacher of Mr Barron having a meeting with Pupil A in his room with the door shut (pages 72, 78 and 79) and Mr Barron's admission during his interview dated 22 October 2015 as part of the school's internal disciplinary procedure (pages 73 to 77).

The panel was therefore satisfied that this allegation was proven.

### **b. Sunday 18 October 2015**

Mr Barron admitted this allegation in the Statement of Agreed Facts signed by him on 20 April 2016 (pages 13 to 17). This admission is consistent with the evidence in the papers, for example the report from a teacher of Mr Barron having a meeting with Pupil A in his room with the door shut (page 78) and Mr Barron's admission during his interview dated 22 October 2015 as part of the School's internal disciplinary procedure (pages 73 to 77).

The panel was therefore satisfied that this allegation was proven.

## **12. His conduct at 11 was in breach of school policy**

Mr Barron admitted this allegation in the agreed Statement of Agreed Facts signed by him on 20 April 2016 (pages 13 to 17). The panel has taken note of the School's policy which states that "All meetings with pupils should take place in school time... 1:1 meetings with pupils should be avoided if possible. If 1:1 meetings are unavoidable they should take place in openly accessible rooms, doors should ideally have glazed windows or doors should be kept open...".

The panel was therefore satisfied that this allegation was proven.

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

Having found the allegations to have been proven, the panel has gone on to consider whether the facts of those proven allegations amount to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In doing so, the panel has had regard to the document Teacher Misconduct: The Prohibition of Teachers, which the panel refers to as "the Advice".

The panel is satisfied that the conduct of Mr Barron in relation to the facts found proven, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considers that by reference to Part Two, Mr Barron 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...;
- 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.

In considering each of the proven allegations and whether or not they amount to unacceptable professional conduct, the panel has been mindful of the obiter comments in the Court of Appeal case of *Schodlok v GMC* [2015] *EWCA Civ 769* and has considered each allegation individually and considered whether each allegation amounts to serious misconduct falling significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

In respect of allegations 1, 2, 4 and 6, the panel was not satisfied that the conduct of Mr Barron constituted serious misconduct that fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession for the following reasons:

- Allegation 1 – Mr Barron’s conduct in socialising with one or more pupils outside school hours but on school premises, for example by playing cards with his tutor group in the common room at the boarding house, was unwise as Mr Barron should have considered how this behaviour might be interpreted as inappropriate by others. However, the panel did not consider that this conduct crossed the line into serious misconduct falling significantly short of the standards expected of the profession;
- Allegation 2 – In respect of discussing another member of staff with pupils, this was in contravention of the school’s staff code of conduct which states that “staff must never criticise colleagues in front of, or in communication with, pupils or parents” and was inappropriate. However, although not to be condoned, the panel did not consider that this behaviour crossed the line into serious misconduct falling significantly short of the standards expected of the profession;
- Allegation 4 – Mr Barron’s conduct in sending coded emails to Pupil A was in contravention of the school’s staff code of conduct which states that “all communication must be transparent, respectful and constructive”. The nature of the emails were playful and overly friendly with Pupil A and the emails were written in code. However, the content of the emails were innocuous (in discussing arrangements for a cricket match) and the communication took place on the

school email system (which could be traced and accessed by others if necessary). Therefore, although not to be condoned, the panel did not consider that this conduct crossed the line into serious misconduct falling significantly short of the standards expected of the profession; and

- Allegation 6 – The panel considered that giving undue attention to a pupil during a school performance could be an indication of support or encouragement from a teacher to a pupil. Whilst the panel was mindful of how this behaviour could be perceived by others who interpreted Mr Barron’s behaviour of favouring one pupil, there was no evidence that Mr Barron’s behaviour involved any inappropriate motivation and therefore the panel did not consider that the conduct crossed the line into serious misconduct falling significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

However, in respect of allegations 3, 5 and 7 to 12, the panel is satisfied that the conduct of Mr Barron fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession for the following reasons:

- Allegations 5 and 10 – In respect of the allegations that Mr Barron filmed Pupil A during a school concert and took a selfie with Pupil A and Pupil B, there was no acceptable reason for Mr Barron to use his personal device to make the recordings / take the image, as other avenues would have been available to him (for example establishing if the School was arranging for the concert to be filmed). Further, the panel considers that taking any recording or image of pupils on a personal electronic device, without justification or prior permission from a parent or the School, to be a fundamental breach of safeguarding principles. Mr Barron will have received safeguarding training as part of his training and his behaviour demonstrates a lack of insight into safeguarding principles. The panel considers that this conduct was serious and fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession around safeguarding;
- Allegation 7 - In respect of the allegation that Mr Barron engaged in inappropriate physical contact with Pupil A, the panel considers that “jostling” with a student, as admitted to by Mr Barron, crossed the teacher/pupil professional boundary. In behaving in this way, Mr Barron had clearly lost sight of his obligation to treat pupils with mutual respect, and at all times to observe proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher’s professional position. The panel therefore considers that this behaviour constitutes serious misconduct falling significantly short of the standards expected of the profession;
- Allegations 8 and 9 – in respect of the allegations that Mr Barron initiated meetings with Pupil A and Pupil B outside of the School and bought food for Pupil A and Pupil B, the panel considers that this again demonstrates a lack of insight into safeguarding principles. By inviting pupils to join him outside of the School, without permission of or notification to parents or teachers, Mr Barron

contravened safeguarding principles. Mr Barron also failed to safeguard his own position as a teacher, as he risked his actions and intentions being misinterpreted by others. The panel therefore considers that this conduct is serious and falls significantly short of the standards expected of the profession around safeguarding;

- Allegations 11a, 11b and 12 – In relation to holding 1:1 meetings with Pupil A with the classroom door closed and this being in breach of the School’s staff code of conduct, the code states that “All meetings with pupils should take place in school time... 1:1 meetings with pupils should be avoided if possible. If 1:1 meetings are unavoidable they should take place in openly accessible rooms, doors should ideally have glazed windows or doors should be kept open...”. Mr Barron had previously been reminded about the policy for 1:1 meetings with pupils, and warned about his closeness with pupils. Nevertheless, Mr Barron proceeded with the 1:1 meetings with Pupil A on two occasions, both of which took place outside of the School hours, without notifying any other member of staff and conducting the meetings with the door closed. In so doing, Mr Barron put himself in a vulnerable position; his behaviour again ignored fundamental safeguarding principles. The panel finds such conduct to be serious and considers that it falls significantly short of the standards expected of the profession;
- Allegation 3 – in light of the findings in respect of allegations 5 and 7 to 11, the panel considers that Mr Barron did form an inappropriate relationship with one or more pupils, including Pupil A. By virtue of his behaviour, Mr Barron blurred and crossed the boundaries that should exist between teachers and their pupils, at times treating pupils as friends, rather than maintaining a professional relationship and distance at all times.

The panel has also considered whether Mr Barron’s conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 8 and 9 of the Advice, as 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 has found that none of these offences are relevant.

Accordingly, the panel is satisfied that Mr Barron is guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel has taken into account how the teaching profession is viewed by others and considered the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel has taken account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils’ lives and that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way they behave. The panel considers that the public and parents would view establishing professional relationships with pupils and at all times observing proper boundaries to be a fundamental role of a teacher, and Mr Barron failed to do this.

The panel therefore finds that Mr Barron's actions constitute 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 is 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 has to consider whether it is an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it is in the public interest to do so. Prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have a punitive effect.

The panel has considered the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and having done so has 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.

The panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Barron was not treated with the utmost seriousness. Building relationships rooted in mutual respect and at all times observing proper boundaries is fundamental to teaching practice. Mr Barron received advice about his behaviour relating to maintaining appropriate boundaries with pupils. Mr Barron was also subject to an internal disciplinary procedure as a result of his continued breach of the school's staff code of conduct and his close relationships with pupils, which resulted in a written warning. Notwithstanding this advice and the disciplinary investigation, Mr Barron continued to cross the boundaries that should exist between teachers and their pupils, rather than maintaining a professional relationship and distance at all times.

The panel considered that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Mr Barron was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

The panel however did not consider that there was a public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils or the public. The panel has noted that the School received advice from the LADO in June 2015, who empathised that the case was 'borderline' in terms of safeguarding and that the actions of the teacher did not pose a risk of significant harm to pupils. The panel has also noted that the school felt that Mr Barron's behaviour did not display any apparent grooming or sexual exploitation. The panel has not seen any evidence that pupils were adversely affected by his behaviour.

Notwithstanding that there were clear public interest considerations 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 Barron.

In carrying out the balancing exercise the panel has considered the public interest considerations both in favour of and against prohibition as well as the interests of Mr Barron. 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 proven. In the list of such behaviours, those that are relevant in this case are:

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

Even though there were behaviours that would point to a prohibition order being appropriate, the panel went on to consider whether or not there were sufficient mitigating factors to militate against a prohibition order being an appropriate and proportionate measure to impose, particularly taking into account the nature and severity of the behaviour in this case.

In light of the panel's findings, the panel considers that Mr Barron's actions were deliberate. This is particularly the case where Mr Barron was provided with advice and a number of warnings (informal and formal) as to the appropriateness of his behaviour yet continued to disregard them. There is also no evidence to suggest that Mr Barron was acting under duress.

The panel has noted the character references from a former employer and Mr Barron's parish priest that were provided to the School when Mr Barron was first employed, which are positive about his role as a resident tutor at a college and a youth worker. These references are positive and provide clear evidence of good character.

The panel has also taken into account the difficult personal circumstances that Mr Barron was experiencing at the time of allegations 11 and 12 (the 1:1 meetings with Pupil A), as a result of a family bereavement and family illness.

The panel is of the view that prohibition is both proportionate and appropriate. The panel has decided that the public interest considerations outweigh the interests of Mr Barron. The fact that Mr Barron has failed to appreciate and fully understand the seriousness of his behaviour and has consistently failed to change his behaviour in order to maintain appropriate boundaries with pupils, despite advice and warnings, was a significant factor in forming that opinion. In February 2014, Mr Barron was given clear and consistent guidance whereby the "difference between being a friend and friendly" was explored and Mr Barron "agreed that closing his door to talk to a pupil was leaving him vulnerable". Then in January 2015, Mr Barron was again warned to keep his professional distance from pupils. Following further concerns being raised in June 2015 (concerning the coded emails, the filming and undue attention of Pupil A during school concerts, physical contact with Pupil A, and going off site with Pupil A and Pupil B without permission,

buying them ice cream and taking a selfie with them), Mr Barron was subject to the school's internal disciplinary procedure, following which he was given a written warning. Despite this, in October 2015 Mr Barron then conducted 1:1 meetings with Pupil A in inappropriate circumstances, in clear breach of the School's staff code of conduct and a warning not to do so. Therefore, although the panel considered that Mr Barron's actions were at the lower end of the spectrum of seriousness, there was a pattern of behaviour which he did not amend following repeated advice and warnings. The panel are therefore satisfied that Mr Barron failed to fully understand the importance of adhering to safeguarding principles and failed to have proper and professional regard to the ethos, policies and practices of the School.

Accordingly, the panel makes 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 them to decide to recommend that a review period of the order should be considered. The panel were mindful that the Advice advises 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 behaviours that, if proven, would militate against a review period being recommended. The panel has not found any of the specified behaviours to be relevant in this case.

The panel has considered the extent to which Mr Barron has shown insight into his actions. Mr Barron has admitted the allegations in this case and admitted that they amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, which in itself displays remorse and insight into his actions. However, the panel was not satisfied that Mr Barron has demonstrated clear and unequivocal insight into his conduct. In his mitigating explanation provided to the panel (pages 87 to 88), Mr Barron refers to the "misinterpretation of my actions, and the strict enforcement of this particular school's rules". The panel considers that this demonstrates Mr Barron's lack of insight into why and for what reasons his behaviour was inappropriate and a failure on Mr Barron's part to fully appreciate the importance of having safeguarding policies in place.

The panel felt however that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate given that the behaviour was at the lower end of the spectrum of seriousness and did not involve a risk of harm to pupils. As such the panel decided that it would be proportionate in all the circumstances for the prohibition order to be recommended with a provision that Mr Barron should be allowed to have the prohibition order reviewed after a period of two years. The panel noted that Mr Barron appeared to a competent and successful teacher and hoped that these two years would allow Mr Barron a period of time to reflect on his conduct and take steps to fully understand and appreciate the importance and rationale for having safeguarding procedures in place.

## Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

I have given very careful consideration to this case and to the recommendations made by the panel in respect of both sanction and review period.

I have noted that the panel did not find that all of the facts that were found proved amounted to unacceptable professional conduct. I have therefore put from my mind those facts that were found proven but did not amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

I have therefore followed the panel in considering only those facts where unacceptable professional conduct was found and/or where that conduct may bring the profession into disrepute.

I agree with the panel that in considering Mr Barron's behaviour, proper account needs to be taken of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils' lives and that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way they behave. Like the panel I consider that the public and parents would view establishing professional relationships with pupils and at all times observing proper boundaries to be a fundamental role of a teacher; Mr Barron failed to do this.

I have noted that Mr Barron received advice about his behaviour relating to maintaining appropriate boundaries with pupils. Mr Barron was also subject to an internal disciplinary procedure as a result of his continued breach of the school's staff code of conduct and his close relationships with pupils, which resulted in a written warning. Notwithstanding this advice and the disciplinary investigation, Mr Barron continued to cross the boundaries that should exist between teachers and their pupils, rather than maintaining a professional relationship and distance at all times.

I have also noted that the school received advice from the LADO in June 2015, who empathised that the case was 'borderline' in terms of safeguarding and that the actions of the teacher did not pose a risk of significant harm to pupils. The panel has also noted that the school felt that Mr Barron's behaviour did not display any apparent grooming or sexual exploitation. The panel are clear that it has not seen any evidence that pupils were adversely affected by his behaviour.

I have taken into account the advice published by the Secretary of State relating to factors to be taken into account when considering the prohibition of teachers.

I have taken into account the need to balance the public interest and the interests of Mr Barron. I have also taken into account the need to be proportionate. I have taken into account the mitigating factors set out by the panel in this case.

On balance and for the reasons set out, I support the panel's recommendation that Mr Barron be prohibited from teaching.



I have gone on to consider the issue of a review period.

I have noted the thinking of the panel in this case. I support that. Mr Barron has shown some insight.

I support the recommendation of the panel that Mr Barron should have a review period of 2 years.

**This means that Mr Jamie Barron 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 5 July 2018, 2 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 Jamie Barron remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr Jamie Barron has a right of appeal to the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this order.



**Decision maker: Alan Meyrick**

**Date: 29 June 2016**

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