



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Stephen Adcock: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome**

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

**September 2022**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	5
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	10
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	13

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

**Teacher:** Mr Stephen Adcock  
**Teacher ref number:** 00/54030  
**Teacher date of birth:** 30 December 1964  
**TRA reference:** 0017697  
**Date of determination:** 30 September 2022  
**Former employer:** Okehampton Community College, Devon

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 30 September 2022, by virtual means, to consider the case of Mr Stephen Adcock.

The panel members were Mr Peter Ward (lay panellist – in the chair), Mr Terry Hyde (lay panellist) and Mrs Bernie Whittle (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mrs Luisa Gibbons 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 Adcock that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Adcock provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, Ms Carolyn Thackstone, or Mr Adcock.

The meeting took place in private.

## **Allegations**

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 16 September 2022.

It was alleged that Mr Adcock was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that:

Whilst a teacher at Okehampton Community College, Devon:

1. He engaged in inappropriate and/or unprofessional behaviour between April 2018 and October 2018 by

a. On one or more occasions he viewed or attempted to view pornographic video and/or pornographic material using school equipment;

b. On one or more occasions, using school equipment, he viewed and/or attempted to view pornographic video and/or pornographic material with search terms referring to:

i. "virgin fuck", and/or

ii "Sluts" and / or

iii "Teen Porn".

c. On one or more occasions, using school equipment, he viewed or attempted to view:

i. Adult dating websites and/or

ii. couple swapping websites

d. On one or more occasions, using school equipment, he viewed and/or attempted to view video and/or material of sexual indecency;

2. His behaviour as may be found proven at Allegation 1 above was conduct of a sexual nature and/or was sexually motivated.

Mr Adcock admitted the facts alleged and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

## **Preliminary applications**

There were no preliminary applications.

## **Summary of evidence**

## **Documents**

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

Section 1: Notice of Referral and Response – pages 5 to 11

Section 2: Statement of Agreed Facts and Presenting Officer Representations – pages 12 to 18

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 19 to 216

Section 4: Teacher Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 217 to 258

Section 5: Teacher documents - pages 259 to 264

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 Adcock on 16 June 2022.

## **Decision and reasons**

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

The panel carefully considered the case and reached a decision.

In advance of the meeting, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Adcock for the allegations 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 Adcock was employed at Okehampton Community College (the “College”) as the head of computer science, ICT and Business Studies Faculty from 1 September 2001. An investigation took place as to whether Mr Adcock had breached the College’s acceptable use policy to access inappropriate material using school equipment during the school day. A disciplinary hearing took place on 13 March 2019 and Mr Adcock was summarily dismissed. Mr Adcock appealed his dismissal. His appeal was heard at an appeal hearing on 2 April 2019. His appeal was dismissed. The police decided to take no further action on 23 June 2020.

## Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

### **Whilst a teacher at Okehampton Community College, Devon:**

#### **1. You engaged in inappropriate and/or unprofessional behaviour between April 2018 and October 2018 by**

##### **a. On one or more occasions you viewed or attempted to view pornographic video and/or pornographic material using school equipment;**

Mr Adcock admitted having viewed or attempted to view pornographic video and/or pornographic material using school equipment in his response dated 13 December 2021 to the Notice of Referral. He made the same admission in the statement of agreed facts explaining that the occasions when this had happened were when he was working alone within a closed office, and that it did not occur in the classroom environment.

Individual A has provided a witness statement that he was informed of the allegation concerning Mr Adcock on 8 October 2018 by Individual D and Individual E. He explained that those members of staff had informed him that they had been trialling some new software to identify if there were any searches being used by anyone within the College that was concerning ("the Software"). He was informed that the software had identified that Mr Adcock had been accessing adult dating, couple swapping, swingers' sites and other dating sites, and that some semi nudity had been detected. He commissioned Individual B to conduct an investigation.

Individual B has provided a statement producing his investigation report. He explained that during the investigation, he conducted an interview with Individual C. During that interview, Individual B learned that as well as Mr Adcock viewing soft porn, there were also visits to other websites including live streaming sex websites. Individual B has provided screenshots of the websites and images viewed on Mr Adcock's computer, and has also provided a report containing a detailed examination of the web browsing history relating to Mr Adcock's computer.

The examination of that web-browsing history indicated the searching of inappropriate images and websites occurred regularly on a weekly basis, taking place during PPA, non-contact time, break time, lunchtime and/or after school. The website activity was undertaken in Mr Adcock's office, which he had sole use of, on his school PC, using his admin account. In his report, Individual B stated that only four staff in the College had admin rights, allowing users to have unfiltered access to the internet. Mr Adcock was one of those members of staff. As to whether anyone could have accessed Mr Adcock's office, Individual B reported that Mr Adcock's door could be left with a latch on, and it was

possible to use a setting to prevent his PC from locking. However, he stated that Mr Adcock's office was in a busy science corridor, with a window giving clear sight to Mr Adcock's work station. There was an occasion when the access to inappropriate websites took place over a two hour period, and a third person would have needed to have been undetected over this time to continue the activity. He also stated that the searches only took place during Mr Adcock's non-teaching time.

Given Mr Adcock's admission, and the evidence detected through use of the Software, the panel considered that it was more likely than not that Mr Adcock had viewed or attempted to view pornographic video and/or pornographic material using school equipment. The panel considered that this was both inappropriate and unprofessional. Individual B stated that Mr Adcock was responsible for the electronic safety of pupils and staff within the College, and his actions were in direct conflict with his duties.

**b. On one or more occasions, using school equipment, you viewed and/or attempted to view pornographic video and/or pornographic material with search terms referring to:**

**i. "virgin fuck", and/or**

**ii "Sluts" and / or**

**iii "Teen Porn".**

Mr Adcock denied this allegation in his response dated 13 December 2021 to the Notice of Referral. However, he subsequently admitted this allegation in the statement of agreed facts on 16 June 2022.

Appended to Individual B's statement is a list of search terms that had been detected that were within the web-browsing history of Mr Adcock's computer. Those search terms included "sluts" and "porn teen". The Devon and Cornwall Police Constabulary provided information to the presenting officer that the College's investigation had lead the College to locate concerning search history, terms such as "virgin fuck", "Sluts" and "Teen Porn".

In light of Mr Adcock's admission, the list of search terms and the information provided by the police, the panel considered it more likely than not that Mr Adcock had used these search terms. The panel considered that this was both inappropriate and unprofessional. As referred to above, Individual B stated that Mr Adcock was responsible for the electronic safety of pupils and staff within the College, and his actions were in direct conflict with his duties.

**c. On one or more occasions, using school equipment, you viewed or attempted to view:**

**i. Adult dating websites and/or**

## **ii. couple swapping websites**

Mr Adcock denied this allegation in his response dated 13 December 2021 to the Notice of Referral. However, he admitted this allegation in the statement of agreed facts dated 16 June 2022.

Appended to Individual B's witness statement are screenshots of the websites and images viewed on Mr Adcock's college computer. These include screenshots of "swingers" websites identifying "swingers" in Mr Adcock's locality. It also included "hot mature contacts" stated as "looking for casual online dating fun with a local stranger".

In light of Mr Adcock's admission and the screenshots provided, the panel found this allegation proven. The panel considered that this was both inappropriate and unprofessional. As referred to above, Individual B stated that Mr Adcock was responsible for the electronic safety of pupils and staff within the College, and his actions were in direct conflict with his duties.

## **d. On one or more occasions, using school equipment, you viewed and/or attempted to view video and/or material of sexual indecency;**

Mr Adcock denied this allegation in his response dated 13 December 2021 to the Notice of Referral. However, he admitted this allegation in the statement of agreed facts on 16 June 2022.

The screenshots of images that were viewed using Mr Adcock's computer and which are appended to Individual B's statement contain images that are sexually explicit and inappropriate in a school setting, and were thereby indecent.

Evidence was identified of Mr Adcock's computer having been used to access a live streaming sex website where users could join live videos of extreme sex acts being performed. Investigation showed that whilst it was possible that this website first appeared as a pop-up, Mr Adcock clicked onto the website and clicked into a video stream of live sex on at least one occasion.

In light of Mr Adcock's admission and the screenshots provided, the panel found this allegation proven. The panel considered that this was both inappropriate and unprofessional. As referred to above, Individual B stated that Mr Adcock was responsible for the electronic safety of pupils and staff within the College, and his actions were in direct conflict with his duties.

## **2. Your behaviour as may be found proven at Allegation 1 above was conduct of a sexual nature and/or was sexually motivated.**



In a response to the allegations dated 13 August 2021, Mr Adcock provided some context to the circumstances around the allegations. [REDACTED].

[REDACTED]. The panel noted that there was no medical evidence that the behaviour engaged in by Mr Adcock was caused by [REDACTED].

Mr Adcock, thereafter, denied this allegation in his response dated 13 December 2021 to the Notice of Referral.

However, Mr Adcock has subsequently changed his position and has admitted this allegation in the statement of agreed facts on 16 June 2022. He has agreed in the statement of agreed facts the definition of sexual provided in s78a-b of the Sexual Offences Act 2003, and the definition of sexual motivation stated in relevant case law. Mr Adcock has therefore admitted this allegation in full knowledge of how conduct of a sexual nature and sexual motivation are defined.

The panel considered that the volume of searches carried out by Mr Adcock, and the volume of images accessed by him, is indicative that his conduct was not accidental in nature. Similarly, although there may have been a pop-up to the live streaming website, Mr Adcock proceeded to access the site. The panel considered his actions to have been conduct of a sexual nature because the websites accessed and search terms used were by their nature sexual.

Furthermore, the panel considered Mr Adcock's actions to have been in pursuit of sexual gratification. He accessed the material during school hours, evidencing that he was seeking instant gratification. Furthermore, the dating and couple swapping websites contained references to individuals and couples in Mr Adcock's locality indicating that it is more likely than not that he was in pursuit of a future sexual relationship.

The panel found this allegation proven.

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

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Adcock in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Adcock 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

- 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, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.

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 Adcock fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession. By accessing this material during school hours, and on school equipment, Mr Adcock placed pupils at risk of seeing the material, given the evidence that his office was in a busy science corridor, with a window in the door that gave clear sight to his work station. Mr Adcock had responsibilities to promote electronic safety within the College and he took advantage of the lighter restrictions on his usage, in order to access pornographic material. This was in clear contradiction to the policies and practices of the College, and against his safeguarding responsibilities.

The panel also considered whether Mr Adcock's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice. The panel did not consider those behaviours were relevant.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mr Adcock was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel took into account the way 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 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 they behave.

The panel therefore found that Mr Adcock's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Having found the facts of all of the allegations proved, the panel further found that Mr Adcock's conduct amounted to both unacceptable professional conduct and 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 a 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 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 protection of pupils given that Mr Adcock was responsible for electronic safety of pupils, and yet accessed material that was highly inappropriate to be viewed during school hours, on school equipment.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Adcock were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

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

Although no doubt has been cast upon Mr Adcock's abilities as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations outweighed any interest in retaining him in the profession given his fundamental breach of the trust that had been placed in him.

Notwithstanding 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 Adcock.

In carrying out the balancing exercise, the panel had regard to the public interest considerations both in favour of, and against, prohibition as well as the interests of Mr Adcock. 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 are relevant in this case are:

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

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

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

- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving vulnerable pupils) or violation of the rights of pupils;

- sexual misconduct, for example, involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature and/or that use or exploit the trust, knowledge or influence derived from the individual's professional position;

With regard to whether Mr Adcock had a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour, the panel considered that the volume of images and searches carried out by Mr Adcock evidenced this. His behaviour in this regard was harmful to the College. He abused his position of trust by using the greater access he had by virtue of his position.

The panel noted that the Guidance states that the panel should attach appropriate weight and seriousness to online behaviours, including but not limited to online misconduct. The panel considered Mr Adcock's online behaviours to be serious given that he was accessing such content in school hours, on school equipment, in direct contravention of his responsibilities for electronic safety and contrary to the College's acceptable use policy.

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.

The panel has found Mr Adcock's behaviours to be deliberate and sexually motivated.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Adcock was acting under duress. Mr Adcock has provided an explanation of [REDACTED]. However, there is no evidence as to the impact of these factors upon Mr Adcock's behaviour.

There have been no previous findings against Mr Adcock and he has been a teacher for over 20 years. However, the only references the panel have been provided with are ones that were sought by the College when he was employed, so are not current. There is no evidence of Mr Adcock demonstrating exceptionally high standards in both his personal and professional conduct, nor that he has contributed significantly to the education sector.

To Mr Adcock's credit, he has latterly made a full and frank admission, although has previously made various denials during the course of the College's investigation and to the TRA. His evasiveness in accepting culpability give rise to reservations as to his ability to have regard to safeguarding responsibilities in the future. He has expressed regret and shame that his record and reputation is tarnished and has referred to the impact upon himself and his family. Mr Adcock has not, to date, recognised the impact his actions have had on the College.

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 was sufficient would

unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Adcock 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 Adcock. The fact that his actions were in direct contradiction to his responsibilities within the College 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 to recommend that a review period of the order should be considered. 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 behaviours that, if proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. Those behaviours are not relevant in this case. Although the panel has found that Mr Adcock engaged in conduct that was sexually motivated, there is no evidence of it having resulted in harm to a person or persons, and there could have been no criticism of Mr Adcock had he accessed the material outside of school hours on a personal computer. The panel did not therefore consider that his behaviour was serious sexual misconduct. Taking account of the regret and feelings of shame expressed by Mr Adcock, the panel considered that he ought to be given the opportunity to develop and demonstrate insight around his behaviours.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate in all the circumstances for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a review period. The panel therefore recommends a period of two years before an application for review can be made.

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

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

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

In this case, the panel has found all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Stephen Adcock should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of two years.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Stephen Adcock 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

- 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, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.

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 Adcock fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding that Mr Adcock viewed or attempted to view pornographic video and/or pornographic material using school equipment, conduct found to be of a sexual nature and/or sexually motivated.

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 Adcock, 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 pupils. The panel has observed, "There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils given that Mr Adcock was responsible for electronic safety of pupils, and yet accessed material that was highly inappropriate to be viewed during school hours, on school equipment." 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, "To Mr Adcock's credit, he has latterly made a full and frank

admission, although has previously made various denials during the course of the College's investigation and to the TRA. His evasiveness in accepting culpability give rise to reservations as to his ability to have regard to safeguarding responsibilities in the future. He has expressed regret and shame that his record and reputation is tarnished and has referred to the impact upon himself and his family. Mr Adcock has not, to date, recognised the impact his actions have had on the College." 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, "public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Adcock were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession." I am particularly mindful of the finding of accessing/viewing pornographic content in a school environment 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, 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 Mr Adcock himself and the panel comment "There have been no previous findings against Mr Adcock and he has been a teacher for over 20 years. However, the only references the panel have been provided with are ones that were sought by the College when he was employed, so are not current. There is no evidence of Mr Adcock demonstrating exceptionally high standards in both his personal and professional conduct, nor that he has contributed significantly to the education sector."

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Adcock 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 "With regard to whether Mr Adcock had a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour, the panel considered that the volume of images and searches carried out by Mr Adcock evidenced

this. His behaviour in this regard was harmful to the College. He abused his position of trust by using the greater access he had by virtue of his position.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding that “The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Adcock fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession. By accessing this material during school hours, and on school equipment, Mr Adcock placed pupils at risk of seeing the material, given the evidence that his office was in a busy science corridor, with a window in the door that gave clear sight to his work station. Mr Adcock had responsibilities to promote electronic safety within the College and he took advantage of the lighter restrictions on his usage, in order to access pornographic material. This was in clear contradiction to the policies and practices of the College, and against his safeguarding responsibilities.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Adcock has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, that is not backed up by full insight, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

For these reasons, I have concluded that a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest in order to achieve the intended aims of a prohibition order.

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended a 2 year review period.

I have considered the panel’s comments “The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. Those behaviours are not relevant in this case. Although the panel has found that Mr Adcock engaged in conduct that was sexually motivated, there is no evidence of it having resulted in harm to a person or persons, and there could have been no criticism of Mr Adcock had he accessed the material outside of school hours on a personal computer. The panel did not therefore consider that his behaviour was serious sexual misconduct. Taking account of the regret and feelings of shame expressed by Mr Adcock, the panel considered that he ought to be given the opportunity to develop and demonstrate insight around his behaviours.”

I agree with the panel and have decided that a 2 year review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession.

**This means that Mr Stephen Adcock 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 13 October 2024, 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 Adcock remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr Stephen Adcock 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 'SABuxcey', with a horizontal line underneath.

**Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey**

**Date: 6 October 2022**

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