



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Jonathan Adamson: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

October 2023

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Statement of agreed facts	6
Decision and reasons	6
Findings of fact	7
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	9
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	14

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

Teacher:	Mr Jonathan Adamson
Teacher ref number:	3533096
Teacher date of birth:	14 July 1988
TRA reference:	18473
Date of determination:	2 October 2023
Former employer:	Kettlethorpe High School, Wakefield

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ('the panel') of the Teaching Regulation Agency ('the TRA') convened on 2 October 2023 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Jonathan Adamson.

The panel members were Mr Jeremy Phillips (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Anne Davis (teacher panellist) and Ms Juliet Berry (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Rebecca Hughes of Birketts 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 Adamson that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Adamson provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct, conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and conviction of a relevant offence. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, Ms Heather Andersen of Browne Jacobson LLP, Mr Adamson or any representative for Mr Adamson.

The meeting took place in private by way of a virtual meeting.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 18 August 2023.

It was alleged that Mr Adamson was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:

Mr Adamson was convicted, at any time, of a relevant offence for the following:

1. On 25 October 2021 he was convicted at Leeds Crown Court for one or more accounts of penetrative sexual activity with a girl under 16 - offender 18 or over, and engaged in non-penetrative sexual activity with a girl [REDACTED] - offender 18 or over, for which he was sentenced to 7 years imprisonment.

It was also alleged that Mr Adamson was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst employed as a director of communications/team leader for English at Kettlethorpe High School (as amended see below):

2. He engaged in inappropriate and/or unprofessional behaviour towards Pupil B in a lesson, in the academic year 2017/2018 including by:
 - a) Spitting at them; and
 - b) Throwing an object at them.

In his response to the notice of referral dated 26 February 2023 and in the statement of agreed facts signed on 13 April 2023, Mr Adamson admitted allegation 1, 2(a) and 2(b) in full. He also admitted that his behaviour amounted to unacceptable professional conduct, conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and the conviction of a relevant offence.

Preliminary applications

The panel amended allegation 2 to change “professional” to “unprofessional”. It was noted that this was purely a typographical error.

The panel noted that Mr Adamson had not been informed of the proposed changes to the allegations.

The panel was advised that it had the power to amend allegations in accordance with paragraph 4.56 of the Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession April 2018 (the ‘2018 Procedures’).

The panel considered that the proposed amendments would not change the nature and scope of the allegations in that the allegations would correct an obvious typographical error. As such, the panel considered that the proposed amendments did not amount to a material change to the allegations.

The legal adviser drew the panel's attention to the case of *Dr Bashir Ahmedsowida v General Medical Council [2021] EWHC 3466 (Admin), 2021 WL 06064095* which held that the lateness of amendments did not necessarily mean they were unjust, as acknowledged in the previous case of *Professional Standards Authority v Health and Care Professions Council and Doree [2017] EWCA Civ 319 at [56]*.

The panel was of the view that granting the application for the proposed amendments would not cause unfairness and/or prejudice to Mr Adamson.

Accordingly, the panel did grant this application and considered the amended allegations, which are set out above.

The panel noted that since the date of the referral to the TRA in this case, new 'Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession' were published in May 2020 (the 'May 2020 Procedures'). The panel understands that the earlier provisions contained within the 2018 Procedures apply to this case, given that those provisions applied when the referral was made. Although the panel has the power to direct that the May 2020 Procedures should apply in the interests of justice or the public interest, the panel had received no representations that this should be the case. For the avoidance of doubt, therefore, the panel confirms that it has applied the 2018 Procedures in this case.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

- Section 1: Chronology and anonymised person list – pages 6 to 7
- Section 2: Notice of referral, response and notice of meeting – pages 9 to 18
- Section 3: Statement of agreed facts– pages 20 to 26
- Section 4: TRA witness statements – pages 28 to 69
- Section 5: TRA documents – pages 71 to 747
- Section 6: Teachers documents – page 748

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the meeting and watched the video of Mr Adamson and Pupil B uploaded separately at page 746.

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Adamson on 13 April 2023 and subsequently signed by the presenting officer on 28 July 2023.

Decision and reasons

The panel carefully considered the case and reached the following decision and reasons:

In advance of the meeting, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Adamson 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 Adamson began working as a director of communications/team leader for English at Kettlethorpe High School ('the School') on 1 January 2018.

On 12 December 2018, a disclosure was made regarding Mr Adamson sending inappropriate messages to Pupil A.

Mr Adamson was suspended from the School on 17 December 2018 whilst an investigation took place.

On 20 December 2018 a further disclosure was made by a pupil when a video of Mr Adamson allegedly assaulting Pupil B was viewed on social media.

A disciplinary hearing took place on 23 April 2019 and Mr Adamson was dismissed. On 6 February 2020, West Yorkshire Police confirmed its investigation into Mr Adamson's conduct remained ongoing.

In July 2020, the police confirmed that 5 charges had been brought against Mr Adamson regarding alleged sexual activity with a child. On 25 October 2021, Mr Adamson was found guilty of 3 counts of penetrative sexual activity with a girl under 16 – offender 18 or over and 1 count of offender 18 or over engage in non-penetrative sexual activity with girl [REDACTED].

On 6 December 2021, Mr Adamson was sentenced to a total of 7 years imprisonment. He was also made subject to a sexual harm prevention order until further order; notification requirements under the Sexual Offences Act indefinitely; and ordered to pay a victim surcharge of £170.

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:

You have been convicted, at any time, of a relevant offence for the following:

- 1. On 25 October 2021 you were convicted at Leeds Crown Court for one or more accounts of penetrative sexual activity with a girl under 16 - offender 18 or over, and engaged in non-penetrative sexual activity with a girl [REDACTED] – offender 18 or over, for which you were sentenced to 7 years imprisonment.**

The panel noted that Mr Adamson admitted allegation 1, as set out in the notice of referral dated 27 September 2022 and the statement of agreed facts dated 28 July 2023. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the facts available to it.

The panel noted page 8 of the Teacher misconduct: The prohibition of teachers ('the Advice'), which states that where there has been a conviction at any time, of a criminal offence, the panel will accept the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction, unless exceptional circumstances apply. The panel did not find that any exceptional circumstances applied in this case.

The panel had been provided with a copy of the certificate of conviction from Leeds Crown Court, which detailed that Mr Adamson had been convicted of 1 offence of engaging in non-penetrative sexual activity with girl [REDACTED] – offender 18 or over; and 3 offences of penetrative sexual activity with girl under 16 – offender 18 or over.

In respect of the allegations, Mr Adamson was sentenced to a total of 7 years imprisonment. In addition, he was subject to a sexual harm prevention order until further order; notification requirements under the Sexual Offences Act to apply indefinitely; and ordered to pay a victim surcharge of £170.

On examination of the documents before the panel and the admissions in the signed statement of facts, the panel was satisfied that allegation 1 was proven.

You are guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst employed as a director of communications/ team leader for English at Kettlethorpe High School you (as amended):

- 2. Engaged in inappropriate and/or unprofessional behaviour towards Pupil B in a lesson in the academic year 2017/18 by:**

a) Spitting at them; and

b) Throwing an object at them.

The panel noted that Mr Adamson admitted allegations 2(a) and 2(b), as set out in the notice of referral dated 27 September 2022 and in the statement of agreed facts dated 28 July 2023. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the facts available to it.

The panel considered the witness statement of Individual A. Individual A stated that on 20 December 2018, it came to light there had been a video clip circulating on social media. The video was uploaded by a former pupil concerned with a historical incident where Mr Adamson behaved inappropriately. Individual A explained that in the first half of the video, Mr Adamson stood at the front of the class, leaned forward, and then appeared to spit at a pupil. He stated that Mr Adamson then went on to walk to a pupil's desk, where he picked up a piece of paper, scrunched it up and threw it towards a pupil who was walking away with his back to Mr Adamson.

Individual A explained that the School conducted a proper investigation into the video incident. Between the 9 and 16 January 2019, Individual A explained that he examined the video and obtained pupil statements. He stated that on 11 February 2019, the investigation report was passed onto Individual B, [REDACTED] at the School, and a disciplinary hearing was held on 25 March 2019 and 23 April 2019, as Mr Adamson was unfit to attend the first meeting. Individual A stated that following the conclusion of the disciplinary hearing, Mr Adamson was dismissed, and a referral was made to the TRA in June 2019.

The panel considered notes from Individual B's interview with Individual A. Individual A stated during his interview that in the video, it looks like "*a teacher who has lost control*" and that his behaviour was aggressive and was not just role-play.

The panel noted the interview of Individual C on 16 January 2019, who submitted that he is 80% sure it was Mr Adamson in the video. He also stated there is another male English teacher, but "*it is not him as the man in the video is the same build and has the same hair colour as Mr Adamson*". Individual C also stated the man in the video dressed like Mr Adamson. He submitted that 5 or 6 pupils were interviewed who had the video on their phone and they all believed it was Mr Adamson.

The panel considered the video and noted the statements of Pupil A, Pupil B, Pupil C, Pupil D and Pupil E. Most pupils had stated that it was Mr Adamson in the video and that he had thrown something, but there was confusion as to what it was. Pupil A stated that the video was of a teacher throwing paper; Pupil B stated that it was Mr Adamson throwing a pen; Pupil C stated they had been told the video was out of context and that

Mr Adamson had been fired; Pupil D stated they did not know the teacher in the video and Pupil E stated something was thrown by Mr Adamson.

On examination of the documents, video before the panel and the admissions in the signed statement of facts, the panel was satisfied that allegations 2(a) and 2(b) were proven.

Findings as to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and/or conviction of a relevant offence

Having found the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those allegations amount to:

- In respect of allegation 1, conviction of a relevant offence; and
- In respect of allegation 2, unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In doing so, the panel had regard to the Advice.

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

Conviction of a relevant offence

The panel made this finding in respect of allegation 1 only.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Adamson fell very significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel noted that the individual's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting.

Mr Adamson's behaviour would have a significant impact on the safety and security of 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 Adamson's behaviour in committing these offences could undoubtedly affect public confidence in the teaching profession, particularly given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. His conduct ran counter to what should have been at the very core of his practice as a teacher with a duty of care towards children. By virtue of his position, Mr Adamson was in a position of trust and responsibility in relation to his pupils. He abused that position.

The panel noted that the sentence of 7 years imprisonment that was imposed on Mr Adamson was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed.

This was a case involving an offence of sexual activity / sexual communication with a child, which the Advice states is more likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Adamson's ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding that these convictions were for relevant offences was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

Unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute

The panel made the following determination in respect of allegations 2(a) and 2(b).

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Adamson fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel also considered whether Mr Adamson's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice. The panel found that the offence of violence was relevant.

The Advice indicates that where behaviours associated with such an offence exist, a panel is more likely to conclude that an individual's conduct would amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mr Adamson 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 considered 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 findings of misconduct were serious, and the conduct displayed would likely have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public perception. In particular, if a parent discovered that a child's teacher had spat at a pupil or thrown an object at them, they would be appalled.

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

Having found the facts of particulars 2(a) and 2(b) proved, the panel further found that Mr Adamson'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, conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute; and 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 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 to be punitive or 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 and the protection of other members of the public; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct; and that prohibition strikes the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest if they are in conflict.

In light of the nature of the offences for which Mr Adamson was convicted, which involved convictions for engaging in non-penetrative sexual activity with a girl [REDACTED] – offender 18 or over; and engaging in penetrative sexual activity with a girl under 16 – offender 18 or over, as well as the panel's findings against Mr Adamson of inappropriate behaviour towards a pupil in that he spat and threw an object at him, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils and other members of

the public. His actions raised obvious and significant public and child protection concerns, as was clearly recognised by the court when imposing his sentence.

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils, given the serious findings of inappropriate relationships with children.

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

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 Adamson. The panel was mindful of the need to strike the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest.

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 Adamson. 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;
- 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 disclosures.
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- any abuse of any trust, knowledge or influence gained through their professional position in order to advance a romantic or sexual relationship with a pupil or former pupil;
- 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;

- failure in their duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk or failing to promote the safety and welfare of the children (as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE);
- violating of the rights of pupils;
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions or purposeful destruction of evidence, especially where these behaviours have been repeated or had serious consequences, or involved the coercion of another person to act in a way contrary to their own interests;

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors. Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

There was no evidence that Mr Adamson's actions were not deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Adamson was acting under extreme duress, and, in fact, in relation to allegation 1, the panel found Mr Adamson's actions to be calculated and motivated.

The aggravating features in this case were that:

- Mr Adamson has been convicted of a very serious offence and was sentenced to a term of imprisonment of 7 years.
- Mr Adamson was in a leadership position and a position of trust and responsibility. He was also a role model. He had fallen very far short of the standards expected of him in that regard.

In these proceedings, there was limited evidence of regret, remorse or insight on the part of Mr Adamson.

There was some evidence that Mr Adamson demonstrated high standards in his usual professional conduct or contributed significantly to the education sector.

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 Adamson 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 Adamson. The seriousness of the offences 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 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 proven, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. One of these behaviours includes serious sexual misconduct and sexual misconduct involving a child. The panel found that Mr Adamson was responsible for engaging in non-penetrative sexual activity with girl [REDACTED] – offender 18 or over, and engaging in penetrative sexual activity with girl under 16 – offender 18 or over, in addition to spitting at a pupil and throwing something at them.

The Advice also indicates that there are behaviours that, if proven, would have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer review period. The panel found that this was a case involving violence.

The Advice also indicates that if there are behaviours which involve any of the following, it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weight in favour of not offering a review period. The panel found that the following were relevant:

- serious sexual misconduct e.g. where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons, particularly where the individual has used their professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons;
- any sexual misconduct involving a child.

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 the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct, conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and a relevant conviction.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Adamson 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
- 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 Adamson, involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE), namely "failure in their duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk or failing to promote the safety and welfare of the children (as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE)"

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include serious convictions for engaging in non-penetrative sexual activity with a girl [REDACTED] and penetrative sexual activity with a girl under 16, along with inappropriate behaviour towards a pupil.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself, whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and a relevant conviction, 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 Adamson, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children and/or safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, "In light of the nature of the offences for which Mr Adamson was convicted, there was an extremely strong public interest consideration regarding the protection of pupils and other members of the public. His actions raised obvious and significant public and child protection concerns, as was clearly recognised by the court when imposing his sentence." 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, "In these proceedings, there was limited evidence of regret, remorse or insight on the part of Mr Adamson." In my judgement, the lack of full insight or 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 findings of misconduct were serious, and the conduct displayed would likely have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public perception. In particular, if a parent discovered that a child's teacher had spat at a pupil or thrown an object at them, they would be appalled." I am particularly mindful of the finding of a conviction involving sexual activity with girls 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, conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and a relevant conviction 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 Adamson himself and the panel comment “There was some evidence that Mr Adamson demonstrated high standards in his usual professional conduct or contributed significantly to the education sector.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Adamson 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 comment “The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Adamson’s behaviour in committing these offences could undoubtedly affect public confidence in the teaching profession, particularly given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. His conduct ran counter to what should have been at the very core of his practice as a teacher with a duty of care towards children. By virtue of his position, Mr Adamson was in a position of trust and responsibility in relation to his pupils. He abused that position.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that “Mr Adamson was in a leadership position and a position of trust and responsibility. He was also a role model. He had fallen very far short of the standards expected of him in that regard.”

Mr Adamson was sentenced to 7 years imprisonment which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Adamson 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 “The Advice also indicates that there are behaviours that, if proven, would have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer review period. The panel found that this was a case involving violence.

The Advice also indicates that if there are behaviours which involve any of the following, it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weight in favour of not offering a review period. The panel found that the following were relevant:

- serious sexual misconduct e.g. where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons, particularly where the individual has used their professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons;
- any sexual misconduct involving a child.”

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 a serious conviction, significant public and child protection concerns, along with lack of full insight or 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 Jonathan Adamson 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 Adamson 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 Adamson 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: 4 October 2023

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