



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Jeffrey Wilson: 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	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	8
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	11

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

<b>Teacher:</b>	Mr Jeffrey Wilson
<b>Teacher ref number:</b>	1549073
<b>Teacher date of birth:</b>	23 July 1991
<b>TRA reference:</b>	0021261
<b>Date of determination:</b>	16 October 2023
<b>Former employer:</b>	Hills Road Sixth Form College, Cambridge

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 16 October 2023 by virtual means to consider the case of Mr Jeffrey Wilson.

The panel members were Mr Clive Ruddle (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Aisha Miller (teacher panellist), and Mrs Karen Graham (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Priyesh Dave 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 Jeffrey Wilson that the allegation(s) be considered without a hearing. Mr Wilson provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted conviction of a relevant offence. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer Ms Clare Hastie of Kingsley Napley LLP, or Mr Wilson.

The meeting took place in private.

## Allegations

The panel considered the allegation(s) set out in the notice of meeting dated 16 October 2023.

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

Mr Wilson was convicted of a relevant offence, namely:

1. Making indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of children on 12/02/22 Protection of Children Act 1978 s.1 (a)
2. Making indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of children on 12/02/22 Protection of Children Act 1978 s.1 (a)
3. Making indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of children on 12/02/22 Protection of Children Act 1978 s.1 (a)
4. Voyeurism - record a person doing a private act on 22/02/19 - 25/02/19 Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.67 (3)
5. Voyeurism - record a person doing a private act on 22/02/19 - 25/02/19 Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.67 (3)
6. Voyeurism - record a person doing a private act on 20/07/19 Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.67 (3)
7. Without consent/reasonable belief in consent record image under clothing to observe another on 13/04/19 - 31/07/19 Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.67A (2) +s.67A (4)
8. Without consent/reasonable belief in consent record image under clothing to observe another on 01/09/19 - 12/02/22 Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.67A (2) +s.67A (4)

Mr Wilson admitted both the alleged facts and that it amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

## Preliminary applications

### Application to amend allegations

1. An application has been made by the TRA to amend the Notice of Meeting by amending allegation 6's date of act from "27/07/19" to "20/07/19". This application has been made so that the allegation correctly follows the date on the certificate of conviction. The panel has the power to, in the interests of justice, amend an allegation or the particulars of an allegation at any stage before making its decision about whether the facts of the case have been proved.

2. Before making an amendment, the panel must consider any representations by the presenting officer and the teacher. However, no parties are in attendance for this meeting. The teacher has been contacted and agreed to the amendment of the allegation and the statement of facts.
3. The panel considered that the amendment proposed being a correction of a typographical error does not change the nature, scope or seriousness of the allegations. There is no prospect of the case being presented differently had the amendment been made at an earlier stage, and therefore, no unfairness or prejudice caused to the teacher or the TRA. The panel, therefore, decided to amend the allegation as proposed.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section 1: Chronology and Anonymised Individual List – pages 3 to 4

Section 2: Notice of Referral, Response and Notice of Meeting – pages 6 to 31

Section 3: Statement of Agreed Facts and Presenting Officer Representations – pages 33 to 37

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency Documents – pages 39 to 125

The panel made note of Mr Wilson's amendment to the Statement of Agreed Facts.

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 Wilson on 3 September 2023 and as amended on 15 October 2023.

## **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 Wilson 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 Wilson had been employed at Hills Road Sixth Form College (the "School") since August 2019 as a teacher. Mr Wilson ceased to be a teacher at the School on 31 July 2022. In or around February 2022, Mr Wilson was arrested. On 30 July 2022, Mr Wilson plead guilty.

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

**You were convicted of a relevant offence, namely:**

- 1. Making indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of children on 12/02/22  
Protection of Children Act 1978 s.1 (a)**
- 2. Making indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of children on 12/02/22  
Protection of Children Act 1978 s.1 (a)**
- 3. Making indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of children on 12/02/22  
Protection of Children Act 1978 s.1 (a)**
- 4. Voyeurism - record a person doing a private act on 22/02/19 - 25/02/19  
Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.67 (3)**
- 5. Voyeurism - record a person doing a private act on 22/02/19 - 25/02/19  
Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.67 (3)**
- 6. Voyeurism - record a person doing a private act on 20/07/19 Sexual Offences  
Act 2003 s.67 (3)**
- 7. Without consent/reasonable belief in consent record image under clothing to  
observe another on 13/04/19 - 31/07/19 Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.67A (2)  
+s.67A (4)**
- 8. Without consent/reasonable belief in consent record image under clothing to  
observe another on 01/09/19 - 12/02/22 Sexual Offences Act 2003 s.67A (2)  
+s.67A (4)**

The panel has seen a certificate of conviction confirming that you were convicted as alleged. The panel accepted the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction.

You were sentenced to a total custodial period of 12 months. You were also ordered to register with the police for 10 years and were subject to a sexual harm prevention order for 10 years.

After an intelligence operation, the police became aware of your home address and the IP address of your phone connected with indecent photographs and images of children. For the possession of indecent photographs of children convictions, the police found 90 instances of media falling within Class A, 185 pieces of media within Class B, and 52,546 pieces of media within Class C.

You also filmed an adult family friend via a nanny camera without her knowledge related to the voyeurism convictions.

The final convictions related to section 67A voyeurism, otherwise known as 'upskirting'. These images of students and teachers were taken during your employment at both Thomas Clarkson school and the School.

You pled guilty to the offences.

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

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

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

- 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.

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

The panel noted that most of the individual's convictions were not related to teaching; the convictions of allegations 7 and 8 were within two schools and working in an education setting. These include taking images of pupils and teachers.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence:

were contrary to the standards of personal and professional conduct expected of a teacher, with reference to the Teachers' Standards;

were relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting;

would be likely to have an impact on the safety or security of pupils or members of the public; or

would be likely to affect public confidence in the teaching profession if the teacher were allowed to continue teaching.

The panel also took account of the way others view the teaching profession. The panel considered that Mr Wilson's behaviour in committing the offence would likely affect public confidence in the teaching profession if Mr Wilson were allowed to continue teaching.

The panel noted that Mr Wilson's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed and which the Advice states is likely to be considered "a relevant offence".

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

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

The panel viewed the offences as serious. The panel took into account at Mr Wilson's sentencing that the judge set out that Mr Wilson pled guilty at the earliest opportunity.

Although Mr Wilson had taught for over 2 years at the time of his arrest at the School, the panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Wilson's fitness to be a teacher. The panel considered that a finding that this conviction was for a relevant offence/these convictions were for relevant offences was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

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

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

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order is appropriate, the panel had to consider the public interest, the seriousness of the behaviour, any mitigation offered by Mr Wilson and whether a prohibition order is necessary and proportionate. Prohibition orders should not be given in order to be



punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely, the safeguarding and well-being 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 within the teaching profession.

There was a strong public interest consideration with respect to the safeguarding and well-being of pupils, given the serious conviction of the crime of ‘without consent/reasonable belief in consent record image under clothing to observe another’ within two schools.

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

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

Whilst no doubt had been cast upon his ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Wilson in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and he sought to exploit his position of trust.

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the behaviour, noting that the Advice states that the expectation of both the public and pupils is that members of the teaching profession maintain an exemplary level of integrity and ethical standards at all times. The panel noted that a teacher’s behaviour that seeks to exploit their position of trust should be viewed very seriously in terms of its potential influence on pupils and be seen as a possible threat to the public interest.

The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a panel will likely consider a teacher’s behaviour to be incompatible with being a teacher if there is evidence of one or more of the factors that begin on page 15. In the list of such factors, those that were relevant in this case were:

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

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

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

abuse of position or trust;

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;

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

violation of the rights of pupils;

lack of integrity;

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

The panel notes that no references were provided from any colleagues that could attest to his abilities as a teacher.

Mr Wilson had been teaching at the School for 2 years, but there is no evidence of exceptional contribution to teaching.

The panel were satisfied that Mr Wilson's actions were deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Wilson was acting under extreme duress, eg a physical threat or significant intimidation, and, in fact, the panel agreed with the sentencing judge and found Mr Wilson's actions to be calculated and motivated.

### **Proportionality**

The panel first considered whether it would be proportionate to conclude this case with no recommendation of prohibition, considering whether the publication of the findings made by the panel would be sufficient.

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings would be sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Wilson of prohibition.

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr

Wilson. The serious nature of Mr Wilson's convictions were 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 does not have any evidence on insight or remorse of Mr Wilson and could not form a view on whether this behaviour would reoccur or not.

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

The Advice indicates that there are cases involving certain conduct where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period. These cases include any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or indecent pseudo photograph or image of a child, including one off incidents. The panel found that Mr Wilson was convicted for photographing students while working as a teacher at the School and making indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children.

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

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

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

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

In this case, the panel has found all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to a relevant conviction.

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

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

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

- 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.

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

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of a relevant conviction for making indecent images of children which resulted in a custodial sentence.

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 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 Wilson, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children and safeguard pupils. The panel observed, "There was a strong public interest consideration with respect to the safeguarding and well-being of pupils, given the serious conviction of the crime of 'without consent/reasonable belief in consent record image under clothing to observe another' within two schools". A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, "The panel does not have any evidence on insight or remorse of Mr Wilson and could not form a view on whether this behaviour would reoccur or not." In my judgement, the lack of evidence of 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 observed, "Conduct of this sort has the potential to damage the public's perception of, and trust in, the profession." I am particularly mindful of the finding of a conviction for making indecent images of children in this case and the serious, negative impact that such a finding may have on the reputation of the profession.

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

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of a relevant 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 Wilson himself. The panel commented "no references were provided from any colleagues that could attest to his abilities as a teacher" and "there is no evidence of exceptional contribution to teaching".

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Wilson from teaching. A prohibition order would also clearly deprive the public of his contribution to the profession for the period that it is in force.

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel's comments concerning the lack of insight or remorse. Although the panel notes that Mr Wilson pled guilty at the earliest opportunity, it found no evidence of insight or remorse for his actions.

I have also placed considerable weight on the findings of the panel that Mr Wilson "behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and he sought to exploit his position of trust". The panel found his actions to be "calculated and motivated".

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Wilson has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in light of the 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 indicates that there are cases involving certain conduct where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period. These cases include any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or indecent pseudo photograph or image of a child, including one off incidents. The panel found that Mr Wilson was convicted for photographing students while working as a teacher at the School and making indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children."

I have considered whether not allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the very serious nature of the offences of which Mr Wilson was convicted, the lack of evidence of insight or remorse, and the potential damage to the public's perception of the teaching profession.

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

**This means that Mr Jeffrey Wilson is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England.** Furthermore, in view of the seriousness of the allegations found proved against him, I have decided that Mr Wilson shall not be entitled to apply for restoration of his eligibility to teach.

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

Mr Wilson has a right of appeal to the 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 'D Oatley', written in a cursive style.

**Decision maker: David Oatley**

**Date: 18 October 2023**

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