



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Thomas Hadley: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

November 2023

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	7
Documents	7
Witnesses	8
Decision and reasons	8
Findings of fact	8
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	21
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	24

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

Teacher:	Mr Thomas Hadley
Teacher ref number:	1338003
Teacher date of birth:	20 February 1992
TRA reference:	19911
Date of determination:	24 November 2023
Former employer:	Gresham's School, Norfolk

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 20 to 24 November 2023 by virtual means to consider the case of Mr Thomas Hadley.

The panel members were Ms Mona Sood (lay panellist – in the chair), Mr Clive Ruddle (panellist) and Mr Paul Anderson (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mrs Luisa Gibbons of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Louise Ravenscroft of Capsticks LLP solicitors.

Mr Hadley was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 8 September 2023.

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

1. In relation to Person A, a young person under the age of 18 years old, with whom he was or had been in a position of trust as Scout Leader;
 - a. During a shooting lesson in or around 2015 or 2016, he made inappropriate comments to Person A saying words to the effect of:
 - i. you've got a nice figure;
 - ii. you're got nice sized boobs;
 - iii. they're a nice handful in my hands;
 - b. In or around 2015 or 2016, he discussed his personal and sexual relationships with other females to Person A;
 - c. During a shooting lesson in or around 2015 or 2016, he:
 - i. touched Person A's breasts;
 - ii. placed his hand on Person A's back and/or tried to undo Person A's bra;
 - d. During a shooting trip in or around 2017, he offered to give Person A a back massage;
 - e. During a Scout trip in or around October 2017, he:
 - i. got into Person A's bed or tent and/or tried to cuddle Person A
 - f. In or around 2017, he suggested to Person A on one or more occasions, that they should send nude and/or inappropriate pictures of themselves to him via Snapchat
2. His conduct as may be found proved in relation to any or all of paragraph 1 was sexually motivated.

Mr Hadley denied the allegations and did not admit that he was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Preliminary applications

Proceeding in absence

The panel considered an application from the presenting officer to proceed in the absence of Mr Hadley.

The panel was satisfied that the TRA has complied with the service requirements of paragraph 19(1) (a) to (c) of the Teachers' Disciplinary (England) Regulations 2012, (the "Regulations").

The panel was also satisfied that the notice of proceedings complied with paragraphs 5.23 and 5.24 of the Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession May 2020, (the "Procedures").

The panel determined to exercise its discretion under paragraph 5.47 of the Procedures to proceed with the hearing in the absence of the teacher.

The panel took as its starting point the principle from R v Jones that its discretion to commence a hearing in the absence of the teacher had to be exercised with the utmost care and caution, and that its discretion is a severely constrained one. In considering the question of fairness, the panel recognised that fairness to the professional is of prime importance but that it also encompasses the fair, economic, expeditious and efficient disposal of allegations against the professional, as was explained in GMC v Adeogba & Visvardis.

In making its decision, the panel noted that the teacher may waive his right to participate in the hearing. The panel took account of the various factors drawn to its attention from the case of R v Jones [2003] 1 AC1.

Immediately prior to the issue of the notice of hearing on 6 September 2022, Mr Hadley stated "I have no intention of attending or having any representation at any hearing I have left the profession and the affect [sic] this process has had [REDACTED] is not worth the chance of clearing my name of these lies". On 13 September 2023. Mr Hadley submitted representations to be provided to the panel to explain why he would not be attending the hearing. He made reference to the impact that the investigation had [REDACTED] and "the way in which it has dragged out over many years." He explained he was no longer involved in the teaching profession, nor did he intend to re-join the profession. He stated that at every stage of the process he had been assumed guilty. He referred to having started a new career and stated "I am just wanting to see the end of this traumatic experience and be able to move on with my life... As such I do not wish to be contacted about this topic again." The panel was satisfied that Mr Hadley was aware of the proceedings and has unequivocally stated that he did not intend to attend. The panel therefore considered that Mr Hadley had waived his right to be present at the hearing in the knowledge of when and the means by which the hearing was taking place.

In light of the communications received from Mr Hadley there appeared to be no prospect of Mr Hadley attending if the hearing was adjourned to a later date.

Mr Hadley is not represented in these proceedings and has expressed no wish to adjourn in order to obtain legal representation. He was previously represented but his solicitor came off the record on 17 May 2022.

The panel has the benefit of representations made by the teacher and is able to ascertain the lines of defence. The panel has in its bundle two statements attesting to his character, albeit these were not provided for the purpose of the present proceedings but it would be able to take these into account at the relevant stage. The panel has noted that all witnesses relied upon are to be called to give evidence and the panel can test that evidence in questioning those witnesses, considering such points as are favourable to the teacher, as are reasonably available on the evidence. The panel is also able to exercise vigilance in making its decision, taking into account the degree of risk of the panel reaching the wrong decision as a result of not having heard the teacher's account.

The panel considered that there was little risk of reaching the wrong conclusion as to the reason for Mr Hadley's absence. He has made it plain that he does not wish to attend the hearing.

The panel recognised that the allegations against the teacher are serious and that there was a real risk that if proven, the panel would be required to consider whether to recommend that the teacher ought to be prohibited from teaching.

The panel recognised that the efficient disposal of allegations against teachers was required to ensure the protection of pupils and to maintain confidence in the profession. Part of the conduct alleged was said to have taken place whilst the teacher was employed at Gresham's School. Gresham's School and Person A will have an interest in this hearing taken place in order to move forwards.

The panel also noted that there were four witnesses prepared to give evidence, and that it would be inconvenient and potentially distressing for them to attend on a future date. Delaying the case further may impact upon the memories of those witnesses.

The panel decided to proceed with the hearing in the absence of the teacher. The panel considered that in light of:

- Mr Hadley's waiver of his right to appear and his request not to be contacted again;
- the inconvenience an adjournment would cause to the witnesses;
- the public interest in this hearing proceeding within a reasonable time; and

- by taking such measures referred to above to address any unfairness insofar as was possible,

the balance was in favour of this hearing continuing.

Admission of late documents

The panel agreed to accept a bundle of documents consisting of correspondence with Mr Hadley regarding his attendance at the hearing and his engagement with the proceedings. (“the Service Bundle”). The panel decided that the Service Bundle was relevant to the presenting officer’s application to proceed in Mr Hadley’s absence and that it was fair to admit it, since it would enable the panel to ascertain Mr Hadley’s position in respect of his attendance.

The panel also accepted into evidence an application form that Mr Hadley submitted when he applied for his post at Gresham’s School; and references obtained by the School when considering Mr Hadley’s application. These documents were requested by the panel in order that it had an understanding of Mr Hadley’s employment history and were able to verify this by the references. This was relevant to the question of when Mr Hadley had become a teacher. The panel considered that it was fair to admit these documents in order to place the allegations in context.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Anonymised pupil list and list of key people – pages 4 to 5

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 6 to 28

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 29 to 65

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 66 to 431

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 432 to 438

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

The Service Bundle;

An application form that Mr Hadley submitted when he applied for his post at Gresham’s School; and

References obtained by the School when considering Mr Hadley’s application.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the hearing and the additional documents that the panel decided to admit.

Witnesses

The panel heard oral evidence from:

- Person A – complainant
- Witness B – [REDACTED]
- Witness C – [REDACTED]
- Witness D – [REDACTED]

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

From 1 September 2016, Mr Hadley worked at Gresham's Preparatory School as a teacher of design and technology and as a forest school teacher. Prior to this, Mr Hadley was a class teacher for year 1 and year 4 pupil at Wells-Next-the-Sea Primary and Nursery School from September 2014. Mr Hadley was arrested on 14 February 2019 on suspicion of sexual assault, and was released under investigation. In or around June or July 2019, the police decided to take no further action against Mr Hadley and the matter was picked up by the LADO for investigation. Mr Hadley resigned from his post effective from 18 October 2019. On 4 February 2020, a disciplinary hearing took place to consider whether Mr Hadley would have been dismissed had he not resigned before the process was concluded. On 24 March 2021, the matters were referred to the TRA.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

Integral to all of the allegations is the issue of Person A's credibility. The panel had the benefit of a police statement made by Person A on 5 February 2019 somewhat nearer to the time of the matters alleged, albeit was still some time afterwards. Person A confirmed in oral evidence that the matters stated were broadly correct although had not had the opportunity to review and sign the document as an accurate record at the time.

Person A and Mr Hadley were both members of a shooting club. In her police statement, Person A stated that she had not told [REDACTED] (Person G) about Mr Hadley's physical contact at the shooting club immediately after it had happened and that she had just said that she did not want to go alone to the shooting club any more. Person A's

police statement referred to having later made a disclosure to Person G in October 2017, although was not precise as to what exactly Person A had reported to Person G.

The panel also had the police statement provided by Person G. The panel considered this police statement to be admissible. Person G had since [REDACTED]. Her evidence was not the sole or decisive evidence in relation to the allegations; Person A had provided direct evidence of the matters alleged. It was noted that Person G could not provide direct evidence of the matters alleged by Person A, and could only report to the police what she had been told by Person A. Person G, however, also gave direct evidence of the family's relationship with Mr Hadley. Whilst the panel was unable to test Person G's accounts the panel considered that it was fair, in the circumstances, for her evidence to be admitted and the panel could consider what weight it would attach to her evidence.

Person G confirmed Person A's account of Mr Hadley being a family friend who she had known since Mr Hadley had been approximately [REDACTED]. Her [REDACTED] had become friends with Mr Hadley's [REDACTED] through their membership of a scout group that Person A joined as well. She stated that she had got to know Mr Hadley more when he was an adult and he had become a scout leader. Both Person A and Mr Hadley had become involved in target shooting in the same shooting club. She confirmed Person A's account that Mr Hadley had for some time collected Person A to take her shooting. This evidence corroborated Person A's account of the family's relationship with Mr Hadley.

Person G stated in her police statement that during late summer of 2015, when Person A was around the age of [REDACTED], Person A had said that she did not want to go shooting with Mr Hadley by herself and that she wanted Person G to go with her. She stated that Person A had not, at that time, said enough to flag up any concerns. Person G stated that Person A had not said that she had been assaulted by Mr Hadley and Person A did not tell her what had happened until 25 October 2017.

The panel does not have any evidence to explain why it was not until 2019 that the police investigation began.

In her police statement, Person G stated that she had sent a text message to Mr Hadley at 20:37 on 26 October 2017 which she provided to the police.

The panel has not seen the entirety of the message(s) sent by Person G, nor is the message within the panel bundle dated, but the panel bundle does contain what the panel understands to be Mr Hadley's response. This stated: "I think I know what you're talking about and it was stupid lapse of judgment [sic] on my part and something I would also very much like to leave in the past as a silly immature mistake. I thank you and Person A for your continued friendship and support and apologise for any silly daft mistakes that I have made in the time you have known me... I hope what happened

those years ago doesn't affect our friendship going forwards." A reply is then provided which the panel understands to be from Person G stating "Like I said... Enough said".

Mr Hadley was interviewed as part of the School's investigation. Witness B provided evidence that Mr Hadley had not made a self-referral to the School despite having received a message from Person G regarding his conduct. Mr Hadley was asked about this message in an investigation meeting. The notes of that meeting record that Mr Hadley was asked why he did not do anything about the disclosure and Mr Hadley stated that he had sent a message back saying he was sorry for whatever he had done and had not meant any harm. Mr Hadley was asked what he thought he was apologising for. Mr Hadley stated that he thought Person A was referring to an occasion when he had squeezed Person A's knee, giving her a "donkey bite" in the car. Mr Hadley stated that it had crossed his mind to self-refer but when Person G did not respond further, he decided not to as he thought it referred to the "donkey bite". In oral evidence, Witness B explained to the panel that a "donkey bite" was a squeeze just above the knee, typical of horseplay between siblings, that would elicit an involuntary kick of the lower leg.

Person A has made no reference to a "donkey bite" in any of her accounts, although accepted it may have happened. She clearly did not view it as having been of any significance. The panel, therefore, considered it was unlikely that Person G would have been referring to the "donkey bite" in her text message raising her concerns.

The panel received evidence of the strong safeguarding culture in the School from both Witness B and Witness C. Witness B confirmed that it was sensible to self-refer if anything that occurred that could be misinterpreted in order to afford some degree of self-protection in the event an allegation was made. The panel considered that it was implausible that Mr Hadley would not have understood the need to self-refer having received the message from Person G. Person G must have considered the matter to be more than a trivial one to have raised it with Mr Hadley. Although Person A was not a pupil taught by Mr Hadley she was a child under the age of 18 and as such Mr Hadley ought to have been alive to the obvious safeguarding risks of being alone with Person A in the car and in the shooting club. Person A stated that the scout leaders had obtained parental consent for Mr Hadley to transport Person A to the scout group sessions. Irrespective of this, the scout's code of conduct (the "Yellow Card") explicitly stated "Do plan activities that involve more than one other person being present, or at least within sight and hearing of others. Do not plan to be alone with a young person". Witness D stated that parental consent could not override this requirement. Witness D stated that the scouting movement did not encourage lifts to be provided to young persons. In disregarding it, Mr Hadley placed himself in a vulnerable position. The panel noted that Mr Hadley was recently qualified and that safeguarding would have pervaded his training programme. He had received safeguarding training both at Gresham's School and as a scout leader. Failing to address those risks undermined his credibility.

In the notes of the School's investigation meeting with Mr Hadley, he was asked why Person A would make such an allegation against him. He referred to Person A having a history of making things up, but was not specific in any examples of when this had happened. Witness B asked if Mr Hadley believed Person A had made up the allegation against him when he had started a relationship with her friend. Mr Hadley responded "yes", particularly as at the time Mr Hadley and Person A were seeing less and less of each other and Person A's relationship with her [REDACTED] was not good. Person A was asked about this in oral evidence. Person A explained that she had been concerned for her friend when her friend informed her of the relationship but took the view that her friend should "do as she pleased". She referred to the friendship having continued until their lives naturally went their separate ways. She stated that it was not true that she had made the allegations up. She explained that she appreciated the significance and seriousness of the allegation and that it was "not a nice situation to be in" to face such allegations and that she would not lie about them.

Person A told the panel that that she is a [REDACTED] which the panel noted is a regulated profession and is in a trusted position.

In the notes of the investigation meeting with Mr Hadley, Mr Hadley explained why he moved from one scouting group to another. He made no suggestion then that a disagreement within the scouting group had led to allegations against him. However, in Mr Hadley's representations for this hearing, he stated that "there seems to have been a small group within Norfolk scouts who were determined to see me removed from teaching and scouting... In this latest attack they didn't stop with me they also filled [sic] baseless complaints against those who had supported me including the [REDACTED] of the time. All of which were found to be false and go to show how frequently and freely these people lie to try and remove people they do not like." It is not clear whether Mr Hadley was suggesting that the allegations made by Person A were part of the dispute within the scouting group, but if so, there is no evidence of such a motivation on the part of Person A.

Mr Hadley also sought to undermine the findings of the School's investigation on the basis that Witness B had taken undue regard of Mr Hadley's behaviour and body language during the investigation meeting. The panel had no regard for the outcome of the findings of the School's investigation and any assessment made by Witness B in this regard did not feature in the panel's decision making.

The panel assessed the quality of Person A's evidence. Whilst there were inconsistencies in the various accounts provided by Person A, these were no more than would be expected given the passage of time and bearing in mind there was no evidence that she had reviewed her police statement at the time that she provided her account. Her account of significant events remained consistent, albeit her ability to place exactly when events occurred had been eroded, particularly since her police statement was taken approximately 18 months after Person A's disclosure to Person G. The panel noted

that during Person A's evidence, she made no attempt to elaborate her account. Examples of this are as follows. She spoke positively of her relationship with Mr Hadley when they were younger. Person A confirmed on questioning that there had been skin to skin contact during the incident at the shooting club; it was not a detail that Person A had been at pains to point out. Person A was clear that when Mr Hadley had come into her bivvy, she did not remember any physical contact other than the "spooning" and that she had managed to sleep.

On balance, given that:

- Person A's account of the closeness of her family's relationship with Mr Hadley was corroborated by Person G's police statement;
- Mr Hadley failed to identify the safeguarding risks of his relationship with Person A and report when concerns were raised;
- Person A's accounts of what had happened were fundamentally consistent, and any inconsistencies could be explained by the passage of time;
- Person A was measured in her evidence, without embellishing her account;
- Person A's attention was drawn to Mr Hadley's assertion that Person A had a history of lying and Person A responded to this stating that she was saddened by these comments but remained moderate in her responses;
- There was no evidence that Person A had any hostile motive to the allegations she had made

the panel accepted that Person A gave a credible account of the events.

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

- 1. In relation to Person A, a young person under the age of 18 years old, with whom you were or had been in a position of trust as Scout Leader;**
 - a. During a shooting lesson in or around 2015 or 2016, you made inappropriate comments to Person A saying words to the effect of:**
 - i. you've got a nice figure;**
 - ii. you're got nice sized boobs;**
 - iii. they're a nice handful in my hands;**

In Person A's police statement that due to Person G's [REDACTED], Mr Hadley used to take her shooting and they used to go 2 or 3 times per week. She stated that a lot of the times there was no one else present save for her and Mr Hadley. She referred to there being a few sofas in the clubhouse of the shooting club where members could go when

they were having a break from shooting. She stated that, on one occasion, Mr Hadley had taken her shooting. During a break, they went to the clubhouse and Mr Hadley was being cheeky talking about “figures”. Person A stated that she had said that she wished she had a better figure, and that Mr Hadley had said “Oh no you’ve got a nice figure; you’ve got nice sized boobs”. She stated that she felt awkward and said “OK” and Mr Hadley then said “I reckon they’re a nice handful”.

Person A’s police statement went on to record that Person A had stated that she had been nervous and Mr Hadley edged closer to her on the sofa where they were sitting and he leaned across and “groped my boobs” and said “they’re a nice handful in my hands” or words that were very similar. Person A stated that she did not know what to do so lent against the arm of her chair and moved her arms across her chest to cover it. She stated that she was conscious that they were there alone. She stated that Mr Hadley then brushed his hand up her back and it had felt like he was going to undo her brassiere. She stated that she had decided to defuse the situation by saying “let’s go and shoot again”.

Person A stated that, at the end of the shooting practice, Mr Hadley drove her home and they didn’t chat much as she was being blunt with him. She stated that she saw Person G but didn’t tell her what had happened and just said that she “didn’t want to go alone anymore.” At the end of her police statement, Person A stated that she was [REDACTED] when this incident occurred.

Person G stated that during the summer of 2015, Person A had spoken to her and said that she did not want to go shooting again with Mr Hadley by herself and that she wanted Person G to go with her. This was consistent with Person A’s account that she had not at this point told Person G what had happened relating to this incident. Person G stated that Person A did not tell her what had happened until 25 October 2017. Person G reported what Person A had told her namely that whilst Person A and Mr Hadley were at the shooting club, Mr Hadley had sat next to her on the sofa and kept sidling up to her, that he was chatting about the size of her breasts and then took hold of them. Person A had told Person G that she turned away and that she thought he then tried to undo her bra strap. Person G stated that she had asked Person A if it had gone any further but she was adamant that it had not.

In Person A’s witness statement for the present proceedings, Person A referred to an occasion when she was [REDACTED] and Mr Hadley had come to her house to pick her up. She stated that it was a really hot day and that she was wearing shorts, which was unusual, as she would normally be more covered up in scouting and shooting activities. She stated that Mr Hadley had made a comment, saying “you’ve got your legs out”. She stated that at the range, in between shooting practice, they were alone in the club room and he was sitting on an old sofa. She stated that Mr Hadley asked if she wanted to sit down and she had said no as she normally only took 5 minutes between her shoots. She stated that Mr Hadley had then started making comments about the size of her breasts and that she had told him that they were normal and average size. She stated that Mr

Hadley had replied that they were not average and that they were a good handful. Person A stated that he told her to come over to him and she asked why, and he asked her to come over to him again, which she did. She explained that she had already been relatively close to him when he had made the comment but he then grabbed her breast and said “look it’s a good handful”. She stated that she could not say anything, just moved away and went back to shooting. She stated that she could not think properly after this and when she got home she did not say anything to anyone. She stated that she made sure that Person G took her to the shooting club after that. Person A stated that she never gave Mr Hadley permission to touch her and that after the incident she tried to avoid Mr Hadley in a way that was not obvious and always tried to ensure that someone else was around when she saw him.

In oral evidence, Person A confirmed that this incident had occurred as alleged. She also confirmed, on questioning, that there had been skin to skin contact. She explained that she had felt uncomfortable and almost felt trapped as the shooting club was remote and she had barely any phone signal, and was dependent upon him to return her home. She stated that she had not reported it at the time, as it was awkward given the support Mr Hadley had provided [REDACTED] when he would cheer Person G up. She described that after the incident, the extent to which she had practised her shooting decreased but that she had carried on with scouts as she felt safer there as she was never alone with Mr Hadley. Person A confirmed that she had been under 18 at the time of this incident. Even after she learned to drive, she still had to go with someone to the shooting club as she was not permitted to transport her rifle alone in the car until she reached the age of 18.

Given the panel found Person A’s account to be credible, the panel considered that it was more probable than not that Mr Hadley had acted in the manner alleged and that this had taken place when Person A was under the age of 18.

The panel found this allegation proven.

b. In or around 2015 or 2016, you discussed your personal and sexual relationships with other females to Person A;

In Person A’s police statement, she stated that Mr Hadley used to pick her up and take her to scouts and that she had obtained written permission from Person G for this as the other scout leaders did not like him doing this. She stated that they used to chat in the car, and it started off very innocently but it changed as he would comment on her [REDACTED] and start to make “cheeky innuendo jokes”. She stated that she had been aged [REDACTED] at the time.

In Person A’s witness statement for the present proceedings, Person A stated that on multiple occasions during car journeys, Mr Hadley would tell her about the lady he was dating and about their sexual experiences together. Person A gave an example of this. She stated that she did not know what to say to such comments and would laugh it off

and try to change the subject. She stated that these types of conversations made her feel uncomfortable. She stated that as she got older, Mr Hadley would often talk about other women in sexual ways which she felt was disrespectful.

In oral evidence, Person A stated that Mr Hadley used to make comments regarding her [REDACTED] whilst they were in the car and that he occasionally made comments about his personal relationships. She stated that he referred to quite intimate experiences with his girlfriend which she did not appreciate as she did not want to hear about this. She stated that on such occasions, she kept quiet and hoped he would change the subject.

Given the panel found Person A's account to be credible, the panel considered that it was more probable than not that Mr Hadley had discussed with Person A his personal and sexual relationships with other females and that this had taken place when Person A was under the age of 18, given that she reported that those conversations took place during car journeys.

The panel found this allegation proven.

c. During a shooting lesson in or around 2015 or 2016, you:

- i. touched Person A's breasts;**
- ii. placed your hand on Person A's back and/or tried to undo Person A's bra;**

This allegation relates to the same incident referred to in allegation 1.a. and the panel found this allegation proven for the same reasons as referred to above.

2. Your conduct as may be found proved in relation to any or all of paragraph 1 was sexually motivated.

The matters found proven in allegations 1.a. and 1.c. formed part of a continuous incident, starting with Mr Hadley making inappropriate comments and culminating in Mr Hadley touching Person A's breasts and placing his hand on her back such as she thought he was trying to undo her bra. This conduct was by its nature sexual. There could be no other justification for it, other than it being motivated either by Mr Hadley's pursuit of sexual gratification or a future sexual relationship.

The matters found proven in allegation 1.b. could be considered by reasonable persons to be sexual. The panel then went on to ask itself whether in all the circumstances of the conduct in the case, it was more likely than not that Mr Hadley's purpose of his comments was sexual. Given that Mr Hadley later went on to make sexual comments about Person A and touch her breasts, the panel considered that it was more likely than not that his personal and sexual comments about his girlfriends were intended by Mr Hadley to develop an intimacy between himself and Person A and were therefore in pursuit of sexual gratification or a future sexual relationship. There was a clear transition in Mr Hadley starting to talk about Person A's [REDACTED] and then about his own

relationships that indicated that proper boundaries had been crossed. The panel noted that the nature of the comments made Person A feel uncomfortable.

The panel therefore found that that the conduct found proven in allegation 1.a., 1.b. and 1.c was sexually motivated.

The panel found the following particulars of the allegations against you not proved, for these reasons:

1. In relation to Person A, a young person under the age of 18 years old, with whom you were or had been in a position of trust as Scout Leader;

d. During a shooting trip in or around 2017, you offered to give Person A a back massage;

Person A's police statement stated that in 2017, they were at a shooting competition together. She stated that she had shot a lot on the one day and had [REDACTED]. She stated that Mr Hadley was insistent on giving her a massage but that she did not want it.

In oral evidence, Person A stated that she had attended a national shooting competition held over a week long period in August 2017. She stated that this occurred in a main living area and that Person G had been present when he had made the initial offer which she declined. She stated that Mr Hadley was aware that [REDACTED] and that Mr Hadley had offered to "get the knots out" and had said that he had had some training in this.

This was not an event referred to by Person G in her police statement, but the panel noted that her statement focussed on the matters reported to her by Person A and what happened after Person A had made that disclosure.

Given the panel found Person A's account to be credible, the panel considered that it was more probable than not that Mr Hadley had made this offer.

However, Person A confirmed in oral evidence that her date of birth was [REDACTED], and therefore when this event occurred in 2017, Person A was not under the age of 18 years old. On this basis the panel was unable to find this allegation had been proven by the presenting officer.

e. During a Scout trip in or around October 2017, you:

i. got into Person A's bed or tent and/or tried to cuddle Person A

In Person A's police statement, she referred to this incident that had taken place when she and Mr Hadley had attended a scout camp. She stated that, at the time she was [REDACTED] and a junior leader. She stated that they had been sitting around the campfire, and that it had started to rain, so she got "under her bivvy", that it had "started to hammer it down" and that Mr Hadley had "dived into my bivvy". She stated that she

had told him to get out but that he said he had not set his up. She stated that “he was lying next to me and kept trying to spoon me but I would keep moving out to get away from him.” At the end of Person A’s statement she stated that she had definitely been aged under 18 at the time of this incident and was probably [REDACTED].

This was not an event referred to by Person G in her police statement, but the panel noted that the statement focussed on the matters reported to her by Person A and what happened after Person A had made that disclosure.

In Person A’s witness statement for these proceedings, she referred to having attended this event in October 2017 as an assistant leader/ helper. She stated that she had been intending to sleep in a sleeping bag around the campfire, but it had felt like it was going to rain. She stated that she moved under her “bivvy” which was a couple of metres away from the fire. She stated that she had set it up so the front of it was fully open, tied between two trees. She stated that within a couple of minutes, Mr Hadley came over to her “bivvy” despite having his own. She stated that she had asked him what he was doing and he told her that she had said it was going to rain. She stated that she told him that he had his own “bivvy” and he had said “can’t I come in here?” She stated that she had told him “no” but that he had laughed and stayed anyway. She stated that they were both in their own sleeping bags and that she had moved over so she was away from him, but that he had shuffled over to her. She stated that she then rolled over so she was not facing him and did not know what to say or do. She stated that although other scout leaders were around, it was dark and she did not know if they were asleep or not, and that she had not wanted to “make a scene”.

Person A stated that Mr Hadley had come closer to her and started to spoon her, so his front was against her back. She stated that although they were in separate sleeping bags, he could not have been closer to her and that the position was a sexual one. She stated that this made her feel uncomfortable and that she had only felt slightly at ease because the front of the “bivvy “ was open and others were around.

In oral evidence, Person A confirmed that she had been [REDACTED] at the time of this incident, and as an adult she had set up her “bivvy” in an area with the other leaders away from the junior scouts. She stated that she had planned to sleep by the campfire and had settled down for the night when Mr Hadley had said that it was going to rain. She stated that she had not wanted to get wet so went to her “bivvy” and he came in as well. She stated that Mr Hadley had his own “bivvy” which he had set up elsewhere. She confirmed that he had insisted he would stay in her “bivvy”, that she had tried to move away from him, and turned to face away. She described his position as “spooning” her and that he was a lot closer than she wanted.

Given the panel found Person A’s account to be credible, the panel considered that it was more probable than not that Mr Hadley had got under Person A’s bivvy and tried to “spoon” her.

However, Person A confirmed in oral evidence that her date of birth was [REDACTED], and therefore when this event occurred in 2017, Person A was not under the age of 18 years old. Person A was clear that she had been [REDACTED], as she had chosen to taken her own “bivvy” in which to sleep on her own, as adults did not tend to share tents, in the way younger scouts of the same sex might share a “bivvy”. She also referred to the issues she had had establishing appropriate boundaries with her peers who had not yet reached the age to become adult leaders. Since Person A was [REDACTED] at the time of this incident in 2017, the panel was unable to find this allegation had been proven by the presenting officer.

f. In or around 2017, you suggested to Person A on one or more occasions, that they should send nude and/or inappropriate pictures of themselves to you via Snapchat

In Person A’s police statement, she stated that at the scout camp referred to in allegation 1e above, in the evening they were sitting around the campfire, chatting about people sending “nudes” on Snapchat. She stated that Mr Hadley had asked her if she had any nudes on her phone and that she told him “no”. She stated that Mr Hadley had then said that he would like to see a “picture of my arse” and again she had said no. She stated that they talked about Snapchat and Mr Hadley had said that he did not have it and that people only had it to send “nudes”. She went on to state that a short while after camp, she had been on Snapchat and noticed that Mr Hadley had added her. She stated that she left it for a while and then sent him a message asking why he had added her. She stated that he replied that he now had Snapchat. She stated that he could see that she was in bed and that he kept hinting for her to send him nudes, but that she did not. She stated that he did not send any of himself and she stopped replying to him.

In Person A’s witness statement for these proceedings, she stated that in 2017, when she said she was [REDACTED], she had been at home in bed and Mr Hadley had added her on “snapchat”. She stated that she accepted his request and that he had sent a blank photo asking what she was doing. She stated that she had sent a photo back, so it had a photo of her TV and the foot of her bed and said that she had told him she was in bed. She stated that she cannot remember exactly what was said, but she remembered Mr Hadley making a comment that she was in bed and asked to see her face. She stated that he then asked if she was wearing pyjamas and asked for nude photos of her.

Person A stated in her witness statement for these proceedings that at the scout camp referred to in allegation 1e above, before going to sleep, she had been giggling with her friend about something. She stated that Mr Hadley had been sat next to her and asked what they were giggling about. She stated that they had told him that it was none of his business. She stated that her friend had showed her something on her phone and Mr Hadley was trying to look over her friend’s shoulder even though her friend was asking him not to. She stated that he then asked if there were any nude photos on their phones and they ignored him.

In oral evidence, Person A confirmed these events took place, but she could not remember when.

Given the panel found Person A's account to be credible, the panel considered that it was more probable than not that Mr Hadley had asked Person A for a nude photograph.

However, as referred to above, Person A confirmed in oral evidence that her date of birth was [REDACTED]. She confirmed that the scout camp had been in October 2017 and her police statement indicated that the exchange between them when Person A had been at home in bed had taken place after the scout camp. Therefore, it was more probable than not that when these events occurred, Person A was not under the age of 18 years old. On this basis the panel was unable to find this allegation had been proven by the presenting officer.

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

Having found a number allegations 1a, 1b, 1c and 2 proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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

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

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 Hadley, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education ("KCSIE"). It was required that everyone who comes into contact with children and their families has a role to play in safeguarding children. Mr Hadley failed to have due regard to this safeguarding

role, noting that children includes everyone under the age of 18 regardless of whether or not the child was a pupil of the school in which Mr Hadley taught.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Hadley fell significantly short of the standard of behaviour expected of a teacher.

The panel also considered whether Mr Hadley's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice.

The panel found that the offences of sexual activity and sexual communication with a child were relevant.

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

The panel noted that the allegations found proven took place outside the education setting. However, his conduct affected the way the person fulfilled his teaching role as Mr Hadley abused his position of trust and disregarded his safeguarding obligations to a child.

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

The panel then considered whether Mr Hadley was guilty of conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel took into account the way the teaching profession is viewed by others, the responsibilities and duties of teachers in relation to the safeguarding and welfare of pupils 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 that they behave.

In considering the issue of disrepute, the panel also considered whether Mr Hadley displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice.

As referred to above, the panel found that the offences of sexual activity and sexual communication with a child were relevant.

The Advice indicates that where behaviours associated with such offences exist, a panel is likely to conclude that an individual's conduct would amount to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The findings of misconduct are serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher.

The panel considered that Mr Hadley's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher.

The panel therefore found that Mr Hadley's actions constituted 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 is appropriate, the panel had to consider the public interest, the seriousness of the behaviour and any mitigation offered by Mr Hadley 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 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 protection of other members of the public; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

There is a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of sexually motivated conduct towards a child.

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

Whilst there is evidence that Mr Hadley had ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Hadley 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;
- 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 (particularly involving vulnerable pupils)
- an 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).

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

The panel considered that although the matters found proven were at the lower end of the possible scale, they were serious given that they were sexually motivated.

Mr Hadley's actions were deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Hadley was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation and, in fact, the panel found Mr Hadley's actions to be calculated and sexually motivated.

Mr Hadley did have a previously good history, but there was no evidence that he demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both his personal and professional conduct or of having contributed significantly to the education sector

The panel were provided with two references that Gresham's school obtained prior to his employment. Both were positive and confirmed his suitability for the position for which he had applied. The hearing bundle contained a reference from two [REDACTED] of Norfolk Scouts who attested positively to Mr Hadley's attitude to safeguarding. The panel remained guarded about placing significant weight upon these references, given the conduct found proven involved flagrant breaches of safeguarding obligations. The panel was careful given that an abuse of a power is usually concealed from others.

In representations in response to the allegations against him, Mr Hadley conceded that he had put himself in a vulnerable position and opened himself up to allegations and he stated that he humbly apologised for this. He stated that he fully accepted that his support during this time could have been misconstrued and he attributed this to his naivety in his dropping his professional guard in his personal life, rather than through any ill intent. However, Mr Hadley has not indicated that he has any appreciation of his actions upon Person A. To the contrary, he has sought to discredit Person A and suggested that he had opened himself up to an infatuation situation, seeking to shift the blame squarely onto Person A. Although he provided written representations for this hearing, he did not attend the hearing in order that the level of his insight could be properly explored.

In the text message to Person G, Mr Hadley accepted he had made a lapse of judgment and made a silly immature mistake. In the same text message he sought to apologise for what he referred to as "silly daft mistakes". This sought to minimise the significance of his actions. The panel did not consider that it was sufficient to demonstrate remorse.

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 Hadley 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 Hadley. His failure to abide by his safeguarding obligations of which he was well aware, causing discomfort to Person A and impacting Person A's participation in activities in which she had a particular interest, were significant factors in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate for it to decide to recommend a review period of the order. The panel was mindful that the Advice states

that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances, in any given case, that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 2 years.

The Advice indicates that there are cases involving certain conduct where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period. These cases include 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 his professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons; and any sexual misconduct involving a child. The panel found that Mr Hadley was responsible for breaching his safeguarding obligations and his position of trust to engage in sexually motivated conduct with a child.

The age differential was not significant between Mr Hadley and Person A. However, there was insufficient evidence of insight or remorse to assure the panel that he would not abuse his position of trust in a similar manner again.

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 provision 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 some of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. In this case, the panel has found some of the allegations not proven (including allegations 1.d, 1.e.i and 1.f). I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

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

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

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

- treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
- having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions

Teachers must have 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 Hadley involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE) in that he failed to have due regard to the requirement that everyone who comes into contact with children and their families has a role in safeguarding children.

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include findings of abusing a position of trust and sexually motivated conduct towards a child.

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 likely to 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 Hadley, 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. Although the allegations found proven against Mr Hadley took place outside an education setting, the panel has noted that "his conduct affected the way the person fulfilled his teaching role as Mr Hadley abused his position of trust and disregarded his safeguarding obligations to a child." The panel has also observed, "There is a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of sexually motivated conduct towards a child." 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 representations in response to the allegations against him, Mr Hadley conceded that he had put himself in a vulnerable position and opened himself up to allegations and he stated that he humbly apologised for this. He stated that he fully accepted that his support during this time could have been misconstrued and he attributed this to his naivety in his dropping his professional guard in his personal life, rather than through any ill intent. However, Mr Hadley has not indicated that he has any appreciation of his actions upon Person A. To the contrary, he has sought to discredit Person A and suggested that he had opened himself up to an infatuation situation, seeking to shift the blame squarely onto Person A. Although he provided written representations for this hearing, he did not attend the hearing in order that the level of his insight could be properly explored.”

“In the text message to Person G, Mr Hadley accepted he had made a lapse of judgment and made a silly immature mistake. In the same text message he sought to apologise for what he referred to as “silly daft mistakes”. This sought to minimise the significance of his actions. The panel did not consider that it was sufficient to demonstrate remorse.”

In my judgement, the lack of full insight and 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 has observed that “public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Hadley were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.” I am particularly mindful of the findings of exploiting a position of trust and sexually motivated conduct towards a child in this case and the impact that such findings 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 unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, 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 Hadley himself. The panel has noted that “Mr Hadley did have a previously good history, but there was no evidence that he demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both his personal and professional conduct or of having contributed significantly to the education sector.” The panel also considered two references that Gresham’s Preparatory School obtained on Mr Hadley

prior to his appointment, and the panel noted that these were positive and confirmed his suitability for the position for which had applied. The panel also noted a reference from two [REDACTED] of Norfolk Scouts who attested positively to Mr Hadley's attitude to safeguarding, but the panel was guarded about placing significant weight upon these because the conduct found proven involved breaches of safeguarding obligations.

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Hadley from teaching if he were to decide to return to the profession. A prohibition order would also clearly deprive the public of his contribution to the profession for the period that it is in force.

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel's comments concerning the lack of insight or remorse. The panel has said, "there was insufficient evidence of insight or remorse to assure the panel that he would not abuse his position of trust in a similar manner again."

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that "the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Hadley 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." In recommending a prohibition as proportionate and appropriate the panel has also noted that "His failure to abide by his safeguarding obligations of which he was well aware, causing discomfort to Person A and impacting Person A's participation in activities in which she had a particular interest, were significant factors in forming that opinion."

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Hadley 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 and remorse, 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 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 his professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons; and any sexual misconduct involving a child. The panel found that Mr Hadley was

responsible for breaching his safeguarding obligations and his position of trust to engage in sexually motivated conduct with a child.”

I have considered whether 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 serious nature of the sexually motivated conduct found proven, the abuse of a position of trust, the breach of safeguarding obligations and the lack of full insight and 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 Thomas Hadley 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 Hadley 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 Hadley 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', with a large, sweeping flourish at the end.

Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 27 November 2023