



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Daniel Stevenson: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome**

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

**June 2024**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	4
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	8
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	12

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

**Teacher:** Mr Daniel Stevenson  
**Teacher ref number:** 0038170  
**Teacher date of birth:** 11 December 1968  
**TRA reference:** 20376  
**Date of determination:** 25 June 2024  
**Former employer:** Derby Moor Academy, Derby

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened virtually on 25 June 2024, to consider the case of Mr Daniel Stevenson.

The panel members were Mr Terry Hyde (former teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Jayne Bamford (lay panellist) and Miss Victoria Miller (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Rachel Phillips of Blake Morgan LLP.

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 Stevenson that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Stevenson 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, or Mr Stevenson.

The meeting took place in private.

## **Allegations**

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 14 June 2024.

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

He had been convicted at any time, of the following relevant offence:

1. On 09 August 2021, he was convicted of intentionally attempting to engage in sexual communication with a child for the purpose of obtaining sexual gratification between 15 October 2020 and 31 October 2020, contrary to section 1 (1) of the Criminal Attempts Act 1981 and Section 15A (1) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003.

Mr Stevenson admitted the facts of the allegations and that the offence amounted to a conviction for a relevant offence.

## **Preliminary applications**

There were no preliminary applications.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section 1: Chronology and List of Key People – pages 3 to 4.

Section 2: Notice of Referral, Response and Notice of Meeting – pages 5 to 19.

Section 3: Statement of Agreed Facts and Presenting Officer Representations – pages 20 to 24.

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 25 to 126.

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 Stevenson on 28 May 2024.

## 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 Stevenson 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.

The panel proceeded to consider the case carefully, having read all of the documents, and reached a decision. It accepted the legal advice provided.

Mr Stevenson was previously employed as an English teacher at Derby Moor Academy ("the School"). He commenced employment at the School on 1 September 2016.

On 31 October 2020, Mr Stevenson was arrested and interviewed by the police on suspicion of engaging in sexual communication with, whom he believed to be, a 14-year-old child between 15 October 2020 and 31 October 2020.

On 30 March 2021, he was dismissed from employment with the School.

On 12 July 2021, Mr Stevenson was charged with the offence of attempting to engage in sexual communication with a child. On 09 August 2021, Mr Stevenson entered a guilty plea, and was convicted at South Derbyshire Magistrates Court.

On 13 October 2021, he was sentenced in Derby Crown Court.

## Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

**You have been convicted at any time, of the following relevant offences:**

- 1. On 09 August 2021, you were convicted of intentionally attempting to engage in sexual communication with a child for the purpose of obtaining sexual gratification between 15 October 2020 and 31 October 2020, contrary to section 1 (1) of the Criminal Attempts Act 1981 and Section 15A (1) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003.**

The panel was presented with a statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Stevenson, in which this allegation was admitted.

The panel was also presented with a certificate of conviction from Derby Crown Court, confirming that Mr Stevenson was convicted, on 09 August 2021, of the offence particularised in allegation 1.

Mr Stevenson was sentenced to:

- a. 8 months imprisonment, suspended for 21 months;
- b. 30 days of Rehabilitation Activity;
- c. 240 hours of unpaid work;
- d. £156 victim surcharge; and
- e. Ancillary order: forfeiture and destruction of mobile phone seized by the police.

The panel was presented with the sentencing remarks of the presiding judge sitting at Court on 13 October 2021, summarising the offence and the reasons for the sentence imposed.

The panel accepted the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of the commission of these offence by Mr Stevenson.

In light of this and Mr Stevenson's admission, the panel found the allegation proven.

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

Having found the allegation proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of the proved allegation amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

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 Stevenson in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, he 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
- not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

In addition, the panel noted that, pursuant to the Advice it is likely that:

- A conviction for any offence that led to a term of imprisonment, including any suspended sentence will be considered “a relevant offence”.
- A conviction for any offence that relates to, or involves, sexual communication with a child will be considered “a relevant offence”.

The panel noted that the allegation took place outside the education setting. However, as the conduct directly related to Mr Stevenson’s sexually motivated communication with a child, the panel was satisfied that Mr Stevenson's conduct still impacted on the way he fulfilled his teaching role.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Stevenson's behaviour in committing this offence would undoubtedly affect public confidence in the teaching profession, particularly given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. His conduct ran counter to what should be at the very core of the practice of a teacher with a duty of care towards children.

Mr Stevenson's behaviour ultimately led to a suspended term of imprisonment, which demonstrated the public and child protection issues raised by his actions together with the other aspects of the sentence imposed.

The panel did not consider there to be any relevant mitigating circumstances in relation to the commission of the offence.

For all these reasons, the panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was directly relevant to Mr Stevenson's ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding that this conviction was for relevant offences

as 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 should be made, the panel had to consider whether it would be an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it would be in the public interest to do so. Prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely:

- The safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and protection of other members of the public;
- the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In the light of the nature of the offence for which Mr Stevenson was convicted and having regard to the specific context, with particular reference to the sentencing remarks, there was an extremely strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and protection of other members of the public. Mr Stevenson's actions raised obvious and significant public and child protection concerns.

The panel considered that public confidence in the profession would be significantly undermined if conduct such as that found against Mr Stevenson was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the profession. This was conduct that was, very clearly, at the most serious end of the spectrum, amounting to an egregious breach of the trust placed in him as a teacher.

For the same reasons, the panel decided that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present.

Whilst no doubt had been cast upon Mr Stevenson's abilities as an educator, given the nature of the allegations in this case and in the absence of any evidence that he ought to be regarded as an exceptional practitioner, the panel concluded there was not a strong public interest consideration in retaining him in the profession.



Notwithstanding the clear public interest considerations that were present, the panel considered carefully whether or not it would be proportionate to impose a prohibition order, taking into account the effect that this would have on Mr Stevenson.

In carrying out the balancing exercise, the panel had regard to the public interest considerations both in favour of, and against, prohibition as well as the interests of Mr Stevenson. The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours of a teacher have been proved.

In the list of such behaviours, those that are relevant in this case are:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of the Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- sexual misconduct, e.g. 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; and
- actions or behaviours that... undermine fundamental British values of democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty, and mutual respect and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs.

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

The panel considered that the following mitigating factors are present in this case:

- Mr Stevenson made full admissions to the allegation against him.
- Mr Stevenson pleaded guilty in the criminal proceedings.
- Mr Stevenson is noted to have engaged with a number of agencies in relation to his rehabilitation.

Weighed against this, the aggravating features in this case included that:

- Mr Stevenson's actions were pre-meditated and deliberate.

- Mr Stevenson's actions amounted to a clear breach of the Teachers' Standards and raised serious public and child protection concerns.
- Mr Stevenson has been convicted of and sentenced for a very serious offence involving a child, for which he received a custodial sentence.
- Mr Stevenson was in a position of trust and responsibility. He was also a role model. He had fallen very far short of the standards expected of him in that regard.

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

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

Mr Stevenson's actions were fundamentally incompatible with his being a teacher. This was conduct of the most serious nature. The nature and gravity of the offence was a matter of significant concern. Accordingly, there were particularly strong public interest considerations in this case in terms of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and protecting the public, public confidence in the teaching profession and the declaring of proper standards of conduct in this case.

Mr Stevenson's behaviour led to him receiving a suspended sentence, which is indicative of the seriousness of the offence. The panel noted, in particular, the following remarks of the sentencing judge:

- *"You pleaded guilty, effectively having been caught out by these people that go around and try and catch out people like yourself who, for whatever reasons, want to communicate with somebody who is underage, in this particular case 14 years of age. You are 52. You have never been in trouble before and everybody who speaks of you – and I have a number of references – speaks incredibly highly of you and I am sure, as they have said, are completely shocked that you would engage in this kind of behaviour."*
- *"In my view, culpability in this case is high and the potential for harm is high and, in those circumstances, I would have put you, had there been categories, in the highest of categories."*

The panel was therefore of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Stevenson, and any mitigating factors identified.

Additionally, when balancing the aggravating and mitigating circumstances present in this case, its overall seriousness called for a higher regulatory sanction to protect the wider public interest factors.

Accordingly, it made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate to recommend that a review period of the order should be considered.

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

The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period.

These behaviours 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 their professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons; and
- any sexual misconduct involving a child.

The panel considered both of these behaviours to be directly applicable in this case.

The panel found that Mr Stevenson was responsible for a series of failings in relation to his conduct. These failings included serious sexual misconduct with an individual, who he believed to be a child, and who he exploited for his own sexual gratification.

Accordingly, 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 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 Daniel Stevenson should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Stevenson 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
- not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs
- 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 Stevenson fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of a conviction for intentionally attempting to engage in sexual communication with a child for the purpose of obtaining sexual gratification.

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 Stevenson, 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 has observed that “the allegation took place outside the education setting. However, as the conduct directly related to Mr Stevenson’s sexually motivated communication with a child, the panel was satisfied that Mr Stevenson’s conduct still impacted on the way he fulfilled his teaching role.” A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

The panel has not commented on Mr Stevenson’s insight or remorse. However, the panel has noted that Mr Stevenson made full admissions to the allegations, pleaded guilty in criminal proceedings, and has engaged with agencies in relation to his rehabilitation.

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 would be significantly undermined if conduct such as that found against Mr Stevenson was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the profession. This was conduct that was, very clearly, at the most serious end of the spectrum, amounting to an egregious breach of the trust placed in him as a teacher.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of sexual communication with a child in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

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

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of 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 Stevenson himself. The panel has commented that no doubt had been cast on Mr Stevenson’s abilities as an

educator but that it had seen no evidence that he should be regarded as an exceptional practitioner.

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Stevenson 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 seriousness of the offence committed by Mr Stevenson which resulted in a suspended prison sentence. The panel has said:

“Mr Stevenson's actions were fundamentally incompatible with his being a teacher. This was conduct of the most serious nature. The nature and gravity of the offence was a matter of significant concern. Accordingly, there were particularly strong public interest considerations in this case in terms of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and protecting the public, public confidence in the teaching profession and the declaring of proper standards of conduct in this case.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Stevenson 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.

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.

The panel has found that the behaviours of “serious sexual misconduct” and “any sexual misconduct involving a child” both apply in this case, and that the Advice indicates that where proven these behaviours militate against allowing a review period. The panel has found that “Mr Stevenson was responsible for a series of failings in relation to his conduct. These failings included serious sexual misconduct with an individual, who he believed to be a child, and who he exploited for his own sexual gratification.”

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, the serious nature of the offence of which Mr Stevenson was convicted means that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the 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 Daniel Stevenson 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 Stevenson 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 Daniel Stevenson 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: 27 June 2024**

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