



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr William Gee: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

May 2025

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	12
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	16

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

Teacher: Mr William Thomas Gee

Teacher ref number: 1580068

Teacher date of birth: 19 February 1993

TRA reference: 22938

Date of determination: 2 May 2025

Former employer: St Benedict's Catholic High School, Warwickshire

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ("the panel") of the Teaching Regulation Agency ("the TRA") convened on 1 May 2025 and 2 May 2025 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr William Gee.

The panel members were Mrs Shabana Robertson, (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Diana Barry (teacher panellist) and Mr Stephen Chappell (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Jonathan White of Blake Morgan LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Miss Cher Lyne Peh of Browne Jacobson solicitors.

Mr Gee was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public save that portions of the hearing were heard in private and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 22 January 2025.

It was alleged that Mr Gee was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that whilst employed as the Head of Music and Assistant Headteacher at St Benedict's Catholic High School:

1. He made and/or accessed and/or stored one or more indecent images of children;
2. He accepted a police caution from West Mercia Police on or around 14 December 2023 for making photographs or pseudo-photographs of children on 28 October 2022.
3. He failed to take appropriate action and/or ensure appropriate action was taken with respect to a safeguarding disclosure concerning one or more images or videos which were sent to him on or around 28 October 2022, in that he;
 - a. Did not contact the Police to disclose that he had been sent images and/or videos, which he had reason to believe contained content of a sexual nature in the presence of someone under the age of 16;
4. His conduct as may be found proven at Allegation 1 was conduct of a sexual nature and/or was sexually motivated.

Mr Gee admitted the facts of Allegations 1 to 4.

Mr Gee also admitted that his conduct, as admitted, constituted unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Notice of referral, response and notice of hearing (incorrectly described as a meeting in the document index) – pages 5 to 40

Section 2: Statement of agreed facts – pages 42 to 46

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 48 to 151

Section 4: Teacher documents – pages 153 to 164

In addition, the panel had also received a bundle relating to the preliminary applications (“the applications bundle”). The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundles in advance of the hearing.

In the consideration of this case, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession 2020, (the “Procedures”).

Witnesses

The panel heard oral evidence from the following witnesses called by the presenting officer:

Witness A: [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.

Mr Gee was employed as Head of Music at St Benedict’s Catholic High School (“the school”) between 1 January 2020 and 5 December 2023. He also held the role of Assistant Headteacher.

In October 2022 Mr Gee had begun communicating with an individual, Individual A, on a chat application. This communication then moved to WhatsApp. During these communications, Individual A sent Mr Gee numerous images. One of these images, sent on or around 28 October 2022, consisted of a video in which Individual A had filmed himself masturbating in the presence of Individual A’s [REDACTED]. The video showed [REDACTED] was 15 years old.

[REDACTED]

Mr Gee accessed and viewed this video.

On or around 2 October 2023, Mr Gee was arrested by West Mercia Police (“the police”) on suspicion of having accessed and/or stored indecent images of children. On 14 December 2023 Mr Gee accepted a police caution for “making indecent photograph or pseudo photograph of children” on 28 October 2022, contrary to section 1(a) of the Protection of Children Act 1978. Mr Gee was also placed on the Sex Offenders Register for a period of two years from 14 December 2023.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

Whilst employed as the Head of Music and Assistant Headteacher at St Benedict's Catholic High School:

1. You made and/or accessed and/or stored one or more indecent images of children;

As a preliminary point, the panel considered the scope of allegation 1. The statement of agreed facts described the video that was sent to Mr Gee on 28 October 2022. This was the image that had resulted in the caution being given to Mr Gee on 14 December 2023. The statement of agreed facts made no reference to any other matter.

In the presenting officer's opening of the case and in the evidence of Witness A, reference was made to a communication that occurred at [REDACTED] in [REDACTED] in January 2023 and to a further image of Individual A's [REDACTED] in his underwear that had been sent to Mr Gee. The presenting officer submitted that the panel could consider these matters and form its own independent conclusion about them. She submitted that they were also relevant to allegation 4 and the question of sexual motivation.

The panel noted that the statement of agreed facts exclusively referred to the video sent to Mr Gee on 28 October 2022. The response to the allegations from Mr Gee related to that video and did not address the [REDACTED] incident or the additional image. The panel concluded that it was reasonable to infer that the reason Mr Gee had not addressed those points may have been because he did not consider them to form part of the allegations in the notice of proceedings. The panel acknowledged that both of these matters were referred to in the bundle and that this bundle had been sent to Mr Gee's trade union representative. No objection had been taken to its contents.

However, the panel was not satisfied that the allegations relating to the [REDACTED] or the additional image formed part of the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings. The statement of agreed facts made no reference to those matters. Accordingly, the panel disregarded reference to those additional matters. They had not been formally tested or responded to in the proceedings and accordingly the panel paid no heed to those matters when determining allegation 1 and, in due course, allegation 4.

The panel therefore proceeded to consider allegation 1 in regard to the video of 28 October 2022, as set out in the statement of agreed facts.

Individual A had been the police officer that dealt with Mr Gee during and following his arrest in October 2023. Individual A's description of the video was consistent with that set out in the statement of agreed facts. Individual A told the panel that the video had not been deleted and was therefore accessible on Mr Gee's device when it was analysed by police. It was stored on the device as a thumbnail. Individual A could not say whether the video would have been automatically saved on receipt as that would have depended on the device settings and the settings on the application used to send the image.

Individual A referred to the Crown Prosecution Service guidance on the term "to make" in this context and explained that it meant downloading an image onto a device. It did not necessarily mean the creation of the actual image. Individual A told the panel that the video on Mr Gee's device had been categorised as a 'category B' image, which meant that it showed a child engaged in non-penetrative sexual activity. Individual A told the panel that he had verified Individual A's [REDACTED] age as being 15.

Individual A confirmed that Mr Gee's devices had been analysed and there was no evidence of Mr Gee searching for any other indecent material.

The panel noted that Mr Gee had accepted a police caution in respect of this matter on 14 December 2023. This established that Mr Gee had made a clear admission of guilt in respect of that offence. While the panel accepted that this was not conclusive of the relevant facts in the same way as a conviction, the panel attached significant weight to this evidence.

The panel had sight of the notice of referral response form dated 27 August 2024 and the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Gee on 5 September 2024. In the statement of agreed facts, Mr Gee admitted that he "accessed and viewed" this video. In addition, on 28 October 2024, Mr Gee's trade union representative confirmed in an email to Browne Jacobson that Mr Gee accepted making the image, having regard to the legal definition of that term.

Mr Gee repeated this admission in his written statement dated 1 April 2025.

The panel was satisfied that Mr Gee's admission was unequivocal and consistent with the other evidence placed before it.

The panel found allegation 1 proved on the balance of probabilities.

2. You accepted a police caution from West Mercia Police on or around 14 December 2023 for making photographs or pseudo-photographs of children on 28 October 2022.

The panel had sight of the notice of referral response form and the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Gee. In the statement of agreed facts, Mr Gee admitted that he

accepted a police caution as set out in the wording of allegation 2. Mr Gee repeated this admission in his written statement dated 1 April 2025.

Individual A had confirmed that the caution was given to Mr Gee in the terms described and the panel had also had sight of the print-out from the police national computer which confirmed the date of the caution, the offence to which it related and the date of the offence.

The panel was satisfied that Mr Gee's admission was unequivocal and consistent with the other evidence placed before it.

The panel found allegation 2 proved on the balance of probabilities.

3. You failed to take appropriate action and/or ensure appropriate action was taken with respect to a safeguarding disclosure concerning one or more images or videos which were sent to him on or around 28 October 2022, in that you;

- a. Did not contact the Police to disclose that you had been sent images and/or videos, which you had reason to believe contained content of a sexual nature in the presence of someone under the age of 16.**

The panel had sight of the notice of referral response form and the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Gee. Mr Gee repeated this admission in his written statement dated 1 April 2025. In that statement he said:

"After sending me the unsolicited indecent image I failed to report this incident to the police. I regret this immensely, and on reflection, believe this to be because I was scared that any action would jeopardise the interest this individual had shown me – I understand now how flawed and foolish this way of thinking was."

Individual A told the panel that he had conducted a search of police systems and had found no record of Mr Gee disclosing concerns as to anything he had received.

The panel was satisfied that Mr Gee's admission was unequivocal and consistent with the other evidence placed before it.

The panel found allegation 3 proved on the balance of probabilities.

4. Your conduct as may be found proven at Allegation 1 was conduct of a sexual nature and/or was sexually motivated.

The panel had sight of the notice of referral response form in which Mr Gee answered 'yes' to the question as to whether he admitted his conduct was sexual in nature and/or was sexually motivated. In the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Gee it was stated:

“...Mr Gee does not dispute that he engaged in activity, which was patently and plainly of a sexual nature, namely viewing a video containing footage of a sexual act. Mr Gee therefore accepts that he was sexually motivated when he engaged in this conduct.”

In his statement of 1 April 2025 Mr Gee wrote:

“The conversation then progressed to the social media app ‘WhatsApp’ as I believed I was forming a genuine connection with this person, who I thought was romantically interested in me. He sent me this unsolicited image, and I made it clear to him that I was not interested in that. In a fragile, isolated state of mind, I continued talking to this individual, ashamedly desperate not to cause him to lose interest in me. After sending me the unsolicited indecent image I failed to report this incident to the police.”

The representations made on behalf of Mr Gee submitted as follows:

“With regards to the allegation around sexual motivation, we wish to make it clear that Mr Gee experienced no sexual gratification from the image. He does not have feelings of a sexual nature towards children. He had no deliberate intention, at any point, to access indecent material. His intentions in interacting with the individual who sent the image were to gain that person’s affection; ‘Individual A’, an adult. Whilst we acknowledge that this was misguided, it was a direct result of the self-esteem issues suffered by Mr Gee at the time; issues he has since made considerable steps to address.”

The panel firstly considered whether the conduct was of a sexual nature. The term sexual is defined in section 78 (a) and (b) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003 as follows:

“...penetration, touching or any other activity is sexual if a reasonable person would consider that—

(a) whatever its circumstances or any person’s purpose in relation to it, it is because of its nature sexual, or

(b) because of its nature it may be sexual and because of its circumstances or the purpose of any person in relation to it (or both) it is sexual.”

The conduct in the video sent to Mr Gee on 28 October 2022 involved touching and masturbation. The panel was satisfied that this was, because of its nature, sexual. The panel was satisfied that in respect of the conduct being of a sexual nature, Mr Gee’s admission was unequivocal and consistent with the other evidence before it.

The panel moved on to consider if the conduct was sexually motivated. The panel considered whether Mr Gee had engaged in the conduct in pursuit of sexual gratification and/or in pursuit of a future sexual relationship.

The panel noted that this was a single video sent to Mr Gee by Individual A in circumstances where Mr Gee wished to engage in a relationship with Individual A. The

panel considered that the primary and overriding motivation for Mr Gee's conduct was that he was seeking to pursue a relationship with Individual A, rather than Mr Gee receiving sexual gratification from the image of Individual A's [REDACTED]. The panel had regard to the evidence of Witness A, who confirmed that there had been no searches by Mr Gee for any other indecent material. The image had been sent to Mr Gee unsolicited and that was consistent with Mr Gee's explanation in his statement.

The panel did not consider Mr Gee's admission in respect of sexual motivation to be unequivocal. Having considered the evidence in the matter, the panel was satisfied on the balance of probabilities that Mr Gee's conduct was sexually motivated to the extent that it was in pursuit of a future sexual relationship with Individual A, rather than Individual A's [REDACTED].

The panel found allegation 4 proved on the balance of probabilities, on the basis that the conduct in allegation 1 was conduct of a sexual in nature and was sexually motivated.

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

Having found all of the allegations 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".

Unacceptable professional conduct

The panel first considered whether the conduct of Mr Gee, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards, noting that there was no evidence before the panel that Mr Gee's conduct took place in the school setting.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Gee was in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel also considered whether Mr Gee's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

The panel found that the offence of possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or pseudo photograph or image of a child, or permitting any such activity, including one-off incidents, was relevant. In this case, Mr Gee had accepted a caution for an offence involving these behaviours. The panel considered that his acceptance of this caution was an admission of behaviours that would amount to unacceptable professional conduct. The panel further noted that Mr Gee had admitted that his conduct amounted to unacceptable conduct.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Gee amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

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

Disrepute

In relation to whether Mr Gee's actions amounted to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, the panel took into account the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. It 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 again considered whether Mr Gee's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice. As set out above in the panel's findings as to whether Mr Gee was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found that the offence of possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or pseudo photograph or image of a child, or permitting any such activity, including one-off incidents was relevant.

In this case, Mr Gee had accepted a caution for an offence involving these behaviours. The panel considered that this was an admission of behaviours that would amount to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel further noted that Mr Gee had admitted that his conduct may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel noted that there was no evidence before it that Mr Gee's conduct took place in the school setting. However, the findings of misconduct were serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on Mr Gee's status as a teacher. The panel further considered that Mr Gee's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher. The offence for which Mr Gee had been cautioned was serious and involved an indecent video of a child, resulting in him being placed on the Sex Offenders Register for two years.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Gee's conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

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

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

- the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public;
- the maintenance of public confidence in the profession – assessed by reference to the standards of the ordinary intelligent and well-informed citizen who both appreciates the seriousness of the proposed sanction and recognises the high standards expected of all teachers, as well as other issues involved in the case;
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct within the teaching profession.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Gee, which involved and related to his making, accessing and storing an indecent image of a child, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils. Mr Gee had held a senior role in the school, which had carried with it significant safeguarding responsibilities. Mr Gee would have received safeguarding training and, given his senior role, was likely to have delivered such training. Those responsibilities extended beyond the school setting and required Mr Gee to have reported the video to Police as soon as he received it from Individual A. Instead, he had retained it on his device for almost a year until his arrest. This raised serious concerns about Mr Gee's understanding and performance of his safeguarding obligations.

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

In addition to the public interest considerations set out above, the panel went on to consider whether there was a public interest in retaining Mr Gee in the profession. The panel recognised that Mr Gee had been teaching since 2016 without any concerns. However, while the panel had no evidence to question Mr Gee's ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Gee in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.

In view of 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 Gee.

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 were relevant in this case were:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a caution, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of the Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures;
- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing, or publishing any indecent photograph or image, or indecent pseudo photograph or image, of a child, or permitting such activity, including one-off incidents;
- failure to act on evidence that indicated a child's welfare may have been at risk, in this case failure to notify the Police when abuse was identified.

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

There was no evidence that Mr Gee's actions were not deliberate. Although he had not asked for the video to be sent to him, his actions in retaining the video and not reporting it to the Police, were deliberate. There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Gee was acting under duress.

Although there had been no previous concerns about Mr Gee, he had not presented evidence to demonstrate exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional

conduct or having contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel noted that Mr Gee had not provided any references from colleagues, or anyone else, who would attest to his abilities as a teacher.

The panel took account of the mitigation advanced by Mr Gee and his trade union representative dated 1 April 2025. In that letter, Mr Gee wrote:

"I have been a qualified teacher since September 2016, and my career spanned two schools over the seven years I was employed in the education sector – one in inner city Birmingham, and the other a suburban school in Warwickshire. At both schools, I led the subject department, and at my most recent school, I also held pastoral and then senior leadership roles. My record prior to this incident is without blemish – I have contributed to positive outcomes for students both in public examinations and in statutory inspection. In my most recent role, I entirely overhauled the personal development curriculum and coauthored the behaviour and reward policy to tie in with the school's values. In 2022, I was nominated for the 'Unsung Hero' award by a parent as part of the Pearson National Teaching Awards."

Mr Gee continued:

"Since the incident, I have been summarily dismissed from both of my jobs (school on Tuesday 5th December 2023 and cathedral on Friday 9th February 2024). In the immediate time after my arrest in October 2023, I accessed some of the self-help resources from 'Stop It Now'. Having completed several of these modules, supported by [REDACTED], I realised that this is not the person I am – I do not have sexual feelings towards children. [REDACTED]. I have become more open and honest in my relationships with family and friends, and no longer use any social media or dating apps.

My handling of this incident is, by far, the biggest regret of my life to date. I regret being stupid enough to not treat this with the severity it deserves. I regret not speaking up on behalf of people who were unable to speak up for themselves. If any incident of a similar nature were to happen in future, I would report it directly to the relevant authority (police, social services etc) and be confident enough to speak up when something is wrong, and someone is being exploited. I understand the harm that my failure to report this has caused to the individuals concerned and I apologise wholeheartedly for this. I hope that I can be given a chance to re-engage with the teaching profession and continue to make a difference in the lives of young people. I believe that I still have a lot to contribute and through my wider life experiences, I am even more motivated to ensure young people are protected from harm and have the best chance possible."

The panel noted that Mr Gee had not provided any independent evidence of the steps he had taken to address the issues that he submitted lay behind his conduct. The panel further noted that in the representations submitted on his behalf by his trade union representative, it was noted that Mr Gee remained unable to speak openly about the

circumstances leading up to these matters. The panel was concerned that if Mr Gee was unable to discuss the matters openly then the progress he claimed to have made may be limited.

The panel noted that while Mr Gee had apologised and had referred to his failure to speak up for those who could not do so for themselves, much of his mitigation appeared to address the impact on him, rather than Individual A's [REDACTED]. The panel was therefore concerned that Mr Gee's insight was incomplete.

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 Gee.

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 Gee. The seriousness of the offence for which he received a caution and the complete failure of Mr Gee to discharge his safeguarding duties was a significant factor in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate 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 certain types of case where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period.

These include:

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

As described above, the panel considered the conduct proved was of a serious nature and Mr Gee's insight into that conduct was not complete. Mr Gee had not provided detail or evidence of the steps he had taken to address the underlying issues.

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

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

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

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

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

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have 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 Gee fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding which involved making, accessing and storing an indecent image of 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 or 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 Gee, 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/safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, “In the light of the panel’s findings against Mr Gee, which involved and related to his making, accessing and storing an indecent image of a child, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils. Mr Gee had held a senior role in the school, which had carried with it significant safeguarding responsibilities. Mr Gee would have received safeguarding training and, given his senior role, was likely to have delivered such training. Those responsibilities extended beyond the school setting and required Mr Gee to have reported the video to Police as soon as he received it from Individual A. Instead, he had retained it on his device for almost a year until his arrest. This raised serious concerns about Mr Gee’s understanding and performance of his safeguarding obligations.” A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel’s comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, “The panel noted that while Mr Gee had apologised and had referred to his failure to speak up for those who could not do so for themselves, much of his mitigation appeared to address the impact on him, rather than Individual A’s [REDACTED]. The panel was therefore concerned that Mr Gee’s insight was incomplete.” In my judgement, the lack of full insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, “The panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Gee was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of accessing and storing an indecent image of 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 unacceptable professional conduct or 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 Mr Gee himself and the panel comment “Although there had been no previous concerns about Mr Gee, he had not presented evidence to demonstrate exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or having contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel noted that Mr Gee had not provided any references from colleagues, or anyone else, who would attest to his abilities as a teacher.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Gee 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 “The panel noted that Mr Gee had not provided any independent evidence of the steps he had taken to address the issues that he submitted lay behind his conduct. The panel further noted that in the representations submitted on his behalf by his trade union representative, it was noted that Mr Gee remained unable to speak openly about the circumstances leading up to these matters. The panel was concerned that if Mr Gee was unable to discuss the matters openly then the progress he claimed to have made may be limited.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that “The panel noted that there was no evidence before it that Mr Gee's conduct took place in the school setting. However, the findings of misconduct were serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on Mr Gee's status as a teacher. The panel further considered that Mr Gee's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher. The offence for which Mr Gee had been cautioned was serious and involved an indecent video of a child, resulting in him being placed on the Sex Offenders Register for two years.”

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

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended that no provision should be made for a review period.

I have considered the panel's comments "the panel considered the conduct proved was of a serious nature and Mr Gee's insight into that conduct was not complete. Mr Gee had not provided detail or evidence of the steps he had taken to address the underlying issues." The panel has also said "The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate."

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 seriousness of the findings and the lack of full insight.

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 William Gee 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 Gee 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 Gee has a right of appeal to the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this order.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S Buxcey', with a horizontal line underneath.

Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey

Date: 9 May 2025

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