



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Reece Gordon: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome**

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

**July 2025**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	4
Decision and reasons	4
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	8
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	11

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

<b>Teacher:</b>	Mr Reece Gordon
<b>Teacher ref number:</b>	2057041
<b>Teacher date of birth:</b>	1 May 2002
<b>TRA reference:</b>	24147
<b>Date of determination:</b>	8 July 2025
<b>Former employer:</b>	Dovecot Primary School, Liverpool

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 8 July 2025 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Reece Gordon.

The panel members were Mr Adnan Qureshi (lay panellist – in the chair), Ms Gill Lyon (teacher panellist) and Ms Laura Mullin (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr James Corrish of Birketts LLP Solicitors.

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Reece Gordon that the allegation be considered without a hearing. Mr Gordon provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and conviction of a relevant offence. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer; Mr Jon Walters of Brabners LLP, Mr Gordon or any representative for Mr Gordon.

The meeting took place in private.

## **Allegations**

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 12 February 2025.

It was alleged that Mr Gordon was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence in that he was convicted at Liverpool Crown Court on 9 October 2024 of:

1. Three counts of making an indecent photograph/ pseudo-photograph of a child contrary to Section 1(a) of the Protection of Children Act 1978.
2. Possessing an indecent photograph / pseudo-photograph of a child contrary to Section 160 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988.

Mr Gordon admitted allegations 1 and 2 and the stem of the allegation as set out in the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Gordon on 18 April 2025.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section 1: Statement of agreed facts – pages 2 to 4

Section 2: Notice of hearing – pages 5 to 18

Section 3: TRA documents– pages 19 to 192

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the hearing.

In the consideration of this case, the panel had regard to the Procedures.

### **Statement of agreed facts**

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Gordon on 18 April 2025.

## **Decision and reasons**

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

In advance of the meeting the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Gordon for the allegations to be considered without a hearing. The panel had the ability to direct that the case be considered at a hearing if required in the interests of justice or in the public interest. The panel did not determine that such a direction was necessary or appropriate in this case.

Mr Gordon was working as a teaching assistant between September 2023 and 29 February 2024 at Dovecot Primary School ('the School'). Mr Gordon carried out teaching work during this time.

The police received information on 28 July 2023 that a Dropbox account which was associated with Mr Gordon's email address, had accessed indecent images of children on the internet. The IP address used to access the indecent images was registered to Mr Gordon's [REDACTED]'s address.

The police obtained results of the interrogation of Mr Gordon's electronic devices and found indecent images. Mr Gordon was charged with 3 counts of making an indecent photograph/ pseudo-photograph of a child contrary to Section 1(a) of the Protection of Children Act 1978 and 1 count of Possessing an indecent photograph / pseudo-photograph of a child contrary to Section 160 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988. He was convicted on 9 October 2024.

Mr Gordon was sentenced on 6 November 2024 to 10 months' imprisonment, suspended for 2 years, a rehabilitation activity requirement of 60 days and an unpaid work requirement of 100 hours. He was also made subject of a sexual harm prevention order for 10 years and notification requirements for 10 years.

The matter was referred to the TRA on 8 May 2024.

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

**You are guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that you were convicted at Liverpool Crown Court on 9 October 2024 of:**

- 1. Three counts of making an indecent photograph/ pseudo-photograph of a child contrary to Section 1(a) of the Protection of Children Act 1978.**
- 2. Possessing an indecent photograph / pseudo-photograph of a child contrary to Section 160 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988.**

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Gordon on 18 April 2025. In that statement of agreed facts, Mr Gordon admitted allegations 1 and 2 and further admitted that the facts of the allegations amounted to conviction of a relevant offence. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the facts available to it.

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

The panel had been provided with a copy of the certificate of conviction from Liverpool Crown Court, dated 2 December 2024, which detailed that Mr Gordon had been convicted of 3 counts of making an indecent photograph/ pseudo-photograph of a child contrary to Section 1(a) of the Protection of Children Act 1978 and 1 count of Possessing an indecent photograph / pseudo-photograph of a child contrary to Section 160 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988. The panel noted that Mr Gordon pleaded guilty to the offences.

In respect of the offences, Mr Gordon was sentenced on 6 November 2024 to 10 months' imprisonment, suspended for 2 years, a rehabilitation activity requirement of 60 days and an unpaid work requirement of 100 hours. He was also made subject of a sexual harm prevention order for 10 years and notification requirements for 10 years.

The panel found allegations 1 and 2 proven.

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

Having found the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to 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 first considered whether the conduct of Mr Gordon, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Gordon 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 an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel noted that Mr Gordon's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting. The panel formed this view as these were criminal convictions for creating and possessing indecent images of children and it was clear that these convictions demonstrated behaviours which constituted serious and ongoing safeguarding concerns and serious risks for any children.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety and/or security of pupils and/or members of the public.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Gordon's behaviour in committing the offence would affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community.

The panel noted that Mr Gordon's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment (albeit that it was suspended) which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed and the panel noted that any such offence was likely to constitute a "relevant offence".

The panel also considered the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

This case concerned an offence involving viewing, taking, making, 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, which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel's view was that the offences for which Mr Gordon had been convicted were serious and represented a serious departure from professional standards. The offences were criminal acts involving accessing and making inappropriate images of children over a prolonged period of time. The panel's view was that the nature of these offences was of the utmost gravity.

Whilst the panel noted Mr Gordon's assertion of difficult personal circumstances and that he had pleaded guilty to the offences, the panel found no material evidence of mitigation.

The panel further noted that in the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Gordon, he admitted the facts amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

Notwithstanding Mr Gordon's admission, the panel, having considered all the evidence before it, found that Mr Gordon had been convicted of a relevant offence.

## **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, the protection of other members of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and the interest in declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Gordon, which involved a conviction for a large string of instances over a prolonged period of time relating to the making of and possessing of indecent images of children (including, without limitation, 268 'category A' indecent photographs) there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Gordon 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 Gordon 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 Gordon in the profession.

The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Gordon in the profession, including that his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.

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. It is clear that Mr Gordon was in serious breach of those standards.

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 Gordon.

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 found by the panel to be relevant in this case were:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of the Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- 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;
- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour;

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 Gordon's actions were not deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Gordon was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation.

There was no evidence that Mr Gordon demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or had contributed significantly to the education sector.

There was no evidence that the incident was out of character and the panel indeed noted that the actions in respect of which Mr Gordon was convicted had taken place over a number of years.

The panel found no evidence of insight or remorse on the part of Mr Gordon.

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 prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Gordon. The safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the nature of the serious and relevant convictions concerning making and possessing of indecent photographs of children which the panel had found (and Mr Gordon had accepted he had been convicted of) as well as and the clear need for protection of other members of the public and a desire to maintain public confidence in the profession were all 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 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 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;

which activity was clearly demonstrated conclusively on the face of the convictions.

The Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate.

None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel's findings.

The panel found no evidence that Mr Gordon had shown insight into his actions or remorse or any awareness of the impact his actions may have had upon children. The panel noted the long duration of the period to which the convictions related and considered there was every risk that the offences which were the subject of the conviction would be repeated, including in circumstances where Mr Gordon was permitted to continue to work as a teacher. The panel saw no evidence which would lead them to conclude that this risk would reduce over time or had, in any way, reduced at the time of the hearing.

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

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

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

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

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

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Gordon 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 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 Gordon fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they involved a conviction for making and possessing indecent images of children.

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 Gordon, 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 light of the panel's findings against Mr Gordon, which involved a conviction for a large string of instances over a prolonged period of time relating to the making of and possessing of indecent images of children (including, without limitation, 268 'category A' indecent photographs) there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public." 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 found no evidence of insight or remorse on the part of Mr Gordon." In my judgement, the lack of insight or remorse means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, "The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Gordon's behaviour in committing the offence would affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community." I am particularly mindful of the finding of a conviction involving indecent images of children 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 Gordon himself and the panel comment “There was no evidence that Mr Gordon demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or had contributed significantly to the education sector.”

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments concerning the lack of insight or remorse. The panel has said, “The panel found no evidence that Mr Gordon had shown insight into his actions or remorse or any awareness of the impact his actions may have had upon children.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that “There was no evidence that the incident was out of character and the panel indeed noted that the actions in respect of which Mr Gordon was convicted had taken place over a number of years.”

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

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

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

I have considered the panel’s comments “The panel noted the long duration of the period to which the convictions related and considered there was every risk that the offences which were the subject of the conviction would be repeated, including in circumstances

where Mr Gordon was permitted to continue to work as a teacher. The panel saw no evidence which would lead them to conclude that this risk would reduce over time or had, in any way, reduced at the time of the hearing.”

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 lack of either insight or remorse, and the risk of repetition.

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 Reece Gordon 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 Gordon 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 Gordon 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 'SABuxcey', with a horizontal line underneath.

**Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey**

**Date: 10 July 2025**

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