



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Christopher Arnold: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

August 2025

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Witnesses	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	12

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

Teacher: Mr Christopher Arnold

Teacher ref number: 0751124

Teacher date of birth: 27 March 1985

TRA reference: 20783

Date of determination: 1 August 2025

Former employer: Hampton School, Hampton, London

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 1 August 2025 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Christopher Arnold.

The panel members were Mr Paul Burton (lay panellist – in the chair), Ms Gill Lyon (teacher panellist) and Mrs Pamela Thompson (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Lara Small of Birketts LLP Solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Adam Slack of Capsticks LLP Solicitors.

Mr Arnold was present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegation set out in the notice of proceedings dated 14 April 2025.

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

1. On 9 May 2022, he was convicted of the following relevant offence:
 - a. Observe a person doing a private act on 23 March 2022.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology, anonymised pupil list, list of key people and statement of agreed facts – pages 4 to 10

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 11 to 39

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 40 to 262

Section 4: Teacher documents – pages 263 to 281

Section 5: Police Documents- pages 285 to 297

In advance of the hearing, the panel also received a service bundle of documents of 18 pages in length.

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 Procedures .

Witnesses

No witnesses were called by the TRA to attend the hearing.

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 Arnold had been employed at Hampton School (the “School”) as a Physics and Computer Science teacher since 1 September 2012.

Mr Arnold was warned by the School in December 2015 when he was suspected of photographing or recording a [REDACTED] colleague, however no further action was taken at the time.

On 23 March 2022, [REDACTED] reported to the School that Mr Arnold had held his mobile phone to the window of the female changing rooms and attempted to take photographs inside.

Mr Arnold was formally dismissed on 6 May 2022 following a disciplinary hearing.

Mr Arnold was arrested, pleaded guilty and was subsequently convicted with the criminal offence of “observing a person doing a private act, knowing that the person did not consent to being observed for your sexual gratification” at Wimbledon Magistrates Court on 9 May 2022.

On 19 July 2022 Mr Arnold was sentenced to 200 hours of unpaid work, 30 days rehabilitation and was made subject to notification requirements under the Sexual Offences Act 2003 (sex offenders register) for 5 years.

The matter was referred to the TRA on 9 May 2022.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

- 1. You were convicted on 9 May 2022 and sentenced on 19 July 2022 of the following relevant offence:**
 - a. You were convicted of the relevant offence of, observing a person doing a private act on 23 March 2022, knowing that the person did not consent to being observed for your sexual gratification.**

The panel considered the Statement of Agreed Facts, signed by Mr Arnold on 10 March 2025. In that statement of agreed facts, Mr Arnold admitted the particulars of allegation 1(a), albeit the panel noted that he had crossed out the words ‘*for his own sexual gratification*’. During the hearing, when asked about this Mr Arnold admitted to the panel that he accepted the facts of allegation 1(a) in their entirety, in that he accepted that he had been convicted of the offence of “observing a person doing a private act on 23 March

2022, knowing that the person did not consent to being observed for your sexual gratification". 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 Wimbledon Magistrates' Court, dated 19 July 2022, which detailed that Mr Arnold had been convicted of:

1. Observing another person doing a private act, knowing that the person did not consent to being observed for his sexual gratification.

The panel noted that Mr Arnold had pleaded guilty to the offence (albeit the panel considered Mr Arnold's verbal submissions as to the context around the reasons why he had pleaded guilty).

In respect of the allegation, Mr Arnold was sentenced to 200 hours of unpaid work. Mr Arnold was also required to register with the police for 5 years on the Sex Offenders' register.

The panel therefore found allegation 1(a) proven.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

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

In doing so, the panel had regard to the Advice.

The panel noted that Mr Arnold admitted and accepted in his Statement of Agreed Facts that he had been convicted of a relevant offence. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination on the evidence available to it.

The panel first considered whether the conduct of Mr Arnold, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Arnold 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
 - building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position;
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others; and
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including the rule of law.
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel noted that Mr Arnold's actions were relevant to teaching and working in an education setting, because he had pleaded guilty to an offence which had been committed on the School's grounds.

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

The panel considered the seriousness, nature and gravity of the offence. The panel noted that Mr Arnold's behaviour did not lead to a sentence of imprisonment, which was indicative that the offence was at the less serious end of the possible spectrum. However, the offence type itself (of voyeurism) is a serious offence and the panel noted that Mr Arnold had been placed on the Sex Offenders' register for 5 years as a result. Whilst the panel noted Mr Arnold's case is that he did not actually take a photo and/or see anything in the ladies' changing rooms at the School, the panel considered that his actions in attempting to do so (regardless of the outcome) demonstrated his intent at the time and is relevant to the seriousness of the offence. The panel also considered that Mr Arnold's actions led to a breach of trust with his colleagues at the School.

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

This was a case concerning an offence involving voyeurism, which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence. The panel also considered sexual activity to be relevant in this regard, noting that Mr Arnold admitted that he had been convicted of the offence of "observing another person doing a private act, knowing that the person did not consent to being observed for his sexual gratification".

For the purpose of considering the seriousness of the offence, the panel took into account evidence of mitigating circumstances raised by Mr Arnold. The panel took into consideration Mr Arnold's account of the [REDACTED].

The panel particularly noted Mr Arnold's statement of 22 November 2022.

The panel read Mr Arnold's evidence that he committed the offence following at a time when he was in a [REDACTED] and was not thinking clearly. Mr Arnold submitted in his statement that he had acted in the way that he did on 23 March 2022 because of his [REDACTED].

The panel noted that Mr Arnold had immediately owned up to his actions on 23 March 2022, had pleaded guilty at the first available opportunity to do so and had co-operated with the School's investigation into the incident. The panel also noted that Mr Arnold had expressed immediate and continued remorse.

However, although the panel carefully considered Mr Arnold's mitigating circumstances for the purposes of assessing the seriousness of the offence, the panel also found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Arnold's ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding that this conviction was for a relevant offence was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

The panel therefore found that there has been a conviction 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:

- (i) the protection of other members of the public;
- (ii) the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and
- (iii) declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct within the teaching profession.

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Arnold, which were conviction of the relevant offence of observing a private act knowing that the person did not consent to being

observed for sexual gratification, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Arnold 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 Arnold 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 Arnold in the profession.

The panel noted that there was evidence of Mr Arnold having significant ability and competence as a teacher. In particular, the panel considered that was evidenced by his academic career studying at Oxford University, before teaching at the School, a private school, and successfully obtaining multiple promotions in the ten years he taught there. The panel also reviewed a number of glowing references about his teaching abilities from colleagues.

However, whilst there is evidence that Mr Arnold had great ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Arnold in the profession, since 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.

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 Arnold.

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 conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of the Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures;
- abuse of position or trust; and

- sexual misconduct, e.g. involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature.

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.

In light of the panel's findings, there was evidence that Mr Arnold's actions were deliberate. The panel considered Mr Arnold's written submission that he acted on 23 March 2022 out of impulse in the belief that it would provide a moment of respite from feelings of panic and despair during a [REDACTED]. However, the panel also noted that Mr Arnold had taken deliberate steps to go through the double doors and up the stairs to reach the ladies' changing rooms in the School. The panel further noted that in Mr Arnold's Statement of Agreed Facts he admitted that he had held his phone up to the window in the ladies' changing room with the intent to take photographs of female members of staff he knew were in the changing room at the time.

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

The panel took into consideration that Mr Arnold did have a previously good academic history, having demonstrated high standards in both his personal and professional conduct and having contributed significantly to the education sector during his ten-year teaching career, this being reflected in his promotions to Assistant Head of Year and Mental Health and Wellbeing Lead. The panel saw evidence of good character through references made in support of Mr Arnold's applications for these roles. For example, the panel referred to the reference from Individual A which noted all requested performance indicators as "outstanding" and complimented his "*empathy and outstanding interpersonal skills*" and experience in pastoral issues. However, the panel noted that no recent references were provided from any colleagues that could attest to Mr Arnold's abilities as a teacher.

The panel was particularly influenced by the remorse expressed by Mr Arnold in his statement dated 21 November 2022 and his ongoing and continued regret of the incident. Mr Arnold stated his actions were "*out of character and contrary to my attitudes and values*", and that he was "*keen to take responsibility for my actions*", accepting conviction and his sentence as an "*opportunity to show understanding and acceptance of my actions*".

Mr Arnold described the [REDACTED] he was undertaking to develop strategies to help him cope with challenges in his personal life and his regret for not getting help sooner with [REDACTED]. The panel noted in Mr Arnold's verbal submissions however that, whilst he has continued to [REDACTED], the panel had seen no evidence of active steps

that he had taken in the last 2.5 years since he wrote his statement on 21 November 2022 to reduce the risk of repetition of a similar event in the future.

The panel was impressed by Mr Arnold attending the hearing in order to give an account of his actions publicly and express his remorse. The panel was particularly influenced by the sincerity of the remorse expressed by Mr Arnold in his verbal submissions during the hearing and the fact that he admitted to the allegations in full. Mr Arnold expressed his continued remorse, not only for the impact his actions had on his female colleagues on 23 March 2022, but also on the impact his departure has had on the wider profession, including parents, pupils and colleagues at the School.

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 Arnold of prohibition.

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Arnold. The conviction of a relevant offence, the strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession and maintaining public confidence in the profession, and the fact that Mr Arnold remained on the Sex Offenders Register were significant factors in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

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

The Advice indicates that there are certain types of case where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period.

One of these includes:

- 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.

Whilst the panel considered this factor to be relevant, the panel noted that the circumstances of the commission of the offence were on the lower range of seriousness.

The panel further noted that Mr Arnold has demonstrated insight into his actions and regret of the incident as outlined in his November 2022 statement and subsequently.

The panel noted Mr Arnold's attempts to acknowledge his personal issues and change his behaviour through undertaking [REDACTED]. The panel noted Mr Arnold's comments that *"My life has changed beyond recognition...and I am wholeheartedly committed to taking whatever measures necessary to make my future more positive, happy and fulfilling"* and *"my situation has been truly transformed by opening up and reaching out for help"*. The panel also had sight of the letter from the probation service dated 6 October 2022 stating that Mr Arnold had *"engaged proactively with all aspects of his order"* and that he posed a *"low risk to children"* at the time of the letter.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a review period. The panel considered that, particularly given Mr Arnold's continued remorse and low risk of repetition in future, a review period of two years would be appropriate in this case.

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 Christopher Arnold should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of two years.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Arnold 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
 - building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position;
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others; and

- not undermining fundamental British values, including the rule of law.
- 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 Arnold fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding of a conviction of the relevant offence of observing a private act knowing that the person did not consent to being observed for 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 Arnold, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case although the panel did not comment on the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children/safeguard pupils, however I have observed the following comment “The panel noted that Mr Arnold’s actions were relevant to teaching and working in an education setting, because he had pleaded guilty to an offence which had been committed on the School’s grounds.”

I have also taken into account the panel’s comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, “The panel was particularly influenced by the remorse expressed by Mr Arnold in his statement dated 21 November 2022 and his ongoing and continued regret of the incident. Mr Arnold stated his actions were “*out of character and contrary to my attitudes and values*”, and that he was “*keen to take responsibility for my actions*”, accepting conviction and his sentence as an “*opportunity to show understanding and acceptance of my actions*”. I have therefore given this element 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, “In light of the panel’s findings against Mr Arnold, which were conviction of the relevant offence of observing a private act knowing that the person did not consent to being observed for sexual gratification, the

panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Arnold was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of a relevant offence which had been committed on School grounds 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 Arnold himself and the panel comment “The panel noted that there was evidence of Mr Arnold having significant ability and competence as a teacher. In particular, the panel considered that was evidenced by his academic career studying at Oxford University, before teaching at the School, a private school, and successfully obtaining multiple promotions in the ten years he taught there. The panel also reviewed a number of glowing references about his teaching abilities from colleagues.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Arnold 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 level of insight or remorse. The panel has said, “Mr Arnold described the [REDACTED] he was undertaking to develop strategies to help him cope with challenges in his personal life and his regret for not getting help sooner with [REDACTED]. The panel noted in Mr Arnold’s verbal submissions however that, whilst he has continued to [REDACTED], the panel had seen no evidence of active steps that he had taken in the last 2.5 years since he wrote his statement on 21 November 2022 to reduce the risk of repetition of a similar event in the future.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel “whilst there is evidence that Mr Arnold had great ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Arnold in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Arnold 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, 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 a two-year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments "The panel noted Mr Arnold's attempts to acknowledge his personal issues and change his behaviour through undertaking [REDACTED]. The panel noted Mr Arnold's comments that *"My life has changed beyond recognition...and I am wholeheartedly committed to taking whatever measures necessary to make my future more positive, happy and fulfilling"* and *"my situation has been truly transformed by opening up and reaching out for help"*. The panel also had sight of the letter from the probation service dated 6 October 2022 stating that Mr Arnold had *"engaged proactively with all aspects of his order"* and that he posed a *"low risk to children"* at the time of the letter." The panel has also said that "The panel considered that, particularly given Mr Arnold's continued remorse and low risk of repetition in future, a review period of two years would be appropriate in this case."

I have decided that a two-year review period is proportionate in this case and to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession.

This means that Mr Christopher Arnold is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. He may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 15 August 2027, 2 years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If he does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Mr Arnold remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

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



Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey

Date: 7 August 2025

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