



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **William Chambers: Professional conduct panel meeting 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
Statement of agreed facts	4
Decision and reasons	4
Findings of fact	6
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 William Chambers
<b>Teacher ref number:</b>	9736305
<b>Teacher date of birth:</b>	12 November 1963
<b>TRA reference:</b>	23467
<b>Date of determination:</b>	19 August 2025
<b>Former employer:</b>	Teaching Personnel, Lancashire and St James Primary School, Burnley

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 19 August 2025 by way of a virtual professional conduct panel meeting, to consider the case of Mr Chambers.

The panel members were Mrs Melissa West (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Richard Young (lay panellist) and Mrs Christine McLintock (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Josie Beal 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 Chambers that the allegation be considered without a hearing. The panel considered the case at a professional conduct panel meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer Ms Kate Baggs of Kingsley Napley LLP or Mr Chambers.

The meeting took place in private.

## **Allegations**

The panel considered the allegation set out in the notice of meeting dated 2 June 2025.

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

1. On or around 9 January 2024, he was convicted at Blackburn Magistrates' Court of three counts of making indecent photographs and/or pseudo-photographs of a child.

The panel noted that Mr Chambers admitted the allegation as set out in the notice of referral form signed by him on 10 February 2025 and the statement of agreed facts, signed by him on 12 May 2025, and the presenting officer, Ms Baggs, on 20 May 2025.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section 1: Chronology and list of key people – pages 3 to 4

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 5 to 13

Section 3: Statement of Agreed Facts – pages 14 to 16

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency Documents – pages 17 to 59

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 document Teacher Misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession 2020, (the "Procedures").

## **Statement of agreed facts**

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Chambers on 12 May 2025 and the presenting officer, Ms Baggs, on 20 May 2025.

## **Decision and reasons**

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 Chambers for the allegation 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 Chambers was employed as a Teacher at Lower Darwen Primary School in Blackburn between 1998 and 2011.

Mr Chambers was registered with Teaching Personnel in Lancashire, a supply agency and part of the Supporting Education Group, between 14 November 2013 and 7 April 2022.

Mr Chambers was employed as a Teacher at Roe Lee Primary School in Blackburn between September 2020 and 2021.

Mr Chambers was employed as a Teacher at St James Primary School in Burnley between October 2021 and April 2022.

Following an investigation by the National Crime Agency, 1564 indecent images were found on Mr Chambers' devices, including 166 Category A images, 544 Category B images and 854 Category C images.

On 9 January 2024, Mr Chambers was convicted at Blackburn Magistrates' Court of three counts of making indecent photographs and/or pseudo-photographs of a child. On 7 March 2024 at Preston Crown Court, Mr Chambers was sentenced.

A referral was made to the TRA on 25 March 2024 by the Supporting Education Group.

## 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. On or around 9 January 2024, you were convicted at Blackburn Magistrates Court of three counts of making indecent photographs and/or pseudo-photographs of a child.**

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Chambers on 12 May 2025, and the notice of referral form, signed by Mr Chambers on 10 February 2025, in which he admitted to allegation 1.

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 was provided with a copy of the certificate of conviction from Preston Crown Court dated 20 February 2025 which detailed that Mr Chambers had been convicted on 9 January 2024 at Blackburn Magistrates' Court of three counts of '*Make indecent photograph/ pseudo photograph of a child*'.

The panel noted that Mr Chambers pleaded guilty to these offences.

On 7 March 2024 Mr Chambers was sentenced to 20 months imprisonment. Mr Chambers was required to register on the Sex Offenders Register for 10 years and made subject to a Sexual Harm Prevention Order for 10 years. Reference was also made to the fact that Mr Chambers would or may be subject to barring from working with children and/or vulnerable adults by the DBS.

Following examination of the documents before the panel and the admissions in the statement of agreed facts and the notice of referral form, the panel found allegation 1 proven.

## Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

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

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

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

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Chambers 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 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 concluded that Mr Chambers' actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting. The offence involved images of children which was clearly relevant to Mr Chambers' role and position of trust as a teacher.

The panel also concluded that the behaviour involved in committing the offence would have had an impact on the safety and security of pupils and members of the public.

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

The panel noted that Mr Chambers' behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed.

The panel also considered the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice. This was a case concerning an offence involving any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or pseudo photograph or image of a child, which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Chambers' 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.

## **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 the following to be relevant in this case: the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct within the teaching profession; and that prohibition strikes the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest, if they are in conflict.

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Chambers, which involved the conviction of a relevant offence of making indecent photographs and/or pseudo-photographs of children, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of 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 would be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Chambers were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Mr Chambers 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 Chambers in the profession.

The panel was not provided with any evidence attesting to Mr Chambers ability as an educator. The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Chambers 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 Chambers.

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;
- 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;
- collusion or concealment...

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

The panel concluded that Mr Chambers' actions were deliberate. The evidence before the panel indicated that Mr Chambers had gone to great lengths to conceal his actions by running "cleaner" software on his laptop a number of times. The panel therefore found his actions to be calculated and motivated.

There was no evidence that Mr Chambers was acting under extreme duress or that he had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel was provided with a transcript of the sentencing hearing. The transcript contained details pertaining to the images and information found on Mr Chambers' devices. The transcript demonstrated that Mr Chambers' offending behaviour had spanned over a number of years. The panel found these details extremely concerning and noted the Judge's conclusion that Mr Chambers was a paedophile with a perverted sexual interest in young boys.

The panel was not provided with any mitigation from Mr Chambers. The panel noted the transcript of the sentencing hearing which referred to Mr Chambers' health and the steps he had taken in relation to rehabilitative work. It also stated that he was now remorseful

for his conduct. The panel did not place considerable weight on this mitigation and did not conclude that there was any compelling evidence before it of insight or remorse on Mr Chambers' part.

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 Chambers 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 Chambers. The serious nature of the conviction and associated circumstances 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. The panel found the following to be relevant to this case: *"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."*

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 considered that Mr Chambers had not demonstrated any meaningful insight or remorse. The panel noted in particular that there was no evidence of remorse towards the victims of his actions. The panel considered there was a significant risk of repetition given the seriousness and extent of Mr Chambers' offending over a long period of time which demonstrated a pattern of behaviour.

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

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

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

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

In this case, the panel has found the allegation 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 William Chambers should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Chambers 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 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 findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of a conviction for making indecent photographs and/or pseudo-photographs, which resulted in a sentence of imprisonment for 20 months.

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 Chambers, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children and safeguard pupils. The panel has observed:

“In light of the panel’s findings against Mr Chambers, which involved the conviction of a relevant offence of making indecent photographs and/or pseudo-photographs of children, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of 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 has set out as follows:

“The panel was not provided with any mitigation from Mr Chambers. The panel noted the transcript of the sentencing hearing which referred to Mr Chambers’ health and the steps he had taken in relation to rehabilitative work. It also stated that he was now remorseful for his conduct. The panel did not place considerable weight on this mitigation and did not conclude that there was any compelling evidence before it of insight or remorse on Mr Chambers’ part.”

In my judgement, the lack of evidence of insight and remorse means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel has observed:

“Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession would be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Chambers were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of a conviction for making 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 Chambers himself. The panel has commented:

“There was no evidence that Mr Chambers was acting under extreme duress or that he had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector.”

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel's comments concerning the seriousness of the offence of which Mr Chambers was convicted and received a sentence of imprisonment. The panel has said:

“The panel was provided with a transcript of the sentencing hearing. The transcript contained details pertaining to the images and information found on Mr Chambers' devices. The transcript demonstrated that Mr Chambers' offending behaviour had spanned over a number of years. The panel found these details extremely concerning and noted the Judge's conclusion that Mr Chambers was a paedophile with a perverted sexual interest in young boys.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the panel's comments regarding the lack of compelling evidence of insight or remorse and also the significant risk of repetition.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Mr Chambers 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 evidence of meaningful insight and remorse, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

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

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

The panel has noted that the Advice indicates that the public interest will weigh in favour of not allowing a review period where a case involves making indecent photographs or pseudo-photographs of children.

I have considered the panel's comments:

"The panel considered that Mr Chambers had not demonstrated any meaningful insight or remorse. The panel noted in particular that there was no evidence of remorse towards the victims of his actions. The panel considered there was a significant risk of repetition given the seriousness and extent of Mr Chambers' offending over a long period of time which demonstrated a pattern of behaviour."

I have considered whether not allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the serious nature of the offences which led to Mr Chambers being convicted and receiving a sentence of imprisonment, the lack of evidence of insight and remorse, and the significant 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 William Chambers 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 allegation found proved against him, I have decided that Mr Chambers 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 Chambers has a right of appeal to the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this order.



**Decision maker: David Oatley**

**Date: 21 August 2025**

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