



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Kieran Atter: 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	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	8
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	10

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

**Teacher:** Mr Kieran Atter

**Teacher ref number:** 1667201

**Teacher date of birth:** 6 July 1990

**TRA reference:** 21396

**Date of determination:** 20 August 2025

**Former employer:** Hayes School, Kent

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 20 August 2025 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Kieran Atter.

The panel members were Mr Paul Millett (lay panellist – in the chair), Ms Jo Palmer-Tweed (teacher panellist), and Ms Susan Ridge (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Graham Miles of Blake Morgan 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 Atter that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Atter provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted conviction of a relevant offence. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, Mr Atter or his representative.

The meeting took place in private.

## **Allegations**

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 13 August 2025.

It was alleged that Mr Kieran Atter had been convicted of relevant offences, in that:

1. On or around 1 May 2024, he was convicted at Woolwich Crown Court of the following offences:
  - (a) Three counts of: making an indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of children on 5 January 2023, contrary to the Protection of Children Act 1978, s1;
  - (b) Two counts of: distributing indecent photograph or pseudo – photograph of children on December 2022 – 4 January 2023, contrary to the Protection of Children Act 1978, s1.

Mr Atter admitted that he had been convicted of the specified offences.

Mr Atter also admitted that the offences were relevant offences.

## **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 Meeting – pages 4 to 25

Section 2: Statement of agreed facts and Presenting Officer representations – pages 27 to 31

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 33 to 53

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 55 to 76

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 Atter on 9 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 Kieran Atter 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 Kieran Atter was employed as a teacher at the Hayes School, Bromley, Kent between 30 August 2022 and 9 February 2023.

On 5 January 2023, Mr Atter was arrested for possession of indecent images of children and later admitted to accessing indecent images of children using Twitter, saving images on his phone and sharing them with others, [REDACTED].

1 May 2024 Mr Atter appeared at Woolwich Crown Court, having been committed for sentence at that court after pleading guilty to the offences in the Magistrates' Court. He was sentenced to a suspended sentence of imprisonment, a rehabilitation activity requirement, an unpaid work requirement, a restraining order, a Sexual Harm Prevention Order and a requirement to sign the Sexual Offenders Register for 10 years.

## Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

**It was alleged that you have been convicted of relevant offences, in that:**

- 1. On or around 1 May 2024, you were convicted at Woolwich Crown Court of the following offences:**

- (a) Three counts of: making an indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of children on 5 January 2023, contrary to the Protection of Children Act 1978, s1;**

**(b) Two counts of: distributing indecent photograph or pseudo – photograph of children [in] December 2022 – 4 January 2023, contrary to the Protection of Children Act 1978, s1.**

Mr Atter admitted that he was convicted of the specified offences and he signed a statement of agreed facts to that effect. In addition, the panel was provided with a certificate of conviction from the Woolwich Crown Court which confirmed Mr Atter's conviction in the Magistrates' Court on 23 February 2024 and sentence at Woolwich Crown Court on 1 May 2024.

The certificate of conviction confirmed that Mr Atter pleaded guilty to three counts of making and two counts of distributing indecent photographs or pseudo - photographs of a child.

The panel found allegations 1a and 1b proved.

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

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

Mr Atter admitted that the convictions were for relevant offences. The panel took these admissions into account but made its own determination.

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 Atter, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Atter 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
  - 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 was satisfied that Mr Atter's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting.

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

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Atter's behaviour in committing the offences 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 noted that Mr Atter's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of 10 months imprisonment, (albeit that it was suspended), which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed. The sentence also included a rehabilitation activity requirement, an unpaid work requirement, a Sexual Harm Prevention Order and a requirement to sign the Sexual Offenders Register for 10 years. The Sexual Harm Prevention Order, amongst other things, prohibits Mr Atter having any unsupervised contact or communication with any person under the age of 18 other than (a) such as is inadvertent and not reasonably avoidable in the course of lawful daily life or (b) with both the express consent of the child's parent or guardian given after having been informed of the terms of this order and with the express approval of the Public Protection Unit for the area in which he resides.

The panel also considered the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice. The Advice states that offences involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or pseudo photograph or image of a child are likely to be considered relevant offences.

Mr Atter accepted in the statement of agreed facts that a number of the images were in the highest category, with some of the images being moving photographs. He also accepted that when distributing photographs/ pseudo photographs, he engaged in sexualised conversation [REDACTED] regarding children. Mr Atter accepted that he had admitted to having a sexual interest in children.

The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the convictions was relevant to Mr Atter's ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding that the convictions were for relevant offences was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

Therefore, the panel found that the convictions were for relevant offences.

## **Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State**

Given the panel's findings in respect of conviction of relevant offences, 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 declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of making and distributing indecent images of children.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Atter 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 Atter 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 Atter in the profession. The panel was not presented with evidence of Mr Atter's proficiency as a teacher which might have enabled the panel to conclude that such a public interest existed. In any event, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any potential public interest in retaining Mr Atter 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 Atter.



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

Even though some of the behaviours 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 teacher's actions were deliberate. There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Atter was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation.

Mr Atter did have a previously good history in that there was no evidence of any previous conviction or adverse disciplinary finding. The panel also had regard to the fact that Mr Atter pleaded guilty to the charges that he faced and admitted that his convictions were for relevant offences.

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 Atter 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 Atter.

The serious nature of the offending behaviour 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:

- 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...;
- 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;

The sentence imposed was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed and the ongoing risk to children. 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 Kieran Atter should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a conviction for making and distributing 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 Atter, 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, "There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of making and distributing indecent images of children." A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

Although the panel did not comment on evidence of insight and remorse, I have taken into account of the following comment "Mr Atter accepted in the statement of agreed facts that a number of the images were in the highest category, with some of the images being moving photographs. He also accepted that when distributing photographs/pseudo photographs, he engaged in sexualised conversation [REDACTED] regarding children.

Mr Atter accepted that he had admitted to having a sexual interest in children.” 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 Atter was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of a serious relevant offence 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 Atter himself and the panel comment “Mr Atter did have a previously good history in that there was no evidence of any previous conviction or adverse disciplinary finding. The panel also had regard to the fact that Mr Atter pleaded guilty to the charges that he faced and admitted that his convictions were for relevant offences.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Atter 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 conviction and that, “The panel noted that Mr Atter's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of 10 months imprisonment, (albeit that it was suspended), which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed. The sentence also included a rehabilitation activity requirement, an unpaid work requirement, a Sexual Harm Prevention Order and a requirement to sign the Sexual Offenders Register for 10 years. The Sexual Harm Prevention Order, amongst other things, prohibits Mr Atter having any unsupervised contact or communication with any person under the age of 18 other than (a) such as is inadvertent and not reasonably avoidable in the course of lawful daily life or (b) with both the express consent of the child's parent or guardian given after having been informed of the terms of this order and with the express approval of the Public Protection Unit for the area in which he resides.”

I have also given considerable weight to the following “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 Atter in the profession. The panel was not presented with evidence of Mr Atter’s proficiency as a teacher which might have enabled the panel to conclude that such a public interest existed. In any event, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any potential public interest in retaining Mr Atter 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 Atter 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 full insight or 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.

I have considered the panel’s comments “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:

- 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...;
- 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.”

The panel has also said “The sentence imposed was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed and the ongoing risk to children. 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 evidence of full insight or remorse, which means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils.

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 Kieran Atter 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 Atter 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 Kieran Atter 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 stylized, cursive script.

**Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey**

**Date: 29 August 2025**

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