



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Stuart Norris: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

September 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	11

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

Teacher: Mr Stuart Norris

Teacher ref number: 9536727

Teacher date of birth: 24 November 1973

TRA reference: 20095

Date of determination: 17 September 2025

Former employer: Thomas Estley Community College, Leicestershire

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 17 September 2025 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Stuart Norris.

The panel members were Ms Jan Stoddard (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Michele Barlow-Ward (teacher panellist) and Mr Nigel Shock (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Kimberley Clayton 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 Norris that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Norris 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 Ms Sherelle Appleby of Browne Jacobson LLP, Mr Norris or any representative for Mr Norris.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 3 September 2025, as amended by the panel during the meeting.

It was alleged that Mr Norris was guilty of having been convicted, at any time, of the following relevant offences, in that:

1. On 27 May 2022, he was convicted at Leicester Crown Court, of the following offences:
 - a) 2 counts of making indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of children on 04/09/20-18/04/21 protection of children act 1987 s1(a)
 - b) Possess prohibited images of children on 04/09/20-18/04/21 coroners and justice act 2009 s62(1)
 - c) 2 offences of without consent/reasonable belief in consent record image under clothing to observe another on 04/06/21-15/06/21 sexual offences act 2003 s67A(2) and s67A(4)

The panel noted that Mr Norris admitted the allegations as set out in the notice of referral form signed by Mr Norris on 28 September 2025 and the statement of agreed facts, signed by him on 28 September 2025, and by the presenting officer, Ms Sherelle Appleby on 2 September 2025. Mr Norris further admitted that his conduct amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Notice of hearing and notice of response – pages 4 to 19

Section 2: TRA documents – pages 21 to 51

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts – pages 53 to 54

In addition, the panel were provided with presenting officer representations dated 2 September 2025 and an updated notice of meeting dated 3 September 2025.

The panel also noted the additional email between Mr Norris and the TRA on 2 September 2025.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the meeting and the additional document referred to above.

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 Norris on 28 September 2025.

The panel noted that the statement of agreed facts was signed by Mr Norris as 28 September 2025. The panel took this to be an administrative error and that the year of the date had been incorrectly written by Mr Norris and should have been 2024.

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 Norris 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 Norris commenced employment at Thomas Estley Community College (‘the School’) on 25 August 2016.

On 14 June 2021, allegations were raised by students at the School that Mr Norris had used his phone to video girls’ legs when circulating the classroom to help students.

On 27 May 2022, Mr Norris was convicted at Leicester Crown Court of 2 counts of voyeurism, 1 count of making incident photograph of a child, 1 count of making indecent photograph of children and 1 count of possessing prohibited images of children.

Mr Norris was subsequently sentenced at Leicester Crown Court on 25 July 2022.

The matter was referred to the TRA on 15 June 2021.

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:

- 1. On 27 May 2022, you were convicted at Leicester Crown Court, of the following offences:**
 - a) 2 counts of making indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of children on 04/09/20-18/04/21 protection of children act 1987 s1(a)**
 - b) Possess prohibited images of children on 04/09/20-18/04/21 coroners and justice act 2009 s62(1)**
 - c) 2 offences of without consent/reasonable belief in consent record image under clothing to observe another on 04/06/21-15/06/21 sexual offences act 2003 s67A(2) and s67A(4)**

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Norris on 28 September 2024, and the notice of referral form signed by Mr Norris on 28 September 2024 in which he admitted to allegations 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c).

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 Leicester Crown Court dated 23 September 2024 which detailed that Mr Norris had been convicted on 27 May 2022 of 2 counts of voyeurism, 1 count of making an indecent photograph of a child, 1 count of making indecent photographs of children and 1 count of possessing prohibited images of children.

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

Mr Norris was sentenced on 25 July 2022 in respect of the offences above. He received a total sentence of 10 months imprisonment (10 months imprisonment suspended for 24 months concurrent and he was ordered to participate in a rehab activity for 40 days and to participate for 90 days in sexual offending behaviour programme in respect of count 1, 10 months' imprisonment suspended for 24 months concurrent in respect of count 2, 6 months suspended for 24 months concurrent in respect of counts 3 and 5, 4 months imprisonment suspended for 24 months concurrent in respect of count 4. Mr Norris was also [REDACTED] ordered to sign the Sex Offenders Register for 10 years, made subject

to a Sexual Harm Prevention Order until 24/07/2027, had his mobile phone seized and was ordered to pay costs of £700 and a victim surcharge of £156.

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 all of the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to a 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 Norris, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Norris 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; and
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others.
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities. Keep children safe.

The panel noted that Mr Norris’ actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting. The offences he committed involved making indecent photographs of children, possessing prohibited images of children and voyeurism.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offences 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 Norris' 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 Norris' behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, (albeit that it was suspended), 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 voyeurism (including upskirting), any activity 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 found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Norris' ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding that this conviction was for a relevant offence/these convictions were for relevant offences 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 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.

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Norris, which involved making indecent photographs of children, possessing prohibited images of children and voyeurism, 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 Norris 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 Norris 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 Norris in the profession. The panel took note of the two references in the bundle. There was no evidence provided to the panel to suggest that Mr Norris had an exceptional ability as an educator. The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Norris in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and he sought to exploit his position of trust.

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 Norris.

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;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- sexual misconduct, e.g. involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature and/or that use or exploit the trust, knowledge or influence derived from the individual's professional position;

- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing, or publishing any indecent photograph or image, or indecent pseudo photograph or image, of a child, or permitting such activity, including one-off incidents;
- failure in their duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk or failing to promote the safety and welfare of the children (as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE);
- violation of the rights of pupils;
- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour; and
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions or purposeful destruction of evidence, especially where these behaviours have been repeated or had serious consequences, or involved the coercion of another person to act in a way contrary to their own interests.

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 evidence that Mr Norris' actions were clearly deliberate.

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

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

The panel was not provided with any mitigation from Mr Norris, nor any evidence of remorse or insight into his actions.

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 Norris 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 Norris. The seriousness of the allegations found proven and the lack of evidence of any

remorse or insight into his actions 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 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.

The panel considered that Mr Norris had not demonstrated any meaningful insight into his actions, and in particular noted that there was no evidence he had shown any remorse towards the victims of his actions.

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 Stuart Norris should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Norris 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; and
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others.
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities. Keep children safe.

The panel finds that the conduct of Mr Norris fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include findings which involved making indecent photographs of children, possessing prohibited images of children and voyeurism.

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 Norris, 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 Norris, which involved making indecent photographs of children, possessing prohibited images of children and voyeurism, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public." The panel also said "Mr Norris' actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting. The offences he committed involved making indecent photographs of children, possessing prohibited images of

children and voyeurism.” 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 was not provided with any mitigation from Mr Norris, nor any evidence of remorse or insight into his actions.” In my judgement, the lack of evidence 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 Norris’ 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.” I am particularly mindful this case involved serious convictions involving children 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 Norris himself and the panel comment “There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Norris demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or having contributed significantly to the education sector.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Norris 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:

“There was evidence that Mr Norris’ actions were clearly deliberate.”

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

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel “The panel went on to consider whether there was a public interest in retaining Mr Norris in the profession. The panel took note of the two references in the bundle. There was no evidence provided to the panel to suggest that Mr Norris had an exceptional ability as an educator. The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Norris in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and he sought to exploit his position of trust.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Norris 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 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.

One of these includes 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 “Mr Norris had not demonstrated any meaningful insight into his actions, and in particular noted that there was no evidence he had shown any remorse towards the victims of his actions.”

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 convictions involving children and the lack of evidence of either insight or remorse.

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 Stuart Norris 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 Norris 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 Norris 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: 19 September 2025

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