



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Rev Ross Jude Bullock: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

October 2025

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	17
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	21

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

Teacher:	Rev Ross Jude Bullock
Teacher ref number:	3453848
Teacher date of birth:	7 July 1958
TRA reference:	19281
Date of determination:	23 October 2025
Former employer:	Queenswood School, Hatfield

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 20 to 23 October 2025 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Rev Ross Jude Bullock.

The panel members were Mrs Emma Hendry (lay panellist – in the chair), Mr Ian Hylan (teacher panellist) and Ms Jo Palmer Tweed (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Helen Kitchen of Blake Morgan LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Michael Bellis of Capsticks LLP solicitors.

Rev Bullock was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 12 June 2025.

It was alleged that Rev Bullock was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst a Teacher at Queenswood School, Hatfield (“the School”):

1. Between May 2018 and October 2018, he:
 - (a) failed to notify the relevant safeguarding team that Person A had been in contact with and/or had seen and/or was living with [REDACTED];
 - (b) failed to notify the relevant safeguarding team that Person A was in and/or was at risk of being in breach of the SOPO and/or the Safeguarding Agreement;
 - (c) searched for information on how to delete text messages from a Samsung mobile phone to seek to remove and/or assist in the removal of potential evidence.
2. By his conduct in paragraphs 1(a) and 1(b) above, he failed to have proper regard for the need to safeguard children.
3. By his conduct at paragraph 1(c) above he was dishonest.

In his response to the notice of referral, Rev Bullock had admitted allegations 1(a) and 1(b) save in relation to the date when they were alleged to have taken place. Rev Bullock had denied allegations 1(c), 2 and 3.

Rev Bullock did not admit unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Summary of evidence

Documents

In advance of the hearing, the panel received two bundles which comprised:

A hearing bundle of documents which included:

Section 1: Chronology, anonymised pupil list and list of key people – pages 1 to 7

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 8 to 39

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – 40 to 79

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 80 to 569

Section 5: Teacher documents and correspondence – pages 570 to 574

A proceeding in absence bundle – pages 1 to 26

The panel members confirmed that they had read all the documents within the bundles, 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”).

The panel noted, in light of the date of the referral of the case for hearing, that the April 2018 version of the Procedures should apply if there was material inconsistency between the 2020 and the April 2018 versions.

Witnesses

The panel heard oral evidence from the following witnesses called by the presenting officer:

Witness A - [REDACTED]

Witness B - [REDACTED]

Witness C - [REDACTED]

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

From September 2010 Rev Bullock, the incumbent in a Church of England parish, the Parish of St Anne’s Chingford, commenced working at the School as a part-time teacher, teaching around 0.2 to 0.6 FTE, his time commitment to the School varying over time.

The School was an all-girl independent boarding school teaching around 450 pupils aged 11 to 18.

Rev Bullock initially taught Religious Studies (RS) to Years 10 to 12 and, later, also taught Psychology to Years 10 to 13. His timetable was split into 20 periods of RS and 8 periods of Psychology. Rev Bullock also had some pastoral responsibilities as well as speaking annually as part of a lecture programme for Years 11 and 12.

In or around 2013 Person A commenced attending the church where Rev Bullock was a parish priest. Person A was a convicted sex offender.

In late December 2015 Person A, was recognised by [REDACTED] and a concern was reported to various bodies including the local authority. The [REDACTED] Safeguarding Team and the School were subsequently contacted. A safeguarding process was initiated and a Safeguarding Agreement was drawn up by the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Team in January 2016. This agreement was subject to review at various intervals.

In or around May 2018 Person A's [REDACTED]. Rev Bullock offered Person A the option to sleep overnight in a room at the back of the parish centre.

On or around about 7 October 2018 the Police undertook a routine visit to Person A's [REDACTED] and could not locate Person A. The Police then visited the parish centre and the wider church premises but did not locate Person A. The Police then returned to Person A's [REDACTED] and found Person A hiding with [REDACTED]. The Police later arrested Person A.

On 17 October 2018 Rev Bullock was suspended by the School whilst police enquiries were on-going.

In February 2020 the School commenced its own internal investigations, having awaited the Police's agreement to proceed. No action was taken forward by the Police in relation to Rev Bullock.

In April 2020 Rev Bullock ceased his employment at the School.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

1. Between May 2018 and October 2018, you:

- (a) failed to notify the relevant safeguarding team that Person A had been in contact with and/or had seen and/or was living with [REDACTED];**
- (b) failed to notify the relevant safeguarding team that Person A was in and/or was at risk of being in breach of the SOPO and/or the Safeguarding Agreement;**

Save for the dates in the opening section of allegation 1, Rev Bullock had made admissions to the facts of allegation 1(a) and 1(b) in a signed response form to a notice of referral dated 24 August 2022.

The panel considered that allegations 1(a) and 1(b) were based on the same factual matrix and so addressed them together.

The panel first considered Rev Bullock's knowledge of Person A's conviction.

The panel noted that from the information Rev Bullock had provided to the School in 2020 and to the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Team in late 2015, that he had been aware for some years before, and certainly between May 2018 and October 2018, that Person A was a convicted sex offender and that his offence involved the sexual abuse of a child [REDACTED]. In Rev Bullock's view he could not inform anyone of this as he was bound by the seal of confession.

Person A's conviction became more widely known in late December 2015 when Person A was recognised by [REDACTED]. Person A's conviction was then formally discussed by the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Advisor with Rev Bullock in late December 2015.

On this basis the panel found that Rev Bullock was aware of Person A's [REDACTED].

The panel then considered Rev Bullock's knowledge of the existence and terms of the [REDACTED] to which Person A was subject (the [REDACTED]) and of the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Agreement of which Person A was the subject (the Safeguarding Agreement).

Witness A gave evidence that in or around January 2016 Rev Bullock and the Police had been present at a meeting between the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Team and Person A during which the [REDACTED] was discussed.

The panel noted that the terms of the [REDACTED] were recorded in the Safeguarding Agreement first drawn up by the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Team in January 2016. Witness A, who had drawn up the Safeguarding Agreement, had been made aware of the terms of the [REDACTED] by the Police who liaised with her about the prohibitions imposed on Person A. The Safeguarding Agreement was subsequently subject to periodic review.

The panel had before it, produced by Witness A, copies of the Safeguarding Agreement dated May 2016 and December 2016. Each narrated the terms of the [REDACTED] which included terms which prohibited Person A from contacting any child under the age of 16 unless the contact was supervised access with his own children ([REDACTED]) and from residing overnight in any premises where Person A knew or believed a child under the age of 16 was present.

The copies of the Safeguarding Agreement produced by Witness A recorded that Rev Bullock's role was to oversee the agreed safeguards which included a requirement that Person A would not engage with any children. The agreement stated that the parties to it, which included Rev Bullock, agreed to adhere to the safeguards and directives within the

agreement and that they would alert the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Team if they became aware of non-compliance with its terms.

Rev Bullock had signed the reviewed Safeguarding Agreement, drawn up in December 2016, in May 2017 and had supplied a signed copy of that reviewed Safeguarding Agreement to Witness A in or around June/July 2017.

The panel also noted that on 16 October 2018, in his communications with the School, Rev Bullock stated that he had been made aware some 5 years previously by Person A that Person A was subject to the [REDACTED] and that he was aware that under its terms Person A was not to have unsupervised access to persons under 16, including his own family. Rev Bullock also stated that he had gone through the Safeguarding Agreement “with a fine toothcomb” after Person A had reported to him that [REDACTED] had become homeless and arrived at Person A’s [REDACTED]. Having noted the term of the [REDACTED] which prohibited Person A from residing overnight with [REDACTED], Rev Bullock had offered alternative overnight accommodation arrangements in the parish centre for Person A. The panel noted that Rev Bullock accepted that he did not, at that time, make the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Team aware of the change in Person A’s circumstances.

The panel also noted that in his communications with the TRA Rev Bullock had acknowledged that he had a parishioner who was subject to a [REDACTED].

On this basis, the panel found that at the relevant time, between May and October 2018, Rev Bullock was aware of the existence, and terms, of the [REDACTED] and the Safeguarding Agreement.

The panel then considered Rev Bullock’s knowledge of his obligation to report safeguarding issues/concerns to the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Team, which it considered to be “the relevant safeguarding team” as specified in allegation 1(a) and 1(b)

The panel noted the [REDACTED] of Chelmsford’s Safeguarding Policy (the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Policy), produced by Witness A, which she evidenced had been distributed in September 2014. Within the policy it stated it was initially made available in hard copy to every parish and church related community and was also available on-line. Amongst other requirements, the policy very clearly stated the requirement that information disclosed about a safeguarding concern should be brought to the attention of the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Team within 24 hours. The panel noted that Rev Bullock had stated to Witness C in the School’s investigation that the safeguarding training he received did not specifically cover the situation in which he found himself in May 2018. However, the panel considered, on the balance of probabilities, that Rev Bullock would have been made aware of the existence of the policy through safeguarding training. Witness A advised the panel that Rev Bullock undertook safeguarding training in July 2015 (Safeguarding Training for Clergy) and April

2016 ([REDACTED] online Adult Safeguarding Training and Child Safeguarding) and would have been able to access a copy of the Safeguarding Policy at the relevant time if he had wished to do so. He was therefore aware, or, had the means to make himself aware and should have made himself aware, of his obligation to report safeguarding concerns/issues to the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Team in the period May to October 2018. The panel considered that Rev Bullock had a responsibility to ensure that he made himself aware of the existence of the policy and its contents.

The panel also noted that Rev Bullock had undertaken safeguarding training at the School in September 2017 and in September 2018 and that the School had a strong ethos of safeguarding children, which included schoolwide publicity of safeguarding reporting. This should have made Rev Bullock aware of the importance of notifying safeguarding concerns to relevant authorities and seeking advice from them about safeguarding concerns at the earliest opportunity.

As regards the Safeguarding Agreement, in its original and reviewed terms, the panel specifically noted that in signing the agreement (as he did in May 2017) Rev Bullock confirmed that he was agreeing to report any non-compliance with the terms of the Safeguarding Agreement to the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Team. Rev Bullock had also been present at various meetings to review the Safeguarding Agreement including Person A's adherence to it.

On this basis, the panel found that at the relevant time, between May and October 2018, Rev Bullock was aware that he was under an obligation to report any non-compliance, or risk of non-compliance, with the SOPO and/or the Safeguarding Agreement to the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Team in light of the risk that this would represent to children.

The panel then went on to consider whether Rev Bullock had become aware of any matters which he had a duty to report.

The panel considered that Rev Bullock had a duty to report to the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Team if he had become aware that Person A had, or was at risk of having, contact with, or was living with [REDACTED] as this would have put [REDACTED] at risk. Awareness of such matters would also have required Rev Bullock to have reported to the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Team that Person A was, or was at risk of being, in breach of the [REDACTED] and the Safeguarding Agreement.

The panel did not consider that this duty to report applied if Rev Bullock had been aware that Person A only had sight of [REDACTED] Safeguarding Team were already aware of this taking place at an earlier date.

The panel then considered what was known to Rev Bullock about Person A having or being at risk of having contact with and/or living with Person A during the period detailed in the allegation.

The panel noted that in the record of interview with church representatives, including the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Adviser, on 15 October 2018, produced by Witness A, that Rev Bullock had said he had become aware Person A had only been living with underage children for a few weeks. There was no indication from the meeting note of when Rev Bullock had become aware of this information. Witness A, when questioned, was not aware of when Rev Bullock was made party to this information.

The panel noted that in an email produced by Witness B and dated 16 October 2018 which was sent to the School by Rev Bullock following his suspension, Rev Bullock stated that Person A's [REDACTED] had become homeless "earlier this year" and had turned up at Person A's [REDACTED]. When he had later become aware of this Rev Bullock offered Person A a place to sleep overnight in the parish centre. He accepted that he should have advised the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Team of this change in Person A's circumstances, but said that he had grown to trust Person A. Rev Bullock stated that the Police had later attended Person A's [REDACTED] and had been unable to find him and, after searching the church premises with Rev Bullock, had returned to Person A's [REDACTED] and found him hiding there with [REDACTED]. Person A had been arrested for breaching his SOPO and for failing to report his change of address.

Witness C, the School's investigations officer, interviewed Rev Bullock on 17 February 2020 as part of the School's investigation, and discussed with him what had taken place. At this time Rev Bullock provided some further clarifications. Rev Bullock stated that Person A's [REDACTED] had become homeless in May 2018, and that Person A had let them stay at his [REDACTED] which Person A "knew to be against his SOPO". Person A then asked Rev Bullock what he could do. Rev Bullock then offered Person A the use of a room at the parish centre. Rev Bullock stressed that he knew he should have informed the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Team and could not really understand why he did not do this. He stated that there was no benefit to him in not doing so.

Rev Bullock provided further information in his School Disciplinary hearing held on 2 April 2020 attended by Witness B. The notes of the meeting recorded that Rev Bullock stated that after Person's A's [REDACTED] had become homeless, Person A had then come to him. Rev Bullock went through the Safeguarding Agreement with a "fine toothcomb" and found "absolutely no advice there" but noted that Person A was not to spend the night under the same roof as children. So, after consulting with other parish officers, Rev Bullock offered Person A accommodation in a room at the back of the parish centre. They then tried to assist Person A's [REDACTED] to find re-housing, which proved difficult. Rev Bullock said that Person A was scared that the Police would come when he was at his [REDACTED] with [REDACTED] but as the Police did not come for over a year Rev Bullock "thought that Person A had become complacent". The Police then undertook the visit to Person A's [REDACTED] detailed above. In the meeting Rev Bullock felt that he should have contacted safeguarding when problems were being experienced finding housing for the family, but he did not think that he had put anyone at risk. He expressed

the view that Person A had been “growing in grace” and going in a positive direction before his family became homeless.

In his email to the TRA on 23 September 2025 Rev Bullock stated that it was his understanding that Person A was staying in the room in the parish centre “when no one was about” from 10.00pm until 7.00am.

In the Police report to the LADO meeting on 16 December 2019 there was an indication that the Police were aware that Rev Bullock had stated that he knew that Person A’s [REDACTED] were residing in Person A’s [REDACTED], and the Police had information that pointed to this being the case for five months. Rev Bullock had thought that Person A had been popping into [REDACTED] to shower and change as opposed to residing there.

The panel considered that Rev Bullock had a duty to report a safeguarding concern to the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Team when he was made aware by Person A that [REDACTED], including [REDACTED], had turned up at [REDACTED]. This represented a matter that Rev Bullock should have reported to the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Team. He should also have reported this to the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Team as a risk of a breach of the SOPO and the Safeguarding Agreement.

The panel considered that Person A’s [REDACTED] continuing to live at Person A’s [REDACTED] represented an on-going risk to Person A’s [REDACTED] which Rev Bullock should have reported to the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Team. These circumstances also represented a risk of a breach of the SOPO and the Safeguarding Agreement which Rev Bullock should also have reported to that team. Rev Bullock had an on-going duty to report these matters to the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Team.

Additionally, when Rev Bullock became aware, or indeed only thought, that Person A was visiting [REDACTED] at a time when Person A’s [REDACTED] were living there, and so may have had contact with [REDACTED], Rev Bullock had a duty to report this safeguarding concern to the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Team. This represented both a risk to Person A’s [REDACTED] and, also, a risk of a breach of the SOPO and the Safeguarding Agreement.

On the balance of probabilities the panel determined that Rev Bullock had been aware of, and should have reported, these safeguarding concerns to the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Team from around May 2018 to October 2018.

The panel noted that Person A was found at or near [REDACTED] alone with [REDACTED] by the Police in early October 2018. This demonstrated the realisation of the safeguarding risk posed to the [REDACTED] of Person A by Rev Bullock’s failure to meet his reporting obligations.

On this basis, and taking account of the admissions made by Rev Bullock, which the panel found to be consistent with the evidence before it, the panel found allegation 1(a) in

relation to Person A having contact with [REDACTED] proven and allegation 1(b) proven in relation to Person A being at risk of breaching the [REDACTED] and the Safeguarding Agreement.

The panel found 1(a) not proven in relation to Person A having seen [REDACTED] for the reason outlined above.

The panel found allegation 1(a) not proven in relation to Person A living with [REDACTED] as it was not satisfied to the required standard that Rev Bullock was aware that Person A was living with [REDACTED].

The panel found allegation 1(b) not proven in relation to Person A being in breach of the [REDACTED] as it was not satisfied to the required standard, on the evidence before it, that Rev Bullock had be aware that Person A had been in breach of the SOPO.

On this basis the panel found allegation 1(a) and 1(b) proven on the basis of the specifics identified above.

(c) searched for information on how to delete text messages from a Samsung mobile phone to seek to remove and/or assist in the removal of potential evidence.

Rev Bullock had denied this part of the allegation in response to the notice of referral.

In the [REDACTED] LADO Evaluation/Strategy meeting held in relation to Rev Bullock on 16 December 2019 the Police notified the meeting that they had evidence from Rev Bullock's mobile phone which showed that Rev Bullock had been researching "how to permanently delete text messages" on his mobile phone 30 minutes after the Police had "left the scene" on 7 October 2018 (incorrectly recorded as 2019).

Witness C, the School's investigating officer, gave evidence that he asked Rev Bullock about this issue in the School's investigation. Rev Bullock responded by acknowledging that he had looked at how to permanently delete texts from a Samsung mobile on his iPhone. Rev Bullock said he believed that Person A and [REDACTED] had been in communication on the evening of the Police visit to Person A's [REDACTED] and he had wished to ensure there was "no evidence of collusion". He said this was something he regretted.

The panel noted that at the time of the Police visit the Police had initially looked for Person A at [REDACTED], then in the room in the parish centre where they had been told by Person A's [REDACTED] that Person A had been living, and then again at Person A's [REDACTED], where they found Person A hiding with [REDACTED].

In the notes of Rev Bullock's School Disciplinary hearing on 2 April 2020, produced by Witness B, Rev Bullock is recorded as saying that he went to Person A's [REDACTED] "a

bit later”, after the Police had found Person A there, as he had left his telephone with the partner of Person A’s [REDACTED].

Rev Bullock in his response to the TRA’s notice of referral stated that if his “supposed action” in searching on his telephone on how to delete messages on a Samsung, as alleged, had taken place and had been designed to impede a police investigation, that he would have been charged by the Police about this (which he was not).

On the basis of the evidence of the Police and Witness C the panel found allegation 1(c) proven on the balance of probabilities. The panel found that Rev Bullock had undertaken the search on his telephone to seek to assist in the removal of potential evidence. However, the panel did not find that this was with a view to Rev Bullock himself seeking to remove potential evidence. It found that the search was undertaken with a view to messages being removed by another person. The panel considered, on the balance of probabilities, that this exchange was with a view to seeking to ensure that the breach by Person A of his SOPO went undetected and so the messages could have been potential evidence in any court proceedings that may have taken place in relation to that breach.

2. By your conduct in paragraphs 1(a) and 1(b) above, you failed to have proper regard for the need to safeguard children.

Rev Bullock had denied this part of the allegation in response to the notice of referral.

The panel considered that it would have been clear to Rev Bullock, in light of all of the information known to him, that the requirement for him to notify the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Team as detailed in allegations 1(a) and 1(b) arose from the risk that Person A posed to Person A’s [REDACTED].

By failing to notify the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Team of the matters detailed and found proven in allegations 1(a) and 1(b) Rev Bullock seriously failed to have proper regard for the need to safeguard children.

The panel found that Rev Bullock’s conduct in 1(a) and 1(b) was an on-going pattern of behaviour that showed a blatant disregard by Rev Bullock of his safeguarding responsibilities. The panel found that he deliberately and intentionally disregarded the need to adhere to measures and procedures put in place to safeguard children so putting them at risk. The panel was of the view that he had put the interests of Person A above the need to safeguard children. This appeared to the panel to be in keeping with the evidence before it of Rev Bullock’s disparaging attitude towards the implementation of the [REDACTED] safeguarding measures in relation to Person A. The panel was concerned by the attitude exhibited by Rev Bullock in subsequent comments in the public domain in relation to safeguarding.

On this basis the panel found allegation 2 proven.

3. By your conduct at paragraph 1(c) above you were dishonest.

Rev Bullock had denied this part of the allegation in response to the notice of referral. In

its consideration of the issue of dishonesty the panel took into consideration Rev Bullock's previous good character but considered that it carried little weight in the particular circumstances of this case.

The panel noted that Rev Bullock had admitted to Witness C that he had searched on his iPhone for how to permanently delete texts from a Samsung mobile. He had stated that he wished to assist in the deletion of messages which he considered evidenced "collusion". This appeared to be "collusion" between Person A and [REDACTED] at the time when the Police visited Person A's [REDACTED], seeking to locate Person A. The Police eventually found Person A hiding at his [REDACTED] (or nearby) alone with [REDACTED]. Rev Bullock had understood that Person A and [REDACTED] had been in communication about where the Police were.

The panel noted that Rev Bullock had stated during the School's investigations that he regretted his actions but subsequently denied taking these actions.

The panel noted that Rev Bullock undertook this search within a short time, possibly half an hour or so, after the Police had left Person A's home for the last time on the night of their visit to Person A's home. The panel considered that it was an intentional action on his behalf and one he chose to undertake.

On this basis the panel determined that Rev Bullock's actions were motivated by a wish to assist in deleting messages which he believed evidenced "collusion" designed to avoid the detection of Person A's breach of his [REDACTED] by the Police. The panel found that Rev Bullock must have been aware of the purpose for which the information he was searching was to be used, to seek to delete messages to avoid them being available to the Police as potential evidence in any proceedings connected to Person A's breach of his [REDACTED]. It was inconceivable that he would not have known that this was a dishonest act.

The panel considered that by the standards of ordinary decent people, and indeed by the standards of the profession, that such actions would be considered to be dishonest.

On this basis the panel found allegation 3 proven.

Findings as to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute

Having found all of the allegations proved, on the basis detailed above, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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 noted that Rev Bullock had stated in his account of relevant events provided on 23 September 2025 that the case “had nothing whatsoever to do with teaching or education or ... [the School]”.

The panel first considered whether the conduct of Rev Bullock, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Rev Bullock was in breach of the following standards:

A teacher is expected to demonstrate consistently high standards of personal and professional conduct...

- 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
 - 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 the conduct of Rev Bullock, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping children safe in education (“KCSIE”).

The panel considered that Rev Bullock was in breach of the following provisions: paragraph 2 (safeguarding of children being the responsibility of all practitioners).

The panel also considered whether Rev Bullock’s conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

The Advice indicates that where behaviours associated with such an offence exist, a panel is likely to conclude that an individual’s conduct would amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel found that the offence of serious dishonesty was relevant.

The panel considered that Rev Bullock’s failure to act in accordance with his duty to notify the relevant safeguarding team of serious safeguarding risks put children at serious risk of harm. He appeared to put the interests of a convicted sex offender above those of

children he had a responsibility to safeguard. His decision making showed a blatant and intentional disregard for his safeguarding responsibilities. In addition, in searching for information on how to delete text messages from a Samsung mobile phone to assist in the removal of potential evidence relevant to a breach by a sex offender of a SOPO, Rev Bullock had acted in a seriously dishonest manner and fundamentally undermined the safeguarding of children.

The panel noted that the allegations took place outside the education setting. However, Rev Bullock's actions demonstrated such fundamental and serious failings in safeguarding children and such serious dishonesty that it raised extremely serious concerns about whether he would take proper steps and follow procedures in place to safeguard children in his role as a teacher and to prevent them from being exposed to safeguarding risks.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Rev Bullock amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Rev Bullock was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Rev Bullock's actions amounted to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, the panel took into account the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. It considered the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel also took account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils' lives and the fact that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way that they behave.

In considering the issue of disrepute, the panel also considered whether Rev Bullock's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice.

As set out above in the panel's findings as to whether Rev Bullock was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the panel found that the offence of serious dishonesty was relevant.

The findings of misconduct are serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher.

The panel considered that Rev Bullock's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher.

For these reasons, the panel found that Rev Bullock's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel took into account assertions made by Rev Bullock that he was experiencing family difficulties but did not consider that it was relevant to the commission of the matters in the allegations.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute 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 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.

In the light of the panel's findings against Rev Bullock, which involved serious failings in the safeguarding of children and dishonesty linked to safeguarding issues, there was a very strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and other children.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Rev Bullock 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 Rev Bullock 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 Rev Bullock in the profession. Whilst there was some limited public interest considerations in retaining the teacher in the profession, since he had many years' service as a teacher and it had heard some

evidence of his ability as an educator when in a classroom setting, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Rev Bullock in the profession. His behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and he had seriously failed in his safeguarding responsibilities towards children and had been seriously dishonest.

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 Rev Bullock.

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;
- misconduct seriously affecting the safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- failure to act on evidence that indicated a child's welfare may have been at risk
- 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);
- actions or behaviours that ... undermine the fundamental British values of ... the rule of law;
- dishonesty; and
- collusion or concealment, with regard to his actions in seeking to assist with the removal of potential evidence.

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.

The panel found there was no evidence that Rev Bullock's actions were not deliberate.

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

Rev Bullock had a previously good history.

The panel noted that no references were provided from any colleagues that could attest to Rev Bullock's abilities as a teacher. Witness B, [REDACTED], had recorded that Rev Bullock obtained good results and was respected by the students at the School. She also told the panel that Rev Bullock was a good teacher in the classroom, although some questions had arisen about his teaching performance outside the classroom for example, with marking, meeting deadlines and his not wanting to follow rules.

The panel noted that Rev Bullock had believed that he was supporting Person A and Person A's [REDACTED] by his actions. At one time he stated that he felt he had been "groomed" by Person A, although the panel had no evidence of that before it. The panel also noted that Rev Bullock had admitted his failure to report safeguarding concerns and expressed regret. The panel also noted the indication from Rev Bullock that he had experienced family challenges and some health difficulties, although there was no medical evidence before the panel to support this.

However, the panel found no evidence of insight or that remedial action or reflection (save as to the impact of his actions on himself) had been undertaken by Rev Bullock, although he had had many years in which to focus on such matters if he had wished to do so. Indeed, the panel was concerned by various comments made by Rev Bullock, and made about him by others, which indicated that he did not value safeguarding processes and was hostile to the contributions made to safeguarding by the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Team. For example, at various times, he was referred to as having; a "dismissive attitude to efforts to apply good safeguarding practices with regard to Person A"; referencing the Safeguarding Agreement as "a load of fuss and unnecessary"; describing the concerns raised against him as "utter nonsense", and, his life being "ruined by the Kafka-esque incompetence and cruelty of the safeguarding industry which is marching full scale ahead into becoming a new Stasi".

The panel was also concerned that Rev Bullock's focus appeared to be on the impact of his conduct on himself rather than on the risk he had caused for children. There appeared to the panel to be no recognition by Rev Bullock of the seriousness of the concerns his conduct raised and the implications of that conduct in terms of the potential harm that a convicted sex offender could have had on children. He had independently taken a decision that there was no risk to children in a convicted sex offender having contact with them. It appeared to the panel that he had put the interests of a convicted sex offender above those of children. These issues led the panel to conclude therefore that there remained a very serious risk of repetition.

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 Rev Bullock 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 Rev Bullock. The serious risk his conduct represented for children, his dishonesty and the risk of repetition were significant factors in forming that opinion. His conduct so fundamentally breached his safeguarding responsibilities and put children at such serious risk that they undermined his position as a teacher at the School. 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.

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

However, the panel noted that it was not an exhaustive list. The panel considered that the serious risk to children posed by Rev Bullock's conduct, the seriousness of his dishonesty (particularly taking account of the safeguarding context in which it took place and the motivation for it), and Rev Bullock's lack of insight together with the risk of repetition were factors that were relevant and weighed in favour of not offering a review period.

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.

These include:

- serious dishonesty.

The panel considered that Rev Bullock's proven dishonesty was serious and demonstrated a fundamental undermining of his safeguarding responsibilities to children. However the panel was mindful that Rev Bullock's conduct in this case included not only

serious dishonesty but other serious conduct which put children at serious risk of harm and which weighed in favour of there being no review period.

As detailed above the panel had serious concerns at Rev Bullock's lack of insight and his wider attitude to safeguarding procedures, despite his having expressed acceptance of his failure to report safeguarding concerns and being "sorry" for not involving the relevant safeguarding team. This together with the seriousness of Rev Bullock's conduct, which put children at serious risk of harm, and the serious risk of repetition identified by the panel made it appropriate for the panel to consider no review period.

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 unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Rev Ross Jude Bullock should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Rev Bullock is in breach of the following standards:

- A teacher is expected to demonstrate consistently high standards of personal and professional conduct.
- 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
 - 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 the conduct of Rev Bullock, involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE).

The panel finds that the conduct of Rev Bullock fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include serious failings in the safeguarding of children and dishonesty linked to safeguarding issues.

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 unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, 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 Rev Bullock, 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 the light of the panel’s findings against Rev Bullock, which involved serious failings in the safeguarding of children and dishonesty linked to safeguarding issues, there was a very strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and other children.”

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, which the panel sets out as follows, “the panel found no evidence of insight or that remedial action or reflection (save as to the impact of his actions on himself) had been undertaken by Rev Bullock, although he had had many years in which to focus on such matters if he had wished to do so. Indeed, the panel was concerned by various comments made by Rev Bullock, and made about him by others, which indicated that he did not value safeguarding processes and was hostile to the contributions made to safeguarding by the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Team. For example, at various times, he was referred to as having; a “dismissive attitude to efforts to apply good safeguarding practices with regard to Person A”; referencing the Safeguarding Agreement as “a load of fuss and unnecessary”; describing the concerns raised against him as “utter nonsense”, and, his life being

“ruined by the Kafka-esque incompetence and cruelty of the safeguarding industry which is marching full scale ahead into becoming a new Stasi”.

In my judgement, the lack of insight 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 considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Rev Bullock were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of safeguarding failings and dishonesty in this case and the impact that such findings have 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 unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, 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 Rev Bullock himself and the panel comment “Rev Bullock had a previously good history.”

“The panel noted that no references were provided from any colleagues that could attest to Rev Bullock’s abilities as a teacher. Witness B, [REDACTED], had recorded that Rev Bullock obtained good results and was respected by the students at the School. She also told the panel that Rev Bullock was a good teacher in the classroom, although some questions had arisen about his teaching performance outside the classroom for example, with marking, meeting deadlines and his not wanting to follow rules.”

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments concerning the lack of insight. The panel has said, “The panel was also concerned that Rev Bullock’s focus appeared to be on the impact of his conduct on himself rather than on the risk he had caused for children. There appeared to the panel to be no recognition by Rev Bullock of the seriousness of the concerns his conduct raised and the implications of that conduct

in terms of the potential harm that a convicted sex offender could have had on children. He had independently taken a decision that there was no risk to children in a convicted sex offender having contact with them. It appeared to the panel that he had put the interests of a convicted sex offender above those of children. These issues led the panel to conclude therefore that there remained a very serious risk of repetition.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding panel that “The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Rev Bullock. The serious risk his conduct represented for children, his dishonesty and the risk of repetition were significant factors in forming that opinion. His conduct so fundamentally breached his safeguarding responsibilities and put children at such serious risk that they undermined his position as a teacher at the School.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Rev Bullock 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 full insight, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

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

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

I have considered the panel’s comments “The panel considered that Rev Bullock’s proven dishonesty was serious and demonstrated a fundamental undermining of his safeguarding responsibilities to children. However the panel was mindful that Rev Bullock’s conduct in this case included not only serious dishonesty but other serious conduct which put children at serious risk of harm and which weighed in favour of there being no review period.”

The panel has also said “As detailed above the panel had serious concerns at Rev Bullock’s lack of insight and his wider attitude to safeguarding procedures, despite his having expressed acceptance of his failure to report safeguarding concerns and being “sorry” for not involving the relevant safeguarding team. This together with the seriousness of Rev Bullock’s conduct, which put children at serious risk of harm, and the serious risk of repetition identified by the panel made it appropriate for the panel to consider no review period.”

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 findings, the lack of insight and the serious 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 Rev Ross Jude Bullock 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 Rev Bullock 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.

Rev Bullock 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: 30 October 2025

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