



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Peter Jenkins: Professional conduct panel outcome**

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

**December 2025**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	8
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	12

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

**Teacher:** Mr Peter Jenkins

**Teacher ref number:** 9155401

**Teacher date of birth:** 18 August 1969

**TRA reference:** 19576

**Date of determination:** 4 December 2025

**Former employer:** Whitecross Hereford, Hereford

## **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 4 December 2025 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Jenkins.

The panel members were Mr Francis Murphy (teacher panellist – in the chair), Ms Gill Lyon (teacher panellist) and Ms Katharine Leale (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Nicoletta Czajkowska of Eversheds Sutherland (International) 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 Jenkins that the allegation be considered without a hearing.

Mr Jenkins provided a signed statement of agreed facts and notice of referral form in which he admitted conviction of a relevant offence. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer or Mr Jenkins.

The meeting took place in private.

## **Allegations**

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 18 November 2025.

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

On 27 July 2022 at Warwick Crown Court, he was convicted of, and on 12 August 2022 he was sentenced for, the following relevant offences:

1. 7 offences of indecent assault on a female under 14, contrary to s.14 of the Sexual Offences Act 1956, s.14
2. 2 offences of intercourse with a girl under 13, contrary to s.5 of the Sexual Offences Act 1956
3. 1 offence of sexual assault (intentionally touching a female, no penetration), contrary to s.3 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003
4. 3 offences of gross indecency with a child (Girl) under 16, contrary to s.1(1) of the Indecency With Children Act 1960
5. 1 offence of rape (female under 16 years), contrary to s.1(1) of the Sexual Offences Act 1956
6. 1 offence of attempted indecent assault on a female under 16, contrary to s.14 of the Sexual Offences Act 1956

Mr Jenkins admitted in a statement of agreed facts that he has been convicted of the relevant offences.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section 1: Chronology and List of Key People – pages 3 to 4

Section 2: Notice of Referral, Response and Notice of Meeting – pages 5 to 21b

Section 3: Statement of Agreed Facts and Presenting Officer Representations – pages 22 to 28

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency Documents – pages 29 to 85

## Section 5: Teacher Documents – pages 89 to 95

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”).

## 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 Jenkins 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.

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Jenkins on 28 September 2025.

Mr Jenkins reported himself to the police on 20 January 2020. He was interviewed voluntarily under caution and admitted committing various sexual offences against five victims between 1984 and 2005 while he was a teacher. Mr Jenkins accepted that some of the offending involved pupils he taught.

He was subsequently charged with various sexual offences relating to those victims.

On 27 July 2022, Mr Jenkins pleaded guilty to the offences at Warwick Crown Court.

His last known employment as a teacher was at Whitecross High School, where he served as Head of Religious Education from 1 September 1999 to 31 August 2006.

The matter was referred to the TRA on 13 October 2020.

Mr Jenkins was made the subject of an interim prohibition order by the TRA on 1 June 2023.

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

**You have been convicted, at any time, of a relevant offence, in that on 27 July 2022 at Warwick Crown Court you were convicted of, and on 12 August 2022 you were sentenced for, the following relevant offences: court in or around 2024 one or more counts of:**

**1. 7 offences of indecent assault on a female under 14, contrary to s.14 of the Sexual Offences Act 1956, s.14**

**2. 2 offences of intercourse with a girl under 13, contrary to s.5 of the Sexual Offences Act 1956**

**3. 1 offence of sexual assault (intentionally touching a female, no penetration), contrary to s.3 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003**

**4. 3 offences of gross indecency with a child (Girl) under 16, contrary to s.1(1) of the Indecency With Children Act 1960**

**5. 1 offence of rape (female under 16 years), contrary to s.1(1) of the Sexual Offences Act 1956**

**6. 1 offence of attempted indecent assault on a female under 16, contrary to s.14 of the Sexual Offences Act 1956**

The panel considered the certificate of conviction confirming Mr Jenkins' convictions of the alleged offences. The panel accepted the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of both the convictions and the facts necessarily implied by the convictions.

The certificate of conviction showed that Mr Jenkins was convicted of 15 offences:

- Seven counts of indecent assault on a girl under 14 years of age;
- Two counts of unlawful sexual intercourse with a girl under 13 years of age;
- Three counts of gross indecency with a girl under the age of 16 years of age;
- Rape of a female under 16 years of age;
- Attempt to indecently assault a girl under the age of 16 years of age; and
- Sexual assault on a female

The judge ordered that Mr Jenkins receive a custodial sentence of 13 years imprisonment.

Mr Jenkins was also subject to a Sex Offenders' Notification Requirements indefinitely and to a Sexual Harm Prevention Order until a further order. The judge also imposed a Restraining Order on Mr Jenkins in respect of two of the victims.

The panel noted that Mr Jenkins confirmed in his statements of agreed facts that he pleaded guilty to all 15 offences on 27 July 2022 at Warwick Crown Court and was sentenced on 12 August 2022.

The panel therefore find the allegations proven.

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

Having found the allegation proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of this proved allegation amounted to 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 offences were committed by Mr Jenkins prior to the coming into force of Teachers' Standards. The panel had regard to its knowledge and experience of teaching standards at that time and considered that breaching trust as a teacher and engaging in a sexual activity with a pupil, which constituted a criminal offence that Mr Jenkins has been convicted of, would fall way below the standard expected of a teacher at the time.

The panel noted that the individual's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting. The panel noted that these actions relate to Mr Jenkins' breach of trust as a teacher in engaging in sexual activity with a pupil and his position within church groups. The panel further noted the sentencing remarks from the Judge:

*"The veneer of respectability in terms of your position as a school teacher and your position within church groups hid the awful reality of your predatory behaviour towards young girls which had persisted well into your 30s."*

The panel found that the behaviour involved in committing the offences would have had an impact on the safety and security of pupils.

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

The panel noted that Mr Jenkins' behaviour led to a significant sentence of imprisonment of 13 years and lifelong Sex Offenders' Notification Requirements and a Sexual Harm

Prevention Order and this was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed. In addition to the sentencing remarks from the sentencing Judge: “*You are, of course, a dangerous offender by reason of these offences*” and “*you are in my view a dangerous offender*”.

The panel also considered the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice. This was a case concerning serious offences involving sexual activity, which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence. The panel considered these offences to be at the most serious end of the spectrum.

There was no significant mitigation presented to the panel in the bundle or reflected in the sentencing remarks, other than Mr Jenkins having reported himself to the police and having pleaded guilty to the offences.

The panel considered that a finding that these convictions were for relevant offences was necessary.

## **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, declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct

In the light of the panel’s findings against Mr Jenkins which involved committing offences of serious sexual misconduct against children, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of inappropriate relationships with children and abuse of trust.

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

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

The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Jenkins in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and he exploited 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. The panel noted that a teacher's behaviour that seeks to exploit their position of trust should be viewed very seriously and be seen as a threat to the public interest.

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 Jenkins.

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 expected of teachers;
- 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);
- an abuse of any trust, knowledge, or influence gained through their professional position in order to advance a romantic or sexual relationship with a pupil or former pupil;
- 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;
- violation of the rights of pupils;

- actions or behaviours that promote extremist political or religious views or attitudes, or that undermine fundamental British values of democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty, and mutual respect and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs. This would encompass deliberately allowing the exposure of pupils to such actions or behaviours, including through contact with any individuals who are widely known to express views that support such activity, for example by inviting any such individuals to speak in schools;
- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour;
- 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.

The panel found that Mr Jenkins' actions were deliberate.

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

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

Mr Jenkins did not provide any character statements or mitigation. However, the panel noted that Mr Jenkins reported himself to the police after 16 years and admitted to all of the offences without a complaint being first made against him. In mitigation the panel noted the sentencing remarks of the Judge:

*"It is extremely rare in my experience in the context of sexual offending, where, as we know, many such offenders dispute their offending and put their victims to the additional trauma of being accused of lying during a trial. For many of them that trauma is as unpleasant as the offending. You have not done that and so substantial credit is justified."*

Mr Jenkins received a lengthy prison sentence for 13 years, however, noting the sentencing remarks on the effect of the victims :

*"No sentence could ever compensate them for your abuse of them and the consequential life-long emotional distress they have suffered. Obviously, you have caused them irreparable harm."*

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 prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Jenkins. The seriousness of the offending involving children, the breach of trust, the lengthy prison sentence, indefinite Sex Offenders' Notification Requirements and a Sexual Harm Prevention Order 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.

This includes:

- serious sexual misconduct e.g. where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons, particularly where the individual has used their professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons;
- any sexual misconduct involving a child;

The Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate.

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

Given that the panel received no evidence of remediation, remorse, or insight, and taking into account the severity, nature, duration, and number of offences committed against different victims, the panel was highly concerned about the risk of repetition.

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

In regards to the Teachers' Standards, the panel has noted:

"The offences were committed by Mr Jenkins prior to the coming into force of Teachers' Standards. The panel had regard to its knowledge and experience of teaching standards at that time and considered that breaching trust as a teacher and engaging in a sexual activity with a pupil, which constituted a criminal offence that Mr Jenkins has been convicted of, would fall way below the standard expected of a teacher at the time."

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of a conviction for sexual offences involving children including rape and indecent assault, which resulted in a custodial sentence of 13 years imprisonment.

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

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children and safeguard pupils. The panel has observed. "In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Jenkins which involved committing offences of serious sexual misconduct against children, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious findings of inappropriate relationships with children and abuse of trust." A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel's comment that it had "received no evidence of remediation, remorse, or insight" on the part of Mr Jenkins. In my judgement, the lack of evidence of insight and remorse means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel has observed that "public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Jenkins were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession." I am particularly mindful of the finding of conviction for serious sexual offences involving 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 Jenkins himself. The panel has commented, "There was no evidence that Mr Jenkins demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or had contributed significantly to the education sector."

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Jenkins 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 serious nature of the offences committed against children, which resulted in lengthy custodial sentence. The panel has said that it "was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Jenkins. The seriousness of the offending involving children, the breach of trust, the lengthy prison sentence, indefinite Sex Offenders' Notification Requirements and a Sexual Harm Prevention Order were significant factors in forming that opinion."

I have also taken into account the panel's comments about the lack of evidence of insight and remorse.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Mr Jenkins has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

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

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

The panel has noted that the Advice states that, in any cases involving serious sexual misconduct or any sexual misconduct involving a child, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period. The panel has also reflected that "Given that the panel received no evidence of remediation, remorse, or insight, and taking into account the severity, nature, duration, and number of offences committed against different victims, the panel was highly concerned about the risk of repetition."

I have considered whether not allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the serious nature of the sexual offences against children of which Mr Jenkins was convicted, the lack of evidence of insight and remorse, and the risk of repetition.

I consider therefore that allowing for no review period is necessary to maintain public confidence and is proportionate and in the public interest.

**This means that Mr Peter Jenkins is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England.** Furthermore, in view of the seriousness of the allegation found proved against him, I have decided that Mr Jenkins 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 Peter Jenkins 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 "David Oatley".

**Decision maker: David Oatley**

**Date: 10 December 2025**

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