



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Paul Jones: Professional conduct panel meeting 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	5
Statement of Agreed Facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	9
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 Paul Jones

**Teacher ref number:** 1282288

**Teacher date of birth:** 16 December 1973

**TRA reference:** 22574

**Date of determination:** 17 December 2025

**Former employer:** Simply Education, Bedford (the “School”)

## **Introduction**

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

The panel members were Mr Paul Hawkins (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Bernie Whittle (teacher panellist) and Mr Scott Evans (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Elizabeth Gilbert of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Callum Heywood of Browne Jacobson LLP solicitors.

Mr Jones was not present and was not represented.

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 Jones that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Jones provided a signed Statement of Agreed Facts and admitted that he was convicted of a relevant offence. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, Mr Jones or his representative.

The meeting took place in private.

## Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Meeting dated 3 October 2025.

It was alleged that Mr Jones was convicted of a relevant offence in that on 16 July 2024, he was convicted at Cambridge Crown Court of:

1. One or more counts of taking Indecent photograph or pseudo photograph of children contrary to the Protection of Children Act 1978 section 1 on or before or between:
  - a. 24.09.2019 and 05.08.2022;
  - b. 30.08.2021 and 07.04.2022;
  - c. 20.08.2022 and 20.08.2022.
2. One or more counts of making an Indecent photograph or pseudo photograph of children contrary to the Protection of Children Act 1978 section 1(a) on or before 28.04.2023.
3. One or more counts of Voyeurism – Record a person doing a private act contrary to the Sexual Offences Act 2003 section 67(3) on or before or between:
  - a. 24.09.2019;
  - b. 17.03.2020 and 09.05.2021;
  - c. 29.05.2021;
  - d. 29.05.2021 and 05.08.2022;
  - e. 05.09.2021 and 07.04.2023;
  - f. 14.07.2022 and 25.08.2022.
4. One or more counts of possession of prohibited images of children contrary to the Coroners and Justice Act 2009 section 62(1) on or between 28.04.2023.

In the Statement of Agreed Facts dated 1 August 2025, Mr Jones admitted allegations 1, 2, 3 and 4 and that his admitted conduct constituted a conviction of a relevant offence.

[REDACTED]

## Summary of evidence

## Documents

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

Section 1: Notice of referral and response – pages 4 to 8

Section 2: Statement of Agreed Facts and representations – pages 13 to 20

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 22 to 96

Section 4: Teacher documents – pages 99 to 101

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the meeting.

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 dated 1 August 2025 which was signed by Mr Jones.

## 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 Jones 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 Jones was employed as a supply teacher at the School from 7 October 2014 to 28 April 2023.

Mr Jones was referred to the TRA on 15 September 2023.

## 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:

**You have been convicted of a relevant offence in that on 15 April 2024, you were convicted at Cambridge Crown Court of:**

- 1. One or more counts of taking Indecent photograph or pseudo photograph of children contrary to the Protection of Children Act 1978 section 1 on or before or between:**
  - a) 24.09.2019 and 05.08.2022;**
  - b) 30.08.2021 and 07.04.2022;**
  - c) 20.08.2022 and 20.08.2022.**
- 2. One or more counts of making an Indecent photograph or pseudo photograph of children contrary to the Protection of Children Act 1978 section 1(a) on or before 28.04.2023.**
- 3. One or more counts of Voyeurism – Record a person doing a private act contrary to the Sexual Offences Act 2003 section 67(3) on or before or between:**
  - a) 24.09.2019;**
  - b) 17.03.2020 and 09.05.2021;**
  - c) 29.05.2021;**
  - d) 29.05.2021 and 05.08.2022;**
  - e) 05.09.2021 and 07.04.2023;**
  - f) 25.08.2022.**
- 4. One or more counts of possession of prohibited images of children contrary to the Coroners and Justice Act 2009 section 62(1) on or between 28.04.2023.**

In the Statement of Agreed Facts, Mr Jones admitted that he was convicted of each of the offences set out in allegations 1, 2, 3 and 4 and the certificate of conviction.

Mr Jones further admitted in the Statement of Agreed Facts that:

- On 28 April 2023, Mr Jones was arrested at his place of work by [REDACTED]. The police had received intelligence that indicated Mr Jones had downloaded indecent images of children at his home address. A search was undertaken of Mr Jones' home address, and 26 devices were seized including an SD card containing video footage

of [REDACTED]. The footage included sexual activity between [REDACTED]. Mr Jones had installed cameras within the bathroom and the bedroom [REDACTED].

- Mr Jones made admissions at interview. As part of his interview Mr Jones confirmed that he had been using file sharing platforms for at least 5 years prior to his arrest and that he had been recording [REDACTED] for several years.
- The matter was first heard before the Peterborough Magistrates Court on 15 April 2024 where Mr Jones indicated guilty pleas in respect of all charges and thereafter was committed for sentence at Cambridge Crown Court on 16 July 2024.
- Mr Jones was sentenced to concurrent sentences of imprisonment, the longest of which was 56 months after plea.

The panel considered a certificate of conviction from Cambridge Crown Court, confirming that Mr Jones was convicted on 15 April 2024 of the offences particularised in allegations 1, 2, 3 and 4. The panel noted that Mr Jones was sentenced on 16 July 2024 to concurrent sentences of imprisonment, the longest of which was 56 months after his guilty plea.

The panel considered the transcript of the sentencing remarks dated 16 July 2024, summarising the offences and the reason for the sentence imposed. The panel noted the following remarks in relation to Mr Jones' conduct [REDACTED]:

- "The most serious aspect of your offending is the breach of trust";
- "They trusted you to be safe"; and
- "You breached that trusts [sic] in a very serious way".

The panel noted that there was no evidence showing that there were any exceptional circumstances to call into question the facts necessarily implied by the conviction. The panel therefore accepted the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of the commission of these offences by Mr Jones.

The panel therefore found allegations 1(a) to (c), 2, 3(a) to (f) and 4 proven.

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

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

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Jones 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
  - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
  - not undermining the rule of law
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel noted that Mr Jones' actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting, as Mr Jones' convictions relate to indecent images and sexual offences against children.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offences could have an impact on the safety and security of pupils and members of the public, given the harm caused by sexual offences against children and the creation of indecent images.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Jones' 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 Jones' behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed.

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

The panel considered Mr Jones' behaviour to be grave, as he was convicted of multiple sexual offences over a prolonged period of time. The panel noted that Mr Jones' behaviour in committing the offences was calculated and took advantage of his position of trust in relation to vulnerable children [REDACTED].

The panel saw no evidence in relation to Mr Jones' previous ability as a teacher or any other mitigating circumstances. Even had the panel seen such evidence, the panel found the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the convictions was relevant to Mr Jones' fitness to be a teacher. The panel considered a finding that the convictions were a relevant offence was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession. As such, the panel found that allegations 1 to 4 each amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

## 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 a 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; and
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Jones which involved convictions of a relevant offence, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils. The serious findings relating to sexual offences against children and indecent images raises significant public and child protection concerns.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Jones 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 Jones 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 Jones in the profession. The panel saw no evidence that Mr Jones had abilities as an educator. The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Jones 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 a high 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 in terms of its potential influence on pupils and be seen as a possible 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 Jones.

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;
- abuse of position or trust;
- sexual misconduct, e.g. involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature;
- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing, or publishing any indecent photograph or image, or indecent pseudo photograph or image, of a child, or permitting such activity, including one-off incidents;
- 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 rule of law; and
- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour.

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

The panel considered that Mr Jones' actions were deliberate, as he installed cameras [REDACTED].

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Jones was acting under extreme duress, such as due to a physical threat or significant intimidation.

There was no evidence of Mr Jones having demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or having contributed significantly to the education sector. Similarly, the panel saw no evidence that showed Mr Jones was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings/warnings.

The panel was not provided with any character references regarding Mr Jones. As such, the panel did not accept that the incident was out of character.

Whilst the panel noted from the sentencing remarks dated 16 July 2024 that “no actual actions to [REDACTED]” had been taken by Mr Jones, the Judge noted the following aggravating factors:

- The criminal acts of a sexual nature occurred over “a reasonably substantial length of time”;
- Mr Jones “organised - intentionally, deliberately - cameras and videos to record” for himself;
- The “most serious aspect” of Mr Jones’ offending was “the breach of trust” towards children [REDACTED] as they “trusted” Mr Jones to be safe but he “breached that trust in a very serious way”;
- The Judge stated it was “quite clear” that Mr Jones was “quite obsessed with questions of sex and younger people, in particular those that were very easy” for him to get.

In light of the above sentencing remarks, the panel was satisfied that Mr Jones’ offending behaviour was a calculated course of conduct in serious breach of his position of trust [REDACTED].

Whilst Mr Jones admitted allegations 1 to 4, the panel noted that there was no evidence of Mr Jones displaying any remorse for his actions. As such, the panel was not satisfied that Mr Jones demonstrated any insight into his conduct and therefore the panel considered that the risk of him repeating his behaviour is high.

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 or 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 Jones 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 Jones. Mr Jones' offending behaviour was deliberate and in clear breach of his position of trust, which was a significant factor in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate for it to decide to recommend a review period of the order. The panel was mindful that the Advice states that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances, in any given case, that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 2 years.

The Advice indicates that there are certain types of cases where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period. These include serious sexual misconduct, any sexual misconduct involving a child and 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 noted these cases were relevant to Mr Jones' offending behaviour.

The panel considered that Mr Jones' behaviour was extremely serious, as Mr Jones' offending behaviour was of a sexual nature in relation to vulnerable children [REDACTED]. The panel considered there to be a risk of Mr Jones repeating his behaviour, as the panel saw no evidence that Mr Jones was remorseful or that he showed any insight into the harm caused by his behaviour.

The panel noted that public confidence in the profession could be seriously damaged if Mr Jones was provided any opportunity to return to teaching. The panel considered that any contribution that Mr Jones could make to the teaching profession in the future was outweighed by the seriousness of his conduct.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Jones 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
  - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
  - not undermining the rule of law
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of a relevant conviction related to indecent images of children and sexual offences against children, which led to a sentence of 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 Jones, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

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

“In light of the panel’s findings against Mr Jones which involved convictions of a relevant offence, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils. The serious findings relating to sexual offences against children and indecent images raises significant public and child protection concerns.”

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 remorse and insight, which the panel has set out as follows:

"Whilst Mr Jones admitted allegations 1 to 4, the panel noted that there was no evidence of Mr Jones displaying any remorse for his actions. As such, the panel was not satisfied that Mr Jones demonstrated any insight into his conduct and therefore the panel considered that the risk of him repeating his behaviour is high."

In my judgement, the lack of evidence of remorse and 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 has observed:

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

I am particularly mindful of the finding of a relevant conviction for multiple sexual offences 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 Jones himself. The panel has commented:

"There was no evidence of Mr Jones having demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or having contributed significantly to the education sector. Similarly, the panel saw no evidence that showed Mr Jones was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings/warnings.

The panel was not provided with any character references regarding Mr Jones. As such, the panel did not accept that the incident was out of character.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Jones 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 evidence of remorse and insight, and the serious nature of Mr Jones’ offending behaviour over a lengthy period. The panel has said:

“The panel considered Mr Jones’ behaviour to be grave, as he was convicted of multiple sexual offences over a prolonged period of time. The panel noted that Mr Jones’ behaviour in committing the offences was calculated and took advantage of his position of trust in relation to vulnerable children [REDACTED].”

I have also noted the panel’s references to the Judge’s sentencing remarks, including:

“The Judge stated it was “quite clear” that Mr Jones was “quite obsessed with questions of sex and younger people, in particular those that were very easy” for him to get.”

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

I have considered the panel’s comments:

“The Advice indicates that there are certain types of cases where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period. These include serious sexual misconduct, any sexual misconduct involving a child and 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 noted these cases were relevant to Mr Jones’ offending behaviour.

The panel considered that Mr Jones' behaviour was extremely serious, as Mr Jones' offending behaviour was of a sexual nature in relation to vulnerable children [REDACTED]. The panel considered there to be a risk of Mr Jones repeating his behaviour, as the panel saw no evidence that Mr Jones was remorseful or that he showed any insight into the harm caused by his behaviour."

I have considered whether not allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the serious nature of the sexual offences against children of which Mr Jones was convicted and received a custodial sentence, the lack of evidence of remorse and insight, 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 Paul Jones 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 Jones 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 Jones has a right of appeal to the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this order.



**Decision maker: David Oatley**

**Date: 19 December 2025**

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