



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Jeremy Gibbs: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome**

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

**January 2026**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	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	11

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

<b>Teacher:</b>	Mr Jeremy Gibbs
<b>Teacher ref number:</b>	9243835
<b>Teacher date of birth:</b>	17 May 1965
<b>TRA reference:</b>	22651
<b>Date of determination:</b>	28 January 2026
<b>Former employer:</b>	Supporting Education Group (supply agency)

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 28 January 2026 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Jeremy Gibbs.

The panel members were Mrs Michelle Chappell (teacher panellist – in the chair), Ms Katie Dent (lay panellist) and Mr Steven Boocock (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Ben Schofield of Blake Morgan LLP.

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 Gibbs that the allegation be considered without a hearing. Mr Gibbs provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted being convicted of a relevant offence. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer of the TRA and Mr Gibbs.

The meeting took place in private.

## **Allegations**

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 9 January 2026.

It was alleged that Mr Gibbs was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that on 20 August 2024, at Colchester Magistrates' Court, he was convicted of the following:

1. On 28 September 2023, making indecent photographs or pseudo photographs of children of Category A, comprising 25 still images and 45 videos, contrary to section 1(a) of the Protection of Children Act 1978.
2. On 28 September 2023, making indecent photographs or pseudo photographs of children of Category B, comprising 56 still images and 45 videos, contrary to section 1(a) of the Protection of Children Act 1978.
3. On 28 September 2023, making indecent photographs or pseudo photographs of children of Category C, comprising 105 still images and 154 videos, contrary to section 1(a) of the Protection of Children Act 1978.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

Section 1: Notice of referral, response, and notice of meeting – pages 2 to 21

Section 2: Statement of agreed facts – pages 22 to 23

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 24 to 48

Section 4: Teacher documents – page 49

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

In the consideration of this case, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession 2020 (the "Procedures").

### **Statement of agreed facts**

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Gibbs on 21 September 2025.

## Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

Mr Gibbs was engaged by Supporting Education Group from 2020 as a supply teacher. He predominantly taught art to secondary and sixth form aged pupils.

On 28 September 2023, Mr Gibbs was arrested by the police under suspicion of possessing indecent images of children. Various electronic devices belonging to Mr Gibbs were seized and inspected by the police. In an interview with the police, Mr Gibbs admitted accessing indecent images of children.

Following his arrest, the police referred its investigation to the TRA on 16 October 2023.

The police found the following images on Mr Gibbs' laptop:

- 25 still images and 45 videos at Category A.
- 56 still images and 45 videos at Category B.
- 105 still images and 154 videos at Category C.

The police described that the majority of the children that appeared in the images were around 10 years old.

The Sentencing Council defines the three categories as:

- Category A: Images involving penetrative sexual activity or images involving sexual activity with an animal or sadism.
- Category B: Images involving non-penetrative sexual activity.
- Category C: Other indecent images not falling within categories A or B.

Following the police's investigation, Mr Gibbs was charged with 'making' these images, a definition which also covers downloading such material from the internet, and therefore 'making' a copy of it.

Mr Gibbs appeared before Colchester Magistrates' Court on 20 August 2024 and pleaded guilty to the offences. He was committed for sentence to the Crown Court and appeared before Basildon Crown Court on 11 November 2024 where he was sentenced as follows:

- A total of 6 months' imprisonment, suspended for 18 months.
- To attend up to 40 days of 'rehabilitation activity requirements', as directed by the Probation Service.

- To complete 150 hours of unpaid work.

Mr Gibbs was also made subject to a Sexual Harm Prevention Order for a period of 5 years, which placed conditions on his use of the internet and notification requirements under the Sexual Offences Act 2003 (commonly referred to as the 'sex offenders register') for a period of 7 years.

Following the criminal proceedings, Supporting Education Group also made a referral to the TRA on 19 November 2024.

## Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

**...on 20 August 2024, at Colchester Magistrates' Court, you were convicted of the following:**

- 1. On 28 September 2023, making indecent photographs or pseudo photographs of children of Category A, comprising 25 still images and 45 videos, contrary to section 1(a) of the Protection of Children Act 1978.**
- 2. On 28 September 2023, making indecent photographs or pseudo photographs of children of Category B, comprising 56 still images and 45 videos, contrary to section 1(a) of the Protection of Children Act 1978.**
- 3. On 28 September 2023, making indecent photographs or pseudo photographs of children of Category C, comprising 105 still images and 154 videos, contrary to section 1(a) of the Protection of Children Act 1978.**

Before the panel was a copy of a certificate of conviction from Basildon Crown Court and signed by an officer of the court. The certificate set out Mr Gibbs's personal details and that he was convicted at Colchester Magistrates' Court on 20 August 2024 of the three above offences. It also set out the sentence and ancillary orders made by the Crown Court.

The panel noted that the contents of the certificate was entirely consistent with the statement of agreed facts, sentencing remarks of the Crown Court judge and other surrounding evidence in the bundle.

The panel took into account the document known as *Teacher Misconduct: The Prohibition of Teachers*, which is further referred to as "the Advice". The Advice sets out (at paragraph 15):

*"[T]he panel will accept the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction, unless exceptional circumstances apply."*

The panel saw no reason to depart from the advice and did not consider there were any exceptional circumstances present. Therefore in light of the certificate, the panel found the factual elements of this allegation proved.

## Findings as to a conviction of a relevant offence

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

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

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
  - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
  - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs
- 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 'Keeping children safe in education 2023' (the statutory guidance to schools on safeguarding principles) sets out:

*"Safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children is everyone's responsibility. 'Children' includes everyone under the age of 18. Everyone who comes into contact with children and their families has a role to play. In order to fulfil this responsibility effectively, all practitioners should make sure their approach is child centred. This means that they should consider, at all times, what is in the best interests of the child."*

Mr Gibbs' actions were the opposite of this fundamental principle.

The panel noted that Mr Gibbs' actions were plainly relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting as the victims of his offending behaviour were young children who had been recorded being sexually abused, and those images distributed over the internet.

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

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Gibbs' 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 and the trust placed by them to properly safeguard pupils and children.

The panel noted that Mr Gibbs' behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, (albeit that it was suspended), which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed.

The panel also considered the offences listed on page 12 onwards of the Advice. This was a case concerning *“any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or pseudo photograph or image of a child, or permitting any such activity, including one-off incidents”*, which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

In considering these factors the panel considered that Mr Gibbs' conviction was for 'relevant offences'.

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

Given the panel's findings in respect of a conviction of relevant offences, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be made, the panel had to consider whether it would be an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it would be in the public interest to do so. Prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect. The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely:

- the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils
- the maintenance of public confidence in the profession
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Gibbs, which involved downloading a large number of images and videos of children being sexually abused (covering all three categories), there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the

safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils. Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Gibbs 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 Gibbs was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

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 Gibbs.

The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours of a teacher have been proved. In the list of such behaviours, those that were relevant in this case were:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of the Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing, or publishing any indecent photograph or image, or indecent pseudo photograph or image, of a child, or permitting such activity, including one-off incidents;

Even though some of the 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 the list of factors at paragraph 43 of the Advice. The panel considered that none of those listed factors applied in this case. Mr Gibbs' actions were deliberate. He was not acting under duress. There was no evidence before the panel of Mr Gibbs' demonstrating exceptionally high standards or significantly contributing to the education sector.

The panel did take into account that Mr Gibbs had fully engaged with the regulatory process and there were no previous regulatory findings against him.

The panel also noted the following mitigating factors present from the criminal proceedings:

- Mr Gibbs made early and full admissions to the police in his interview.

- He pleaded guilty at the first opportunity.
- He had engaged with a counsellor and preventative organisation called “Stop It Now”.

Mr Gibbs had provided a reflective statement to the panel, in which he stated he was “*deeply ashamed of my conduct*” and “*want to apologise for any disrepute that I may have caused the teaching profession*”. The panel noted that Mr Gibbs’ statement made no reference at all to the children who were the victims of his offences. When talking of the “*hurt and trauma experienced*” by others resulting from his behaviour, Mr Gibbs only made reference to its impact [REDACTED]. The panel considered that Mr Gibbs’ statement demonstrated a poor level of insight into his offending behaviour and any remorse shown was superficial in its nature.

The panel first considered whether it would be proportionate to conclude this case with no recommendation of prohibition, considering whether the publication of the findings made by the panel would be sufficient.

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings would be sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Gibbs 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 Gibbs. The significant erosion of public trust in the profession that would occur if restrictive regulatory action was not taken was a significant factor in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

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

The Advice indicates that there are certain types of case where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period.

One of these includes “*any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or indecent pseudo photograph or image of a child, including one off incidents*”.

The panel saw no reason to depart from the guidance in the Advice in this case. The panel further noted that this was not a 'one off incident'. There was a significant volume of images and videos in this case, covering all three categories.

The panel therefore 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 a relevant conviction

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Jeremy Gibbs should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Gibbs is in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
  - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
  - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs
- 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 Mr Gibbs involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance 'Keeping children safe in education'.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a teacher being convicted of making indecent photographs or pseudo photographs of children.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In assessing 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 Gibbs, 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 comments:

“In the light of the panel’s findings against Mr Gibbs, which involved downloading a large number of images and videos of children being sexually abused (covering all three categories), there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils.”

A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel’s comments on insight and remorse, which it sets out as follows:

“Mr Gibbs had provided a reflective statement to the panel, in which he stated he was *“deeply ashamed of my conduct”* and *“want to apologise for any disrepute that I may have caused the teaching profession”*. The panel noted that Mr Gibbs’ statement made no reference at all to the children who were the victims of his offences. When talking of the *“hurt and trauma experienced”* by others resulting from his behaviour, Mr Gibbs only made reference to its impact [REDACTED]. The panel considered that Mr Gibbs’ statement demonstrated a poor level of insight into his offending behaviour and any remorse shown was superficial in its nature.”

In my judgement, the lack of evidence that Mr Gibbs has developed full insight into his behaviour and its impact on others 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 offers this observation:

“...the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Gibbs 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 Gibbs was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of a teacher being convicted of making indecent images of children in this case and the very negative impact that such a finding is likely to 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 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 Gibbs himself. The panel notes the following:

“Mr Gibbs’ actions were deliberate. He was not acting under duress. There was no evidence before the panel of Mr Gibbs’ demonstrating exceptionally high standards or significantly contributing to the education sector.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Gibbs 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 very serious nature of the misconduct found:

“The panel noted that Mr Gibbs’ behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, (albeit that it was suspended), which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the likely damage done to the standing of the profession, as well as the risk of repetition.

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

In doing so, the panel has referred to the Advice as follows:

“The Advice indicates that there are certain types of case where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period.

One of these includes *“any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or indecent pseudo photograph or image of a child, including one off incidents”*.

The panel saw no reason to depart from the guidance in the Advice in this case. The panel further noted that this was not a ‘one off incident’. There was a significant volume of images and videos in this case, covering all three categories.”


I have considered whether not allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate response to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In my judgment, factors mean that allowing a review period would not be sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the very serious nature of the misconduct found, which in my view comprises behaviour fundamentally incompatible with working as a teacher, and the risk of repetition and future harm to pupils.

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

**This means that Mr Jeremy Gibbs 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 Gibbs 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 Gibbs 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 'Marc Cavey', enclosed within a hand-drawn oval border.

**Decision maker: Marc Cavey**

**Date: 4 February 2026**

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