



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Joseph Allen Professional conduct panel 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 |
| Witnesses | 5 |
| Decision and reasons | 9 |
| Findings of fact | 6 |
| Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State | 10 |
| Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State | 14 |

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

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Teacher: | Mr Joseph James Allen |
| Teacher ref number: | 2069386 |
| Teacher date of birth: | 24 May 1999 |
| TRA reference: | 21256 |
| Date of determination: | 13 January 2026 |
| Former employer: | Trinity High School and Sixth Form, Redditch |

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 12 to 13 January 2026 at Cheylesmore House, 5 Quinton Road, Coventry, CV1 2WT to consider the case of Mr Joseph James Allen.

The panel members were Mr Paul Hawkins (lay panellist – in the chair), Ms Karen Graham (teacher panellist) and Mr Jonathan Wettreich (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Jermel Anderson of Blake Morgan LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Saiqa Aslam, Counsel, of No8 Chambers, as instructed by Capsticks LLP solicitors.

Mr Joseph James Allen was present and was represented in part and supported by his mother, [REDACTED].

The hearing took place in public, save for portions of the hearing that were heard in private and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 23 October 2025.

It was alleged that Mr Joseph James Allen was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that while employed as a PE Teacher at Trinity High School and Sixth Form, Easemore Road, Redditch, B98 8HB (“the School”):

1. On or around 5 May 2022 he caused or agreed to or assisted with or facilitated the importation of a controlled drug of Class B, namely Cannabis.
2. On or around 31 October 2022 he accepted a police caution in relation to the conduct set out at allegation 1.
3. On or around 31 October 2022 he provided a misleading explanation to the School for your conduct in relation to allegation 1 and/or 2.
4. His conduct as may be proved at allegation 3 was dishonest.

Mr Allen admitted Allegation 1, Allegation 2, Allegation 3 and Allegation 4. Mr Allen’s admission to Allegation 1 was on the basis that he had “agreed” to the importation of cannabis, but he denied facilitation, importation, assistance or causing it to have been imported. Mr Allen also made admissions to both unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the professional into disrepute.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology– pages 4 to 5

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 6 to 36

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements and exhibits – pages 37 to 121

Section 4: Teacher documents – pages 152 to 153

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

Section 5: Additional documentation – pages 154 to 222

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the hearing and the additional documents that the panel decided to admit.

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

Witnesses

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

Witness A – [REDACTED]

Mr Allen also gave oral evidence and called the following witnesses:

Witness B – [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.

Mr Allen was employed by the School on 1 September 2021.

On 5 May 2022, a parcel addressed to Mr Allen’s address and bearing the name “James Joseph” was intercepted by a Border Force officer. The parcel was identified as containing 1040g of cannabis. West Mercia Police estimated that this would have a street value of £20,000. On 13 July 2022, Mr Allen was interviewed under caution under suspicion of being concerned with the importation of a Class B drug, namely Cannabis. During interview, Mr Allen admitted that he had agreed to allow the parcel to be delivered, having been asked to do so by another.

On 31 October 2022, Mr Allen signed a caution as offered by the Police, admitting the offence as alleged. On the same day, Mr Allen spoke to the Headteacher of the School, Witness A, via telephone, following which he sent him an email, giving an account in which he advised that he had done a favour for someone that he knew socially by agreeing to receive a parcel for them, and that he had no knowledge of what the parcel would contain.

A subsequent Position of Trust meeting was convened on 4 November 2022, during which an account was provided to the School by the police which was contrary to the one given by Mr Allen. During this meeting the police confirmed that Mr Allen had admitted during his police interview that he had agreed to receive a parcel on behalf of a drug dealer, and that he knew the parcel would contain cannabis. Following the meeting, the

Headteacher arranged a discussion with Mr Allen on the same date, whereby Mr Allen confirmed that he had fabricated the prior account.

Mr Allen subsequently resigned from the School.

The School then referred Mr Allen to the TRA on 16 November 2022

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 are guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that, while employed as employed as a PE Teacher at Trinity High School and Sixth Form, Easemore Road, Redditch, B98 8HB (“the School”):

1. On or around 5 May 2022 you caused or agreed to or assisted with or facilitated the importation of a controlled drug of Class B, namely Cannabis.

The panel noted that Mr Allen admitted to this allegation on the basis that he had agreed to the importation of cannabis. It therefore formed the view that to find the allegation proved, it did not need to be satisfied as to the question of causation, facilitation, agreement or assistance. It was also noted by the panel that through his oral evidence, Mr Allen had made a full admission to the allegation.

The panel noted that it had sight of a summary of Mr Allen’s police interview where he made admissions to the conduct as alleged, and within his oral evidence he had confirmed that the summary was an accurate record of the interview.

The panel accordingly found Allegation 1 proved. It noted that Mr Allen had by his account, agreed to the importation of cannabis and had made full admissions to this. It therefore determined that it was more likely than not that this had occurred.

2. On or around 31 October 2022 you accepted a police caution in relation to the conduct set out at allegation 1.

The panel had sight of the police caution signed by Mr Allen and dated 31 October 2022; it was noted that the name “James Joseph” was used on the form. During his oral evidence, Mr Allen had confirmed that this was the name that had been used on the parcel, and that he had chosen not to identify himself in full to the police. Mr Allen also admitted the allegation. The panel therefore was satisfied that it was more likely than not

that Mr Allen had accepted the police caution in relation to the conduct as alleged.

The panel therefore found Allegation 2 proved.

3. On or around 31 October 2022 you provided a misleading explanation to the School for your conduct in relation to allegation 1 and/or 2.

The panel noted that Mr Allen had admitted this allegation. Additionally, it noted that by his account, Mr Allen had given a fabricated account of the conduct belying the caution via an email that he had sent to Witness A on 31 October 2022. The panel noted that it had sight of Witness A's record of the email and also, that Witness A had confirmed through both his written and oral evidence that the account provided by Mr Allen on 31 October 2022 was subsequently discovered to have been inaccurate. Witness A advised that this was then admitted by Mr Allen on 4 November 2022.

Through her oral evidence, Witness B had advised that she had told Mr Allen to provide a fabricated account when disclosing matters to Witness A. Mr Allen's account was that after receiving the caution, he had driven to the home of Witness B who had then advised him to provide a fabricated account to the school. The panel did not consider that the origin of the fabrication narrative was particularly relevant to its overall determination in respect of this allegation; even if the fabrication had emanated from Witness B, the false account was given to Witness A by Mr Allen. Accordingly, the panel found that the misleading explanation was provided by Mr Allen, regardless of where the fabrication had originated.

Having considered the evidence, the panel determined that it was more likely than not that Mr Allen had provided the misleading explanation, noting that even if he had acted on Witness B's instruction, the account of all witnesses was still that the disclosure was made by Mr Allen.

The panel therefore found Allegation 3 proved.

4. Your conduct as may be proved at allegation 3 was dishonest.

Having found Allegation 3 proved, the panel went on to consider the question of dishonesty in respect of the misleading explanation provided by Mr Allen. When making its determination, the panel was cognisant of the test as found at paragraph 74 of the case *Ivey v Genting Casinos* [2017] UKSC 67:

“When dishonesty is in question the fact-finding tribunal must first ascertain (subjectively) the actual state of the individual's knowledge or belief as to the facts. The reasonableness or otherwise of the belief is a matter of evidence (often in practice determinative) going to whether he held the belief, but it is not an additional requirement

that his belief must be reasonable; the question is whether it is genuinely held. When once his actual state of mind as to knowledge or belief as to facts is established, the question whether his conduct was honest or dishonest is to be determined by the fact-finder by applying the (objective) standards of ordinary decent people. There is no requirement that the defendant must appreciate that what he has done is, by those standards, dishonest."

The panel first considered Mr Allen's belief at the time of the misleading disclosure. It noted that on his own admissions, Mr Allen was aware that he had provided a misleading account, even if he had been encouraged to do so by Witness B. It was Mr Allen's own account that he had done this to effectively minimise the potential impact of any consequence that may follow when the School was made aware of the incident. The panel accordingly formed the view that Mr Allen's state of mind at the relevant time was that he knew his disclosure to Witness A was not honest and therefore he was acting dishonestly.

Having found that Mr Allen did not hold the belief that the explanation he provided to Witness A was honest, it then considered whether his actions could amount to dishonesty by the standards of ordinary decent people. The panel was satisfied that in the circumstances, a misleading disclosure to minimise the reality that Mr Allen had received a caution for a serious offence, would be seen as a dishonest act by the standards of ordinary decent people.

The panel accordingly found Allegation 4 proved.

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

Having found all of the allegations proved, 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 first considered whether the conduct of Mr Allen, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that Mr Allen, had acted contrary to the Preamble, which advised that "Teachers act with honesty and integrity". Additionally, the panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Allen 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

- not undermining ..., the rule of law, ...
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos... and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was not satisfied that the conduct of Mr Allen, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of either Keeping Children Safe In Education (“KCSIE”) or Working Together to Safeguard Children.

The panel noted that at page 10 of the Advice, it states that it is likely that a panel would consider the acceptance of a caution for an offence involving behaviours associated with any of the offence types in the list that begins on page 12, as an admission of behaviours that would amount to “unacceptable professional conduct”.

The panel then considered whether Mr Allen’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 following offences were relevant:

- possession with intent to supply another person, supply (selling, dealing or sharing) or production of any class B, class C or any temporary class drugs and
- fraud or serious dishonesty

[REDACTED].

The panel noted that the allegations took place outside the education setting. The serious nature of the allegations as found proved, was indicative of the plausibility that it could have led to pupils being exposed to behaviour in a harmful way. The panel noted that the incident did not take place within the school environment and there was no evidence to suggest that Mr Allen had ever brought cannabis to the school. However, the panel considered that being concerned in the importation of a significant volume of a controlled drug whilst employed as a teacher, potentially created a risk given the involvement in serious criminal activity. The panel accordingly determined that this activity was directly relevant to the way that Mr Allen fulfilled his role as a teacher.

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

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mr Allen was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Mr Allen'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 Mr Allen'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 Mr Allen was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel determined that the following offences were relevant:

- possession with intent to supply another person, supply (selling, dealing or sharing) or production of any class B, class C or any temporary class drugs and
- fraud or serious dishonesty

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 Mr Allen's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher.

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

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 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 Allen which involved him dishonestly misreporting the background of the incident that led to him accepting a caution from the police, there was a strong public interest consideration in relation to all of the considerations as set out above.

The panel considered that there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the fact that Mr Allen was concerned in the importation of a controlled drug whilst employed as a teacher.

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

The panel determined that there was a strong public interest in ensuring the proper standards of conduct in the profession were upheld. It determined that the conduct found against Mr Allen 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 Allen in the profession. It noted that he had only recently qualified as a teacher at the time of the incident and therefore there was limited information that it could rely upon with regard to his contribution to the teaching profession. The panel however had regard to the fact that Witness B referred to him as a "well-regarded" teacher. Accordingly, the panel determined that there was a public interest in retaining Mr Allen within the teaching profession, however this interest was limited, due to the lack of experience that he had in a teaching capacity.

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 Allen.

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;
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions ...;
- ... concealment including:
 - lying to prevent the identification of wrongdoing.

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 acknowledged that Mr Allen had a previous good history, having not been subject to any regulatory findings previously. It was also noted by that panel that Mr Allen had made some admissions at the first possible opportunity, having told the police about the importation during his police interview, which the panel found to be an indication of limited honesty. The panel was mindful of the fact that dishonesty is a spectrum, however it was of the view that this conduct was not insignificant when considered in the context of other forms of dishonest behaviour. Mr Allen had sought to mislead the School and this had a direct impact upon their disciplinary procedures, as confirmed through the oral evidence of Witness A. The dishonesty was therefore found to be significant.

The panel noted that Mr Allen's actions were deliberate and that there was no suggestion that he was acting under duress.

The panel had sight of some material that was provided by Mr Allen's representative in support of his good character, though it felt this material was limited in its ability to assist with the determination as none of the material was contemporaneous in nature. It was additionally noted that Witness A had commented during his oral evidence that Mr Allen was a "good teacher" and that he was "very popular amongst students" and had "lots of good qualities".

The panel considered the fact that Mr Allen had apologised to Witness A for his prior dishonesty to be a mitigating factor in the case which was indicative of a degree of

remorse in respect of the conduct. The panel however felt that Mr Allen's remorse was limited, and that he had shown an overall lack of insight in respect of the conduct and its significance. Whilst Mr Allen had made admissions to the allegations, the panel was of the view that through his oral evidence, he had qualified this in a way that was deflective and did not engage with the seriousness of the conduct.

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 Allen 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 Allen. The dishonest fabrication provided to Witness A 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.

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

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 included the following types of cases that the panel determined were relevant:

- possession with intent to supply another person, supply (selling, dealing or sharing) and production of any class A, B, C or unclassified drugs;
- fraud or serious dishonesty;

As stated above, Mr Allen had been involved in the importation of a significant volume of a controlled drug and then had been dishonest in relation to the full context of this when

reporting it to the School. The panel accordingly determined that its findings were suggestive of a longer review period than the minimum.

The panel considered that Mr Allen had shown a lack of insight in respect of his conduct and therefore, a short review period would be insufficient to address the public interest considerations in the case. Additionally, the panel formed the view that there was a risk of repetition present; Mr Allen had not satisfied the panel that he wholly recognised the significance of the conduct as found proved and had appeared to not accept responsibility for the behaviour in full. The panel therefore formed the view that Mr Allen's insight needed further development.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a review period.

The panel determined that the appropriate review period to recommend to the Secretary of State was one of 6 years.

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 Mr Joseph Allen should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of 6 years.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Allen 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
 - not undermining ..., the rule of law, ...
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos... and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of a teacher accepting a police caution concerning the importation of a controlled Class B drug. They also include a finding of dishonest conduct in providing a misleading explanation to his school.

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 Mr Allen, 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:

“The panel noted that the incident did not take place within the school environment and there was no evidence to suggest that Mr Allen had ever brought cannabis to the school. However, the panel considered that being concerned in the importation of a significant volume of a controlled drug whilst employed as a teacher, potentially created a risk given the involvement in serious criminal activity. The panel accordingly determined that this activity was directly relevant to the way that Mr Allen fulfilled his role as a teacher.”

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

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

“The panel considered the fact that Mr Allen had apologised to Witness A for his prior dishonesty to be a mitigating factor in the case which was indicative of a degree of remorse in respect of the conduct. The panel however felt that Mr Allen’s remorse was limited, and that he had shown an overall lack of insight in respect of the conduct and its significance. Whilst Mr Allen had made admissions to the allegations, the panel was of the view that through his oral evidence, he had qualified this in a way that was deflective and did not engage with the seriousness of the conduct.”

In my judgement, the lack of insight and full 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:

“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 Mr Allen’s conduct could potentially damage the public’s perception of a teacher.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of a teacher accepting a police caution for being involved in the importation of a controlled Class B drug 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 unacceptable professional conduct or 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 Mr Allen himself. The panel has commented:

“The panel had sight of some material that was provided by Mr Allen’s representative in support of his good character, though it felt this material was limited in its ability to assist with the determination as none of the material was contemporaneous in nature. It was additionally noted that Witness A had commented during his oral evidence that Mr Allen was a “good teacher” and that he was “very popular amongst students” and had “lots of good qualities”.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Allen 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 misconduct found proven and its potential impact on pupils. The panel has said:

"The panel considered that there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the fact that Mr Allen was concerned in the importation of a controlled drug whilst employed as a teacher."

I have also placed considerable weight on the panel's comments about the significant dishonesty in this case. The panel has said:

"The panel was mindful of the fact that dishonesty is a spectrum, however it was of the view that this conduct was not insignificant when considered in the context of other forms of dishonest behaviour. Mr Allen had sought to mislead the School and this had a direct impact upon their disciplinary procedures, as confirmed through the oral evidence of Witness A. The dishonesty was therefore found to be significant."

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

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended a 6-year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments:

"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 included the following types of cases that the panel determined were relevant:

- possession with intent to supply another person, supply (selling, dealing or sharing) and production of any class A, B, C or unclassified drugs;
- fraud or serious dishonesty;

As stated above, Mr Allen had been involved in the importation of a significant volume of a controlled drug and then had been dishonest in relation to the full

context of this when reporting it to the School. The panel accordingly determined that its findings were suggestive of a longer review period than the minimum.

The panel considered that Mr Allen had shown a lack of insight in respect of his conduct and therefore, a short review period would be insufficient to address the public interest considerations in the case. Additionally, the panel formed the view that there was a risk of repetition present; Mr Allen had not satisfied the panel that he wholly recognised the significance of the conduct as found proved and had appeared to not accept responsibility for the behaviour in full. The panel therefore formed the view that Mr Allen’s insight needed further development.”

I have considered whether a 6-year 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 shorter review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the serious nature of the misconduct found proven, the lack of insight and full remorse, and the risk of repetition.

I consider therefore that a 6-year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

This means that Mr Joseph Allen is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children’s home in England. He may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 20 January 2032, 6 years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If he does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Mr Allen remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

This order takes effect from the date on which it is served on the teacher.

Mr Joseph Allen 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: 15 January 2026

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