



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Christopher Ingram: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome**

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

**March 2026**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
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**

<b>Teacher:</b>	Mr Christopher Ingram
<b>Teacher ref number:</b>	1148617
<b>Teacher date of birth:</b>	18 June 1973
<b>TRA reference:</b>	24965
<b>Date of determination:</b>	24 March 2026
<b>Former employer:</b>	West Park School, Derby

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 24 March 2026 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Christopher Ingram.

The panel members were Ms Gill Lyon (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Adnan Qureshi (lay panellist), and Mr Jack Davies (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr John Lucarotti of Blake Morgan LLP Solicitors.

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Ingram that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Ingram provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted that his conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, Mr Ingram or his representative.

The meeting took place in private.

## Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 11 December 2025.

It was alleged that Mr Ingram was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst working as Design and Technology Teacher at West Park School:

1. On or around 26 July 2024, in relation to Pupil A, who was a pupil at a former school at which he had worked:
  - a. He met with Pupil A at an agreed location and/or drove alone with her in his car to a public house;
  - b. He took Pupil A to a public house;
  - c. He purchased alcohol for Pupil A who was under the age of 18.
2. On 25 October 2024, he accepted a conditional police caution in relation to the conduct set out at allegation 1c above.
3. By his conduct as set out above in one or more of the allegations, he:
  - a. Failed to maintain professional boundaries;
  - b. Failed to act with integrity.

Mr Ingram admitted all of the allegations

Mr Ingram also admitted that he was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

## Summary of evidence

### Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology and anonymised individual List – pages 4 to 7

Section 2: Notice of referral and response – pages 7 to 21

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts – pages 22 to 25

Section 4: Teacher Regulation Agency documents – pages 26 to 161

Section 5: Teacher's representations – page 162

Section 6: Notice of meeting – page 163

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 Ingram on 16 October 2025.

### **Decision and reasons**

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 Ingram for the allegations to be considered without a hearing. The panel had the ability to direct that the case be considered at a hearing if required in the interests of justice or in the public interest. The panel did not determine that such a direction was necessary or appropriate in this case.

The panel noted the following background to the case:

In September 2023, Mr Ingram started working for West Park School as a Teacher of design and technology. He had previously worked at Lees Brook Academy.

On 26 July 2024, Mr Ingram took Pupil A (who was a pupil at [REDACTED]) to a public house and bought alcohol for them. Pupil A was 16 years old at the time.

On 25 October 2024, Mr Ingram was conditionally cautioned by the police for purchasing/ attempting to purchase alcohol on behalf of a person under the age of 18 and received a fine.

On 31 December 2024, following an internal investigation, Mr Ingram ceased employment at West Park School. He was referred to the TRA on the same day.

### **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

**It was alleged that Mr Ingram was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst working as Design and Technology Teacher at West Park School:**

**1. On or around 26 July 2024, in relation to Pupil A, who was a pupil at a former school at which he had worked:**

**a. He met with Pupil A at an agreed location and/or drove alone with her in his car to a public house;**

The panel noted that, in addition to Mr Ingram's admissions, there was evidence in support of this allegation in the investigation report dated 25 October 2024.

The panel found this allegation proved.

**b. He took Pupil A to a public house;**

The panel noted that, in addition to Mr Ingram's admissions, there was evidence from the police officer who had viewed the relevant CCTV footage that showed Mr Ingram and Pupil A entering the pub.

The panel found this allegation proved.

**c. He purchased alcohol for Pupil A who was under the age of 18.**

The panel noted that, in addition to Mr Ingram's admissions, there was evidence from the police officer who had viewed the relevant CCTV footage that showed Mr Ingram buying an alcoholic drink for Pupil A.

The panel found this allegation proved.

**2. On 25 October 2024, he accepted a conditional police caution in relation to the conduct set out at allegation 1c above.**

The panel noted that, in addition to Mr Ingram's admissions, there was evidence of the conditional caution dated 25 October 2024.

The panel found this allegation proved.

**3. By his conduct as set out above in one or more of the allegations, he:**

**a. Failed to maintain professional boundaries;**

The panel noted that, in addition to Mr Ingram's admissions, there were provisions in the School Code of Conduct policy dated September 2023 that dealt with a teacher's duty of care and the prohibition on social contact with pupils. The panel considered that the

matters relating to allegation 1 demonstrated a clear failure to maintain professional boundaries.

The panel found this allegation proved.

#### **b. Failed to act with integrity.**

The panel received legal advice on alleged failures to act with integrity. In particular, the panel noted that:

- Integrity connotes adherence to the ethical standards of the profession
- The duty of integrity does not require professional people to be paragons of virtue.

The panel noted that Mr Ingram had admitted this allegation. The panel concluded that his actions in taking a former pupil (who was underage) to a pub and buying them alcoholic drinks, were clearly significantly below the ethical standards of the profession.

The panel found this allegation 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.

Mr Ingram admitted both aspects. Whilst the panel took these admissions into account, it made its own judgment as to whether the threshold was crossed in the circumstances of this case.

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 was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Ingram in relation to the facts found proved involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Ingram 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
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel also considered whether Mr Ingram'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 did not consider that any of the offences listed in the Advice were relevant to Mr Ingram's conduct.

The panel found that Mr Ingram's actions in taking a former pupil (who was 16) to a pub and buying her alcoholic drinks displayed a profound ignorance of appropriate safeguarding standards and breached professional boundaries. The panel considered this was especially concerning given the stated [REDACTED] of the pupil in question, the teacher's number of years' experience, and the fact that this was a pre-planned event.

Having carefully considered all of the evidence and having regard to the fact that Mr Ingram had acted contrary to the Teachers' Standards, the panel was satisfied that his conduct fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

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

In considering whether Mr Ingram's conduct was such that it may bring the profession into disrepute, the panel took into account the way the teaching profession is viewed by others and 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 they behave.

For the reasons set out above, the findings of misconduct were serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on Mr Ingram's status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public perception. The panel considered that a member of the public would be extremely troubled to learn that any teacher had behaved in this manner with a pupil.

The panel therefore found that Mr Ingram's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In summary, having found the facts of all allegations proved, the panel further found that Mr Ingram's conduct amounted to both unacceptable professional conduct and 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;
- the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Ingram, which involved significant breaches of professional boundaries in him taking a former (underage) pupil to a pub for alcoholic drinks, there was an extremely strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils.

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

The panel also decided that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was present as the conduct found against Mr Ingram was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

The panel did not consider that there was a particularly strong public interest consideration in retaining Mr Ingram in the profession. There were no references or

testimonials submitted for the specific purpose of these proceedings from any individuals with knowledge of his admitted conduct.

Nonetheless, the panel did take account of the evidence available about Mr Ingram's background and career in education. It noted that Mr Ingram had been working as a teacher for approximately 15 years and that no other concerns had been raised about him during that time.

Notwithstanding 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 Ingram.

In carrying out the balancing exercise, the panel had regard to the public interest considerations both in favour of, and against, prohibition as well as the interests of Mr Ingram.

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 are relevant in this case are:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- 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);

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 following mitigating factors were present in this case:

- Mr Ingram had an otherwise good record. He had not been subject to any previous regulatory or disciplinary proceedings.
- Mr Ingram had engaged with the TRA and, ultimately, made full admissions.
- Mr Ingram had expressed some remorse for his actions. Within his statement presented for these proceedings, Mr Ingram stated that he had made 'an error of judgement.'

Weighed against this, the aggravating features in this case were that:

- Mr Ingram's actions were deliberate and premeditated. He was not acting under duress.
- Mr Ingram ought to have known what was required of him in terms of his duties and responsibilities.
- Mr Ingram was in a position of responsibility and had an obligation to act as a role model. He failed in his duties in that regard.
- Mr Ingram's actions amounted to a clear breach of the Teachers' Standards.
- There was limited evidence of insight on the part of Mr Ingram

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 was sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Ingram 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 Ingram. The fact that Mr Ingram had taken a former pupil (who was underage) to a pub for alcoholic drinks, was a significant factor in forming that opinion. This was an egregious instance of professional boundaries being breached and a lack of integrity.

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 to recommend that a review period of the order should be considered.

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 two years.

The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period.

None of these behaviours were present in this case.

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 2 year review period.

## **Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State**

I have given very careful consideration to this case and to the recommendation of the panel in respect of both sanction and review period.

In considering this case, I have also given very careful attention to the Advice that the Secretary of State has published concerning the prohibition of teachers.

In this case, the panel has found all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Christopher Ingram should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of 2 years.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Ingram 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
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- 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 Ingram fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding "...which involved significant breaches of professional boundaries in him taking a former (underage) pupil to a pub for alcoholic drinks, there was an extremely strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils".

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 Ingram, 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 safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, "...that Mr Ingram's actions in taking a former pupil (who was 16) to a pub and buying her alcoholic drinks displayed a profound ignorance of appropriate safeguarding standards and breached professional boundaries. The panel considered this was especially concerning given the stated [REDACTED] of the pupil in question". 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 sets out as follows, "There was limited evidence of insight on the part of Mr Ingram". The panel also note "Mr Ingram had expressed some remorse for his actions".

In my judgement, the lack of full insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour, and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, "...public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Ingram were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession".

I have had to consider that the public has a high expectation of professional standards of all teachers and that the public might regard a failure to impose a prohibition order as a failure to uphold those high standards. In weighing these considerations, I have had to consider the matter from the point of view of an "ordinary intelligent and well-informed citizen."

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mr Ingram himself. The panel comment, "It noted that Mr Ingram had been working as a teacher for approximately 15 years and that no other concerns had been raised about him during that time". However, it also found that it "...did not consider that there was a particularly strong public interest consideration in retaining Mr Ingram in the profession. There were no references or testimonials submitted for the specific purpose of these proceedings from any individuals with knowledge of his admitted conduct".

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel's comments concerning the lack of insight or remorse.

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that Mr Ingram "...displayed a profound ignorance of appropriate safeguarding standards and breached professional boundaries".

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

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 2 year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments that Mr Ingram has expressed some remorse for his actions and the panel's view that a 2 year review period would be "proportionate".

I have considered whether a 2 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 my view, the factors in this case mean that a 2 year review period is sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the seriousness of the conduct and the limited insight and remorse demonstrated by Mr Ingram

I consider therefore that a 2 year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

**This means that Mr Christopher Ingram 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 03 April 2028, 2 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 Ingram remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr Ingram 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 cursive script, appearing to read 'S. Blomfield'.

**Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield**

**Date: 27 March 2026**

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