



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Duncan Jackson: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

April 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	15
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	24

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

Teacher:	Mr Duncan Jackson
Teacher ref number:	9756611
Teacher date of birth:	23 September 1975
TRA reference:	24636
Date of determination:	16 April 2026
Former employer:	Felixstowe School, Felixstowe

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ('the panel') of the Teaching Regulation Agency ('the TRA') convened on 15 and 16 April 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Duncan Jackson.

The panel members were Mr Terry Hyde (former teacher panellist – in the chair), Ms Sue Davies (lay panellist) and Mr Francis Ekengwu (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Rebecca Hughes of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Mark Millin of Kingsley Napley LLP solicitors.

Mr Jackson was present and was represented by Mr Sam Denham of NASUWT.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 15 December 2025.

It was alleged that Mr Jackson was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst working as Head of Physical Education at Felixstowe School:

1. On or around 29 April 2024, he submitted marks to the exam board that were inaccurate and/or not reflective of the work completed by pupils;
2. Between on or around 29 April 2024 and on or around 3 May 2024, he allowed and/or instructed pupils to amend their work after submission of marks to the exam board;
3. On or around 3 May 2024, he amended at least one pupil's work after the submission of marks to the exam board;
4. He knew or ought to have known that his conduct at paragraphs 1, 2 and/or 3 was not permissible;
5. His conduct at paragraphs 1, 2 and/or 3 above:
 - a. was dishonest;
 - b. lacked integrity.

Mr Jackson admitted the particulars of allegations 1, 2, 3, 4, 5(a) and 5(b), as set out in his response to the allegations, dated 15 April 2026.

Mr Jackson also admitted, in respect of those admitted facts, that his conduct amounted to 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 list of key people – pages 6 to 8

Section 2: Notice of hearing and response – pages 9 to 18

Section 3: TRA witness statements – pages 19 to 27

Section 4: TRA exhibits – pages 28 to 514

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 515 to 524

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

- Mr Jackson's response to the allegations dated 15 April 2026 – pages 525 to 530.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the hearing and the additional document 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 Mr Jackson.

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 Jackson commenced employment as head of PE at Felixstowe School ('the School') on 1 September 2010.

In May 2024, concerns were raised about Mr Jackson's conduct of the non-examined assessment part of the NCFE V Cert Health and Fitness qualification. It was alleged that pupils were being withdrawn from lessons to complete coursework despite the deadline for submission of marks having already passed. It was further alleged that Mr Jackson had submitted inaccurate marks to the exam board for the coursework, including in relation to work that had not yet been completed.

It was further alleged that Mr Jackson had amended a pupil's coursework after the marks had been submitted to the exam board, but before any sample scripts were provided to the exam board for moderation.

The School conducted an investigation into Mr Jackson's conduct, and a disciplinary hearing was held on 9 July 2024. The outcome of the hearing was appealed, and an appeal hearing was held on 25 August 2024.

The matter was referred to the TRA on 27 October 2024.

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:

The panel noted that Mr Jackson had admitted all allegations as set out in his response, dated 7 January 2026, to the notice of proceedings and in his response to the allegations dated 15 April 2026. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the facts available to it.

1. On or around 29 April 2024, you submitted marks to the exam board that were inaccurate and/or not reflective of the work completed by pupils;

The panel considered screenshots of the coursework tracker table as set out in the School's investigation report. The panel noted that the figures in the "*original marks with comments*" table from 29 April 2024 were substantially different from the figures in the "*entered marks*" table from 30 April 2024. Each of the 30 students had different marks, with an average difference of 21 marks. The panel noted that these were substantial increases rather than minor adjustments.

The panel considered the notes of a fact-finding meeting between Mr Jackson and Individual A on 17 May 2024, conducted as part of the School's investigation. In this meeting, Mr Jackson stated that the coursework marks for the NCFE course were submitted by 30 April 2024. He stated that the marks were arrived at by looking "*holistically*" at the pupils' work and their performance throughout the year. Mr Jackson stated that the marks submitted did not match the work completed, but that the marks submitted were based on what he believed the pupils would be able to achieve if they had more time.

The panel considered Mr Jackson's written response to the allegation. Mr Jackson accepted that the marks submitted were not an accurate reflection of the students' work at the time they were submitted to NCFE. He explained that, due to the approaching submission deadline of 30 April 2024, he and a colleague met to review the marks for each task prior to submission. During that process, he formed the view that the standard of the controlled assessment work fell below the level at which the students had previously been performing.

Mr Jackson stated that, based on historical assessment data and an internal tracking spreadsheet, he decided to enter marks which he believed reflected the level the students were capable of achieving, with the intention of allowing additional time for the work to improve to that level. He asserted that the marks entered were aligned to each student's assessed capability (for example, where a student was working at Level 2 pass, marks were entered at that level).

The panel considered the notes of a meeting between Individual A and [REDACTED] on 7 May 2024, Individual B, conducted as part of the School's investigation. Individual B had told Individual A that if the work had been uploaded, there would be discrepancies between the mark submitted to the exam board and the work completed.

The panel considered screenshots of WhatsApp messages between Mr Jackson and Individual B. The panel noted that in these messages, Mr Jackson asked Individual B to complete assessor feedback sheets for coursework before the work had been completed. Individual B raised issues with this approach in response, asking, "*surely they need to finish before I can feedback?*".

The panel noted that the marks submitted to the exam board were significantly higher than the marks which could reasonably be attributed to the work the pupils had completed at that time. The panel was satisfied that the marks submitted did not accurately reflect the standard of the work produced by the students.

In light of this evidence, the panel found, on the balance of probabilities, that allegation 1 was proved.

2. Between on or around 29 April 2024 and on or around 3 May 2024, you allowed and/or instructed pupils to amend their work after submission of marks to the exam board;

The panel considered the notes of a meeting between Mr Jackson and Individual A, on 17 May 2024, conducted as part of the School's investigation. In this meeting, Mr Jackson stated that the coursework marks for the NCFE course were to be submitted by 30 April 2024.

The panel considered the written statement of Individual A, who stated that on 3 May 2024, teacher Individual C had raised concerns with Individual D, [REDACTED], regarding a pupil who had been taken out of Individual C's science lesson to complete their PE coursework. In the written statement, she stated that whilst this was fairly common at the School in the summer term, Individual C was concerned that the student should not have been further amending their coursework as it was after the deadline for the submission of marks.

The panel noted that, in a subsequent email chain dated 3 May 2024 between Individual C and Individual D, Individual C had told Individual D that the pupil had said he had not completed his coursework and still had lots left to do.

The panel considered the various interviews with pupils conducted by Individual A in the course of the School's investigation. The panel noted that many of the 19 students interviewed on 8 May 2024 stated that they had not yet completed their coursework and were expecting to do so by working on it further at home and in lessons, including being

pulled out of lessons for other subjects. The panel noted that there was an inconsistency between the pupils' understanding of the deadline for their coursework.

The panel considered Mr Jackson's written response to the allegation. In his response, Mr Jackson accepted that he had instructed students to amend their coursework after the submission of marks to the exam board. He stated that his intention was to enable students to submit work that reflected the level of capability they had demonstrated since the start of Year 10. Mr Jackson explained that he had delivered examination courses over a 22-year period, which, in his view, provided him with professional insight into what students were capable of achieving. He stated that, based on this judgment, he entered marks for each student which he considered reflected their potential capability. By way of example, he stated that where he considered a student capable of achieving a Level 2 pass, those were the marks entered.

Mr Jackson acknowledged that, if he had been thinking clearly at the time, he would have recognised that permitting amendments to coursework after the submission of marks was contrary to examination rules and regulations, and that, given his experience, he should have known this was wrong. He stated that, with hindsight, he regretted his actions and acknowledged that the situation may have been avoided had he planned the academic year more effectively in order to meet all relevant deadlines.

The panel noted that the marks submitted to the exam board were significantly higher than the marks which could reasonably be attributed to the work the pupils had completed at that time. The panel was satisfied that the marks submitted did not accurately reflect the standard of the work produced by the students.

The panel found that Mr Jackson both allowed and instructed pupils to amend their work after submission of marks to the exam board.

The panel found allegation 2 proved.

3. On or around 3 May 2024, you amended at least one pupil's work after the submission of marks to the exam board;

The panel considered Individual A's written statement. In her written statement, Individual A stated that on 3 May 2024, she and Individual D checked what Mr Jackson was doing on his computer using Impero, software used by the School to live-monitor the screens of other computers. Individual A's evidence was that she and Individual D could see Mr Jackson making edits and additions to student coursework.

The panel considered the video taken by Individual A when she and Individual D were monitoring Mr Jackson's screen using Impero. The panel noted that the video was taken on 3 May 2024 and showed work being modified by Mr Jackson. The panel also considered that one of the videos clearly displayed a date, which the panel accepted

corresponded to a time after the relevant coursework deadline had passed. The panel was, therefore, satisfied that the footage overall related to the same period.

The panel considered the notes of a meeting between Mr Jackson and Individual A conducted as part of the School's investigation. In this meeting, Mr Jackson stated that he did not have the intention of submitting the work he had amended to the exam board.

The panel considered Mr Jackson's written response to the allegation. Mr Jackson explained that, in early May 2024, he had asked students to improve their coursework tasks and provided them with a copy of the assessment criteria to use when doing so. On Friday, 3 May 2024, during a gap in teaching, he was reviewing a piece of student work and was reflecting on how he could provide effective feedback.

Mr Jackson stated in his response to the allegations and in his oral evidence that, in his teaching practice, he commonly provides verbal feedback by prompting students to think about how work could be improved, including through the use of examples and explanations. Due to perceived time pressures, he decided to amend a copy of one student's work by rewriting parts of it in the first person, as though he were articulating feedback himself. He described this as a technique he had previously used in teaching to provide examples prior to any assessment.

Mr Jackson stated in his response to the allegations that, as the assessed tasks were to be uploaded to the exam board via Google Drive, Mr Jackson made a copy of the student's work and saved it to his laptop. He stated that this was done so that, when giving feedback, he would have his own copy in front of him while sitting opposite the student, who would have their Chromebook.

Mr Jackson explained that, after returning to School after hours on Friday, 3 May 2024, he continued amending the copied work by rewriting it in the first person, as shown in the video. He stated that, during this process, he realised he was going too far and that the level of feedback he was attempting to provide was inappropriate whilst students were completing assessed work. He further recognised that he would not be able to provide the same level of feedback to all students, which would be unfair. At that point, he stopped the activity, decided not to use the amended work, closed his laptop and went home. Mr Jackson stated that there was never any intention to visually show the amended document to the student or to share it electronically, and that students were instead expected to rely on the assessment criteria and submit their completed work to the exam board.

The panel questioned Mr Jackson on how he would be able to distinguish his work and the pupil's work as he had been rewriting this work in the "*first person*" and had not been done in track, a different colour or comments. Mr Jackson in his oral evidence acknowledged that people may have interpreted this as an intention of submitting teacher amended work on behalf of a pupil and that he could not differentiate the changes he

made to the pupil's work. Mr Jackson further submitted that in that week he had not been thinking with clarity.

The panel considered the evidence relating to Mr Jackson's return to the School premises after hours on Friday, 3 May 2024. The panel noted that the Head Teacher and a Deputy Head both gave evidence that they observed Mr Jackson returning to the School that evening. They stated that they saw him in the area near the office.

The panel found the video evidence to be compelling. Taken together with the witness evidence and Mr Jackson's admissions, the panel was satisfied that Mr Jackson had returned to the School after hours at around that time and had amended a pupil's work after the submission of marks to the exam board.

The panel found allegation 3 proved.

4. You knew or ought to have known that your conduct at paragraphs 1, 2 and/or 3 was not permissible;

The panel considered the notes of a meeting between Mr Jackson and Individual A conducted as part of the School's investigation. In this meeting, Mr Jackson stated that the NCFE course and specification was new to him, with the current year 11 students being the first cohort who had studied the course.

The panel considered the School's internal investigation report and the screenshots within it, which showed the 'Declaration' required when submitting marks to the exam board. The panel noted that this read: *"By ticking this declaration, I am confirming that the marks entered are accurate and ready to be taken forward for moderation."*

The panel was satisfied that this declaration was clear and unambiguous, and that Mr Jackson accepted responsibility for the accuracy and integrity of the marks submitted.

The panel considered the Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ) suspected malpractice policies and procedures, which include, as an example of malpractice, deception, including *"inventing or changing marks for internally assessed components (e.g. non-examination assessments) where there is no actual evidence of the candidates' achievement to justify the marks awarded"*.

The panel considered the School's non-examinable assessment policy and noted, in particular, the provisions related to subject teachers, which stated: *"Ensure when work has been assessed, candidates are not allowed to revise it."* The panel also noted that the policy directed subject teachers to *"Work with the QA lead/Lead internal verifier to ensure appropriate procedures are followed to internally standardise/verify the marks awarded by subject teachers"*.

The panel was satisfied that these policies formed part of the framework within which Mr Jackson was expected to operate.

The panel placed significant weight on Mr Jackson's role as Head of Department. In that capacity, Mr Jackson was responsible not only for his own compliance but also for providing guidance to others and ensuring that assessment processes were properly followed within the department. The panel considered that colleagues would reasonably look to him for advice and leadership in relation to coursework and assessment requirements.

The panel noted that Mr Jackson was an experienced teacher who had previously directed coursework and internal assessment processes. The panel was satisfied that this was not his first experience of managing internally assessed work. The panel also accepted that the final deadline for submission of coursework marks was a significant and well-known date within the School calendar, and that Mr Jackson accepted that he was fully aware of the relevant deadlines.

The panel further noted Mr Jackson's own admissions that he had "*gone too far*" and that his actions were dishonest.

The panel was satisfied that the integrity of marks, whether for mock assessments or formal submissions, is a fundamental principle of assessment. The panel found that there was no realistic basis on which Mr Jackson could have believed that altering marks or allowing changes after the deadline was permissible.

Accordingly, the panel found that Mr Jackson knew, and in any event ought to have known, that the conduct set out at paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 was not permissible. Given his seniority, experience, and acknowledged awareness of the assessment framework and deadlines. The panel considered that Mr Jackson ought to have known that his conduct at paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 was not permissible. Therefore, the panel found allegation 4 proved.

5. Your conduct at paragraphs 1, 2 and/or 3 above:

a. was dishonest;

b. lacked integrity.

The panel considered whether Mr Jackson had acted dishonestly and, in doing so, had regard to the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd t/a Crockford*.

The panel firstly sought to ascertain the actual state of Mr Jackson's knowledge or belief as to the facts.

The panel considered the notes of a meeting between Mr Jackson and Individual A conducted as part of the School's investigation. The panel noted Mr Jackson's admission

that he had realised on 3 May 2024, when he was typing examples and sources into the coursework documents, that he “*was doing too much*”, and that despite being unfamiliar with the rules of the specific course, he knew that he was “*going too far*” in changing students’ work.

The panel noted that Mr Jackson described his judgment as having been clouded at the time and that he characterised his actions as mistakes or misjudgements. However, the panel was satisfied that this did not displace his underlying knowledge that his conduct was wrong. The panel found that, as an experienced teacher, Mr Jackson would have known that he should not complete work for students, alter their work beyond permitted boundaries, or submit work in a way that circumvented assessment rules.

The panel then went on to consider whether Mr Jackson’s conduct was dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people.

The panel was satisfied that falsifying or improperly altering assessment outcomes would plainly be regarded as dishonest by ordinary decent people. The panel considered that if cheating in a test is viewed as dishonest, then a teacher facilitating or engaging in such conduct would be viewed as at least equally, if not more, serious and dishonest.

The panel then went on to consider whether Mr Jackson had failed to act with integrity. The panel considered the case of *Wingate & Anor v The Solicitors Regulation Authority*, which describes integrity as the “*higher standards which society expects from professional persons*”.

The panel was mindful that professionals are not expected to be “*paragons of virtue*”, but they are expected to act in accordance with the ethical and behavioural standards that underpin their professional role.

The panel was satisfied that Mr Jackson would and should have had a clear understanding of the standards expected of him as a teacher and as Head of the PE Department, a role he had held at the School for almost 15 years. The panel found that his conduct demonstrated a serious lack of integrity. This included completing or substantially altering students’ work, changing marks, submitting work after formal deadlines, and manipulating assessment systems.

The panel considered the wider impact of Mr Jackson’s actions, as his conduct did not only affect him but potentially had wider implications for pupils across the country by undermining the integrity of the national examination system. It created an unfair advantage for certain students and for the School, to the detriment of other pupils whose teacher complied with the rules. It also risked misleading students about their true level of attainment and preparedness for future study.

The panel further noted that Mr Jackson’s actions risked drawing students themselves into dishonest conduct. As a senior member of staff, Mr Jackson also set a poor example

to colleagues and acted inconsistently with the standards he would have been expected to uphold and enforce.

While Mr Jackson suggested that his actions were intended to provide feedback to students, the panel was satisfied that any such explanation could not justify allowing changes to be made or making substantive amendments to assessed work after the deadline. The panel concluded that even if his stated intention were accepted, he had acknowledged that he realised he had gone too far.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that Mr Jackson's conduct amounted to a lack of integrity.

The panel found allegation 5 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 Jackson, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Jackson 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.
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

In reaching this conclusion, the panel found that Mr Jackson involved pupils in a dishonest assessment process, thereby engaging them in conduct which breached professional boundaries and fell short of treating them with dignity and respect.

The panel further found that Mr Jackson failed to have proper and professional regard for the School's assessment policies and relevant examination board requirements. The evidence demonstrated that Mr Jackson was experienced, familiar with examination processes across a number of years and examination boards, and aware of the formal procedures available to address concerns about pupil performance or exceptional circumstances. Despite this, he chose not to pursue those avenues and instead acted unilaterally.

The panel was also satisfied that Mr Jackson failed to act in accordance with the relevant statutory and regulatory frameworks governing assessments. The integrity of the examination and coursework system forms a core part of the national education framework, and Mr Jackson's actions undermined that system.

The panel also considered whether Mr Jackson'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 behaviour of serious dishonesty was relevant. In reaching this view, the panel noted that Mr Jackson knowingly submitted inaccurate grades and created a structured opportunity for pupils to meet those grades after the event. This conduct was not a momentary lapse or error but involved an element of planning and was applied across a cohort of pupils. The panel accepted that Mr Jackson may have been motivated by a desire to support his pupils. However, that motivation did not diminish the seriousness of the conduct.

The panel considered that the dishonesty extended beyond Mr Jackson's own classroom and had wider implications. It had the potential to advantage his pupils over others locally and nationally who had not been given additional time or opportunity, thereby corroding fairness within the examination system. The panel concluded that the impact of this conduct was therefore systemic rather than limited or technical in nature.

The panel noted that Mr Jackson admitted that his conduct was unacceptable professional conduct.

For all of these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Jackson 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 Jackson was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Mr Jackson'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 Jackson'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, the panel found that behaviours associated with serious dishonesty were present.

The panel considered that Mr Jackson's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher.

The panel noted that Mr Jackson admitted that his conduct as found proven constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel concluded that Mr Jackson's conduct had the potential to damage public confidence in the teaching profession. In particular, it undermined confidence in the fairness and integrity of the assessment system and risked bringing the profession into disrepute in the eyes of pupils, parents, examination bodies and the wider public.

For all of these reasons, the panel found that Mr Jackson'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 a punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely, the safeguarding and well-being of pupils; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct. The panel noted that the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils was engaged, but not in the sense of there being a risk of physical harm to children or a wider risk to the public.

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Jackson, which involved maladministration in the conduct of an assessment, lack of integrity and dishonesty, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the 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 Jackson was 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 Jackson 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 Jackson in the profession. Whilst there was evidence that Mr Jackson had ability as an educator, the panel considered whether the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Jackson in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the behaviour, noting that the Advice states that the expectation of both the public and pupils, is that members of the teaching profession maintain an exemplary level of integrity and ethical standards at all times.

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 Jackson.

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;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education...and well-being of pupils;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- violation of the rights of pupils;
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity;
- collusion including:
 - encouraging others to break rules; and
- deliberate action in serious contravention of requirements for the conduct of an examination or assessment leading to an externally awarded qualification or

national assessment...particularly where the action had, or realistically had the potential to have, a significant impact on the outcome of the examination assessment.

The panel acknowledged the conduct found proven in this case did not involve safeguarding concerns in the sense of physical harm, sexual misconduct, or an ongoing risk to the public. However, the panel was satisfied that Mr Jackson's conduct nevertheless engaged pupil wellbeing in a broader sense. The conduct related to public examinations, an area of particular importance and sensitivity for pupils, and had the potential to undermine pupils' understanding of the seriousness of examination rules, deadlines, and assessment integrity. The panel considered that such conduct could cause confusion, or longer-term detriment to pupils' educational experience and attitudes towards assessments, and therefore amounted to misconduct capable of affecting pupils' education and wellbeing.

The panel concluded that there had been a serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards. The panel noted that Mr Jackson was aware of the relevant examination regulations and requirements, and that the breaches occurred within the context of public examinations governed by a national regulatory framework affecting large numbers of pupils. The conduct involved multiple pupils and engaged external examination processes, which the panel considered to elevate the seriousness of the departure from the standards expected of a teacher. The panel considered that the conduct had the potential to undermine confidence in the integrity of the examination process. It also noted that the actions could realistically have led to pupils being disadvantaged in their assessments, including the possibility that pupils might not have been awarded grades to which they were otherwise entitled.

The panel considered whether Mr Jackson had abused his position of trust. It found that he did so, in that he was entrusted with responsibility for administering examinations and inputting examination results, and thereby occupied a position of trust both in relation to the pupils and the examination process itself. That trust was placed in him by the School and the examination board, both of which were entitled to expect that examinations, including coursework, would be administered fairly and in accordance with the relevant rules. In abusing that position, the panel accepted that the conduct did not fall at the most serious end of the scale of severity. Nevertheless, the conduct involved the improper use of Mr Jackson's role, including the entry of incorrect scores into the system, and therefore amounted to an abuse of the position and trust placed in him.

The panel also considered whether the conduct amounted to a violation of the rights of pupils. It was satisfied that this factor was engaged. Pupils are entitled to have their examination results properly submitted and assessed in accordance with the applicable rules and standards. The misconduct directly affected the examination process for individual pupils and therefore interfered with their right to proper standards of education and fair assessment, even if no ultimate detriment was intended.

The panel considered the public interest factor of collusion or concealment, including encouraging others to break rules. The panel was satisfied that this factor was engaged to a limited extent. There was no allegation, and no finding, that the teacher lied or sought to conceal wrongdoing in order to prevent its identification. However, the panel found that Mr Jackson did act dishonestly and, in his actions, had encouraged a colleague to depart from established examination rules.

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.

There was no evidence that Mr Jackson's actions were not deliberate. The panel found that, while it was possible that he was under pressure or not thinking clearly at the time, this did not amount to confusion sufficient to undermine the deliberate nature of his actions.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Jackson was acting under extreme duress. The panel noted that although he may have been experiencing pressure, pressure is not equivalent to extreme duress.

The panel noted that it was submitted on Mr Jackson's behalf that Mr Jackson demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both his personal and professional conduct and had contributed significantly to the education sector. Having considered the evidence as a whole, the panel did not accept that this high threshold had been met. No supporting evidence was submitted to show that Mr Jackson had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector. However, the panel noted that there was evidence that he had contributed to the education sector. The panel noted that Mr Jackson is a very experienced teacher, with approximately 24 years' teaching experience and around 15 years as a Head of Department. There was clear evidence that he is a competent and committed teacher who is well regarded by colleagues and pupils. In particular, the panel noted evidence that Mr Jackson gave additional time to support students, including returning to look at their work, and was actively involved in a wide range of extra-curricular activities, including sports events and School trips.

The panel noted that the testimonial evidence and materials within the bundle demonstrated that Mr Jackson had made a positive contribution to his School community and to the lives of his pupils. However, it did not amount to an exceptional contribution to the education sector as a whole, nor did it demonstrate exceptionally high standards.

The panel accepted that the incident was out of character. The panel accepted that, at the relevant time, Mr Jackson was subject to a considerable build-up of pressure. This included a demanding workload involving responsibility for multiple examination courses,

GCSE moderation scheduled shortly after the events in question, preparation for a departmental review, and extensive involvement in extra-curricular activities. This period included a ski trip running for the entirety of half-term, with limited opportunity for rest.

The panel saw no evidence that Mr Jackson was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings or warnings.

The panel noted the mitigation evidence submitted by Mr Jackson, [REDACTED].

The panel considered that in Mr Jackson's response to the allegations he stated he had reflected and had identified areas where improved organisation and planning would have assisted him in managing deadlines more effectively. He acknowledged that, in future, leadership training, particularly around managing difficult conversations, would be beneficial.

Mr Jackson stated that he should have had a better understanding of the running of the NCFE course, as it was the first year the course was delivered, particularly in relation to the conduct of the controlled assessment. He explained that, going forward, he would take the opportunity to attend relevant in-person or online training provided by exam boards to ensure full compliance with course requirements.

Mr Jackson stated that he has now reduced his external commitments by limiting the number of organisations and clubs he volunteers with and is now only coaching football and occasionally officiating at swimming galas.

Mr Jackson stated that the main learning outcome has been developing a clearer understanding of his self-worth, an ability to speak up when he is struggling, and ensuring concerns are escalated beyond his line manager where necessary. He explained that, following his dismissal in July 2024, he became determined to better protect his wellbeing in pressured situations. [REDACTED].

[REDACTED], including taking time during work breaks to speak with colleagues. He stated that he now actively manages his workload by limiting the number of tasks he takes on and by being able to say "no" without fear of negative judgement. He believes these steps have enabled him to rebuild appropriate professional boundaries.

Mr Jackson stated that he would welcome the opportunity to return to teaching. He explained that he began his teaching career in 1999 following the completion of his PGCE at Marjon in Plymouth and has taught in London, Hertfordshire, Northamptonshire, Vietnam and Suffolk. He stated that his most rewarding experience was serving the community, where he organised initiatives including the first Sports Awards evening, a range of extracurricular activities, a ski trip and a "Sportathon".

Mr Jackson stated that he has consistently been regarded as a good practitioner who reflects on feedback and engages in continuing professional development ('CPD'). He

referred to support from former line managers and colleagues referenced in the hearing bundle and described his commitment to collaboration, school policies and community engagement. He stated that he was proud to have contributed to the School's improvement from an Ofsted rating of 'Inadequate' to 'Good'.

The panel gave careful consideration to the mitigating factors advanced on Mr Jackson's behalf and to the wider context in which the misconduct occurred.

The panel considered Mr Jackson's evidence that, at the relevant time, he felt particularly under pressure with workload. [REDACTED]. The panel noted that Mr Jackson said he had told his line manager at the time about his issues, but that his line manager was then absent from work and Mr Jackson was not sure that his concerns were ever communicated to anyone else at the School.

The panel accepted that, at the relevant time, Mr Jackson was experiencing a combination of personal and professional pressures. These included [REDACTED]. The panel also took into account pressures arising from [REDACTED], and the practical demands of travelling a long distance to see them at weekends.

The panel acknowledged that professionally Mr Jackson had taken on additional responsibilities, including involvement in School trips and preparation for an anticipated Ofsted inspection. He also commenced delivery of a new examination course during the relevant period. While the panel was not persuaded that these matters amounted, in isolation, to undue pressure imposed by the School, it accepted that Mr Jackson had a tendency to shoulder responsibility as a committed and conscientious member of staff and that this contributed to the overall strain upon him. The panel accepted that this sense of obligation, combined with his underlying [REDACTED], affected his ability to prioritise effectively and to seek assistance at an earlier stage.

The panel noted the absence of formal medical evidence, such as a contemporary report from a GP or therapist. It therefore approached this mitigation advanced with appropriate caution. Nevertheless, it accepted that the combination of factors described provided a credible explanation for the context in which the conduct occurred, while concluding that they did not excuse the dishonest actions themselves.

The panel considered that the misconduct arose from a period of overwhelming pressure, leading to errors of judgement in relation to a single class, of 26 pupils, over a limited period, rather than from a sustained pattern of dishonest behaviour. The panel accepted that, at the time, Mr Jackson did not fully appreciate the seriousness of his actions or their consequences, including the integrity of the examination system and the impact on pupils. His judgement was impaired, and he adopted ill-advised steps to address perceived problems rather than escalating concerns appropriately.

The panel also noted that it had not been provided with any evidence that Mr Jackson was seeking to personally gain from the conduct but instead was focused on the needs of his pupils, albeit inappropriately.

The panel noted a number of character references submitted on behalf of Mr Jackson, which pertained to his professional conduct, his contribution to the profession, and his history and ability as a teacher. The panel considered the following:

Individual E, [REDACTED]

“Duncan’s leadership skills extend beyond just organisational ability. He inspires his team and those around him with his incredible work ethic and dedication to developing young students. He fosters a positive, supportive environment, encouraging all students to reach their full potential, both in a sporting context and in their personal growth.”

Individual F, [REDACTED]

“Duncan was a reflective practitioner and was always open to receiving feedback. In our line management meetings, I found Duncan to be conscientious, open, honest and transparent; he always came to see me if he was worried about anything or had any concerns.”

Individual G, [REDACTED]

“Between us we set up and worked very closely with the development of new GCSE PE specifications, liaising with and supporting several schools in the area with professional development opportunities, hosting meetings, creating resources and setting up standardisation opportunities for non-examined assessments both written and practical.”

“Mr Jackson continued to support the extracurricular side of the profession stepping into area and county leadership roles within Athletics... Mr Jackson’s contributions to academic and extra-curricular provision in his own school, the local area and county, have allowed countless numbers of young people to have access to ever improving opportunities and success.”

Individual H, [REDACTED]

“During my time at Felixstowe School, I have witnessed first-hand Duncan’s dedicated commitment to improve not only the PE department, but the school as a whole. In terms of creating a positive culture and ethos across the school, the influence Duncan has had is truly second to none.”

“As a much respected teacher he has taught so many different groups over the years and whether core PE or exam classes has done so with the up most integrity. Through his kind, caring and compassionate nature he builds the

strongest relationships with all those students in his care and he is hugely respected by all the staff in the school.”

Individual I, [REDACTED]

“Duncan has relentless belief in and aspiration for those around him. Duncan enjoys working with children and young adults, to help them learn and develop themselves to be the best they can be. In PE and sport, he is not only hugely knowledgeable and passionate but he is also willing to lead the way and lead by example. The school and the profession are stronger for having Duncan Jackson as a teacher.”

The panel noted that the character references largely spoke to Mr Jackson’s positive contribution to the School community, particularly his significant involvement in and impact on the sporting culture of the School. The references described him as a committed and well-regarded colleague who routinely volunteered additional time and responsibilities. The panel recognised that this willingness to take on extra commitments, while commendable, was also a factor which formed part of the background to the circumstances leading to the conduct.

The panel considered whether Mr Jackson had demonstrated insight and remorse in relation to his conduct.

In his response to the allegations, Mr Jackson stated that he was “*deeply regretful*” of his actions. He acknowledged that he had let students down and had breached the trust placed in teachers by the examination board by failing to uphold the values of the profession. He recognised that his conduct risked undermining public confidence in professional teaching standards and could have adversely affected the reputation of the teaching profession more generally.

Mr Jackson further accepted that his actions had the potential to jeopardise the School’s status as an approved examination centre, thereby undermining the work of colleagues and limiting opportunities for students. He acknowledged that, as a subject leader, he held a position of responsibility and was required to demonstrate high standards at all times. He recognised that he had fallen short of the expectations placed upon him and expressed regret for failing to act as an appropriate role model for both colleagues and students.

Mr Jackson explained that he had reflected on his conduct and the circumstances that led to it, including taking on excessive responsibility within the department and failing to delegate appropriately. He stated that he had learned from this experience and was committed to ensuring that such conduct would not be repeated.

The panel found that Mr Jackson demonstrated awareness of the wider implications of his conduct, including the potential impact on the integrity and fairness of the assessment process had his actions not been discovered. He accepted that allowing additional time

for coursework could have affected public confidence in the examination system and the School's reputation.

The panel found Mr Jackson had demonstrated some insight and remorse. The panel further noted that Mr Jackson had admitted his conduct from the outset and engaged fully in both the School and the TRA investigations and proceedings.

In considering the likelihood of repetition, the panel attached weight to Mr Jackson's conduct since the events. The panel considered whether there was a risk of Mr Jackson repeating similar conduct in the future. It noted that Mr Jackson had been open about the conduct, and had articulated an understanding of its seriousness. The panel accepted that Mr Jackson recognised the gravity of the situation and had apologised.

The panel found his expressions of remorse to be genuine. It also noted evidence that he had taken steps to reflect on his behaviour, develop strategies for managing pressure, and seek support, including ongoing therapeutic intervention and the development of a "toolkit" to assist him in recognising when to ask for help. These steps provided reassurance that the risk of repetition was low.

The panel acknowledged that the consequences for Mr Jackson had already been significant. He had lost his employment, had not worked as a teacher since the events, and had experienced disruption to his career and livelihood.

The panel accepted that the misconduct related to one class over a relatively short period, in the context of an otherwise unblemished career.

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 informed, intelligent citizen, the recommendation of no prohibition order would be both a proportionate and an appropriate response. Given that the nature and severity of the behaviour were at the less serious end of the possible spectrum and, having considered the mitigating factors that were present, the panel determined that a recommendation for a prohibition order would not be appropriate in this case.

Balancing these factors against the seriousness of the misconduct, in particular the finding of dishonesty and its impact on public examinations, the panel concluded that a prohibition order was not proportionate in order to maintain public confidence in the profession and to uphold proper standards of conduct.

The panel considered that the publication of the adverse findings it had made was sufficient to send an appropriate message to Mr Jackson as to the standards of

behaviour that are not acceptable, and that the publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession.

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 sanction.

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 recommended that the findings of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute in relation to Mr Duncan Jackson should be published and that such an action is proportionate and in the public interest.

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of dishonesty on the part of a teacher and also involves conduct which “...involved pupils in a dishonest assessment process, thereby engaging them in conduct which breached professional boundaries and fell short of treating them with dignity and respect.”. The panel also found that Mr Jackson had abused his position of trust.

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 Jackson, 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,

“The panel acknowledged the conduct found proven in this case did not involve safeguarding concerns in the sense of physical harm, sexual misconduct, or an ongoing risk to the public. However, the panel was satisfied that Mr Jackson’s conduct nevertheless engaged pupil wellbeing in a broader sense. The conduct related to public examinations, an area of particular importance and sensitivity for pupils, and had the potential to undermine pupils’ understanding of the seriousness of examination rules, deadlines, and assessment integrity. The panel considered that such conduct could cause confusion, or longer-term detriment to pupils’ educational experience and attitudes towards assessments, and therefore amounted to misconduct capable of affecting pupils’ education and wellbeing.”

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,

“The panel found that Mr Jackson demonstrated awareness of the wider implications of his conduct, including the potential impact on the integrity and fairness of the assessment process had his actions not been discovered. He accepted that allowing additional time for coursework could have affected public confidence in the examination system and the School’s reputation.”

The panel has also commented that Mr Jackson had *“demonstrated some insight and remorse. The panel further noted that Mr Jackson had admitted his conduct from the outset and engaged fully in both the School and the TRA investigations and proceedings.”*

The panel further notes, *“The panel found his expressions of remorse to be genuine. It also noted evidence that he had taken steps to reflect on his behaviour, develop strategies for managing pressure, and seek support, including ongoing therapeutic intervention and the development of a “toolkit” to assist him in recognising when to ask for help. These steps provided reassurance that the risk of repetition was low.”*

However, 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, “...*the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Jackson was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.*”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of dishonesty in this case, and particularly involving pupils in that dishonesty, 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 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 Jackson himself. The panel comment “*The panel acknowledged that the consequences for Mr Jackson had already been significant. He had lost his employment, had not worked as a teacher since the events, and had experienced disruption to his career and livelihood.*”

The panel also recorded that “...*it was submitted on Mr Jackson’s behalf that Mr Jackson demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both his personal and professional conduct and had contributed significantly to the education sector. Having considered the evidence as a whole, the panel did not accept that this high threshold had been met.*”

However, the panel did note that Mr Jackson had made a contribution to the education sector, and I have given due regard to the positive testimonials provided to the panel on Mr Jackson’s behalf. The panel note that “...*the character references largely spoke to Mr Jackson’s positive contribution to the School community, particularly his significant involvement in and impact on the sporting culture of the School.*”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Jackson 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.

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that “...behaviours associated with serious dishonesty were present” and that Mr Jackson had involved pupils in that dishonesty. From the panel’s findings, it also appears that Mr Jackson risked drawing a colleague into his conduct.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Jackson 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 full remorse or insight, 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.

The Advice lists factors which, if involved, may weigh in favour of a longer review period. The panel has identified that behaviours associated with serious dishonesty were present in this case.

However, I have weighed that against the finding that the panel has made that the risk of repetition is low. The panel has said,

“In his response to the allegations, Mr Jackson stated that he was “deeply regretful” of his actions. He acknowledged that he had let students down and had breached the trust placed in teachers by the examination board by failing to uphold the values of the profession. He recognised that his conduct risked undermining public confidence in professional teaching standards and could have adversely affected the reputation of the teaching profession more generally.

Mr Jackson further accepted that his actions had the potential to jeopardise the School’s status as an approved examination centre, thereby undermining the work of colleagues and limiting opportunities for students. He acknowledged that, as a subject leader, he held a position of responsibility and was required to demonstrate high standards at all times. He recognised that he had fallen short of the expectations placed upon him and expressed regret for failing to act as an appropriate role model for both colleagues and students.”

I have also taken into account the personal and professional pressures the panel has found Mr Jackson was under at the time, although I note the panel has not found that those pressures amounted to extreme duress.

Additionally, I have taken into consideration the positive testimonials provided to the panel which describe the positive contribution Mr Jackson has made to the school community.

I have considered what duration of 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 a two-year review period is sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the dishonesty found, that there was not full insight or remorse, and the abuse of his position of trust, including by involving pupils in the misconduct.

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

This means that Mr Duncan Jackson 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 1 May 2028, two 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 Jackson remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr Jackson has a right of appeal to the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this order.



Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield

Date: 24 April 2026

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