



# **Mr Martin Jones: Professional conduct panel outcome**

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

**May 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	14
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	17

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

**Teacher:** Mr Martin Jones

**TRA reference:** 20760

**Date of determination:** 29 May 2026

**Former employer:** Repton School, Derbyshire

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 27 to 29 May 2026 at Cheylesmore House, 5 Quinton Road, Coventry, CV1 2WT, to consider the case of Mr Martin Jones.

The panel members were Mrs Monique Clark (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Anila Rai (lay panellist) and Mr Tim Cole (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Madison Taylor of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Alexander Barnfield of Capsticks LLP solicitors.

Mr Jones was present and was represented by Ms Kathryn Pitters of Broadway House Chambers.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

## Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 12 February 2026, as amended following the presenting officer's application during the hearing.

It was alleged that Mr Jones was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that while employed at Repton School (the "School"):

1. In or about 2005, he kissed Pupil B whilst they were a pupil at the School.
2. His conduct at Particular 1 was sexually motivated.

In addition, it was alleged that Mr Jones was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence in that:

3. On 5 July 2005, he was convicted of 'On 13 June 2005 at Ticknall drove a motor vehicle [REDACTED] after consuming so much alcohol that the proportion of it in his breath, namely 70 microgrammes of alcohol in 100 millilitres of breath, exceeded the prescribed limit. Contrary to Section 5(a)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Section 34(1) Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988'.
4. On 18 March 2019, he was convicted of 'On 3 March 2019 at [REDACTED] drove a motor vehicle [REDACTED] after consuming so much alcohol that the proportion of it in his breath, namely 78 microgrammes of alcohol in 100 millilitres of breath, exceeded the prescribed limit'.

Mr Jones denied the facts of allegations 1 and 2. He further denied that his conduct amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, as set out in the response to the notice of proceedings, signed by Mr Jones' representative on 16 March 2026.

Mr Jones admitted the convictions at allegations 3 and 4 and the facts underpinning them, although submitted that it was a matter for the panel to determine if the convictions were 'relevant' for the purposes of the Procedures.

## Summary of evidence

### Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology, anonymised pupil list and list of key people – pages 4 to 7

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 8 to 25

Section 3: TRA witness statements and exhibits – pages 26 to 63

Section 4: Other relevant TRA documents – pages 64 to 115

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 116 to 253

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

- A one-page email thread between Mr Jones and the surgeon who completed surgery on Mr Jones' knee in 2005, which it numbered page 254; and
- A four-page email thread between Mr Jones' solicitor and the TRA, which it numbered page 255-258.

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

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

## **Witnesses**

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

- Pupil M

Mr Jones attended the hearing and gave oral evidence. Mr Jones also called the following witness:

- Pupil B

## **Decision and reasons**

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

In July 2003, Mr Jones commenced employment at the School.

On 5 July 2005, Mr Jones was convicted at Southern Derbyshire Magistrates' Court, having entered a guilty plea for the offence of driving a motor vehicle after consuming so much alcohol that the proportion of it in his breath exceeded the prescribed limit.

In or about 2005, Mr Jones was allegedly seen kissing Pupil B at a School social.

On 18 March 2019, Mr Jones was convicted at Southern Derbyshire Magistrates' Court, having entered a guilty plea for the offence proportion of it in his breath exceeded the prescribed limit.

On 27 April 2022, a former governor of the School submitted a misconduct referral to the TRA raising concerns about alleged sexual misconduct by Mr Jones.

In or around May 2022, a concern was raised with the Independent Schools Inspectorate ('ISI'), which alleged that Mr Jones had engaged in inappropriate conduct with pupils.

On 8 February 2023, a representative of the ISI submitted a misconduct referral form to the TRA in respect of those concerns, alleging that Mr Jones had engaged in inappropriate conduct with pupils.

On 7 March 2023, the School submitted a misconduct referral form to the TRA.

## Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

### 1. In or about 2005, you kissed Pupil B whilst they were a pupil at the School.

The panel noted that Mr Jones denied allegation 1, as set out in the response to notice of proceedings dated 16 March 2026 and reaffirmed in his oral evidence during the hearing.

The panel noted that the primary basis of the TRA's case in respect of this allegation was the evidence of Pupil M.

In the oral evidence and written statement of Pupil M, she recalled attending a social event at the School [REDACTED]. Pupil M provided a detailed description of the physical layout of the setting of the social event, explaining that it was in the School's "theatre" – and confirming when asked that this was the same location known as the "400 Hall" – which had "blackout curtains" in the main area and was populated with a dancefloor with a DJ for the event. She described an atrium area attached to the main area, which people would gravitate to if they wanted some quieter time or a chat, which the panel took to indicate that the main room was noisy due to the dancefloor and DJ. Pupil M described the atmosphere at these social events – which took place once a term – as "big budget events" which were "very exciting, extremely lively, extremely fun [...] a big big party".

Pupil M described being "in the middle of the dancefloor" at the event, which she characterised as busy as it was a "group of 16- to 18-year-olds having a great time". Pupil M recalled seeing a couple kissing near her on the dancefloor, but that she could not identify who the pair was while they were kissing. She commented that it was not

unusual for students to kiss each other at events like these, and that this couple were *“right in front of me”*.

Pupil M recalled being *“knocked”* while on the dancefloor and jostled into the pair, causing them to stop kissing and look towards her. Pupil M stated that at that point, she was able to see the faces of the couple. She recalled that it was Mr Jones who was kissing Pupil B. Pupil M recalled seeing Mr Jones’ face clearly in that moment, stating that he was *“not in fancy dress”* and that once he and Pupil B *“broke apart, his face turned to mine and locked eye contact with me [...] straight at me. There was no mistake who I saw”*.

Pupil M could not recall how many drinks she had consumed at the time she saw Mr Jones and Pupil B kissing. Pupil M explained how she would certainly have had one drink but was unsure whether she had consumed two. Pupil M stated that pupils were only given one or two drinks at these events, typically beer rather than strong alcohol. Pupil M submitted that, [REDACTED], and therefore she would not have consumed more than one or two drinks.

The panel considered Mr Jones’ evidence surrounding the alleged incident.

Mr Jones was not able to recall with any certainty whether he attended the relevant social event. While he accepted that it was not unusual for him and other teachers to attend such events in various capacities, sometimes on a rota to provide supervision for students, sometimes as a social opportunity among the staff to catch up with one another after their respective sporting engagements on Saturdays, he could not definitively recall if he had been at the specific event in question.

With respect to his knowledge of Pupil B, Mr Jones submitted that she was not a pupil he knew in [REDACTED]. He explained that he had not coached her [REDACTED].

Mr Jones denied that he had kissed Pupil B, either on the dancefloor at the [REDACTED] as alleged by Pupil M or at any other point. When asked in oral evidence if there was any social, he could recall where he kissed Pupil B, he responded: *“absolutely not. With 100% certainty. She was a pupil I didn’t know, didn’t coach. I certainly never kissed Pupil B at any time”*.

The panel considered the oral evidence and witness statement of Pupil B.

Pupil B recalled attending the social at the School in [REDACTED]. She stated she *“vaguely remembered perhaps seeing”* Mr Jones at the event, but that they did not interact and there was no reason they would have interacted.

Pupil B characterised her knowledge of Mr Jones as limited, due to the fact that he was engaged at the School almost exclusively in connection with [REDACTED] and that she was not part of any of the teams he coached. She stated that she knew who he was

because [REDACTED] and also because he was one of the staff members at what was a fairly small school faculty. She stated that Mr Jones *"wouldn't have any reason to know"* her.

Pupil B stated in her witness statement that the allegation of a shared kiss was *"false"*. When asked in oral evidence how she felt when the allegation against Mr Jones was first communicated to her, Pupil B stated she was *"really surprised [...] that's not something that happened at all. It surprised me that this was even a conversation. [Mr Jones] and I don't know each other [...] He's just somebody I knew of. I was really surprised with all this."*

In her oral evidence, Pupil B was clear in her view that *"if he had kissed me, I would have remembered it."* She stated that it would have been highly unusual for a teacher and pupil to share a kiss, and that it was not a possibility that she and Mr Jones had kissed and that she could not recall it.

The presenting officer submitted that Pupil B had shared a kiss with Mr Jones as set out in the allegation, but that she had potential motivations to deny the incident by virtue of embarrassment, loyalty or fear of consequences. Pupil B rejected those suggestions.

The panel noted that Pupil B had voluntarily attended the hearing to be a witness on Mr Jones' behalf and heard submissions from the teacher's representative that there was *"no sensible reason"* for her to volunteer to attend a hearing to tell a panel something that was not true.

The panel noted that Pupil M, Mr Jones and Pupil B all agreed that the venue for the spring social was filled with pupils of the sixth form at the School and staff members at the School. The panel considered that this materially impacted the likelihood that a member of staff would engage in a kiss with a pupil, openly, in the middle of the dancefloor.

Taking all the evidence in the round, the panel did not consider that the TRA had discharged its burden to prove on the balance of probabilities that Mr Jones had kissed Pupil B while she was a pupil at the School.

The panel noted that, despite the fact that it did not conclude on the balance of probabilities that Mr Jones and Pupil B had kissed in the circumstances described by Pupil M, it did not consider Pupil M to lack credibility nor to have been dishonest in her recollection.

Essentially, the panel considered that Pupil M, Pupil B and Mr Jones all believed that their individual version of events was truthful. The panel had regard to the passage of a significant amount of time since the alleged incident, and the gathering of accounts in connection with the allegation. The panel understood that memory becomes more

unreliable as time passes, and that it is possible for the passage of time to compound mistaken beliefs rather than to correct them.

There were a number of particularly significant considerations in the panel's deliberations which led to its conclusion. There was no dispute around the characterisation of the venue of the alleged kiss as being dark, crowded, and noisy. There was no dispute that alcohol had been consumed. The incident took place over 20 years ago. Witness evidence only began to be gathered in 2022 and no contemporaneous evidence from the relevant time existed to assist the panel. The room was filled with pupils and staff which impacted on the probability of a kiss between a pupil and staff member taking place openly on a dancefloor. Notably, the panel heard from Pupil B herself that she does not accept that that she and Mr Jones shared a kiss.

The panel found allegation 1 not proved.

## **2. Your conduct at Particular 1 was sexually motivated.**

The panel recognised that its consideration of allegation 2 was contingent on it having previously found the conduct alleged at allegation 1 proven. As it did not make such a finding, the panel was not able to consider allegation 2.

Accordingly, the panel found allegation 2 not proven.

## **3. On 5 July 2005, you were convicted of 'On 13 June 2005 at Ticknall drove a motor vehicle [REDACTED] after consuming so much alcohol that the proportion of it in your breath, namely 70 microgrammes of alcohol in 100 millilitres of breath, exceeded the prescribed limit. Contrary to Section 5(a)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 to the Section 34(1) Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988'.**

The panel considered Mr Jones' representations in an email from his legal representative dated 2 May 2024, as well as Mr Jones' oral submissions in live evidence. Mr Jones consistently admitted the conviction and the facts behind it and confirmed that he had pleaded guilty to driving whilst over the prescribed alcohol limit. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the evidence available to it.

The panel noted page 8 of the *Teacher misconduct: the prohibition of teachers* ("the Advice"), which states that where there has been a conviction at any time of a criminal offence, the panel will accept the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction, unless exceptional circumstances apply. The panel did not find that any exceptional circumstances applied in this case.

The panel had been provided with a memorandum of conviction from Southern Derbyshire Magistrates' Court dated 5 July 2005, which recorded that Mr Jones had been

convicted of driving a motor vehicle on 13 June 2005 after consuming alcohol in excess of the prescribed limit, namely 70 microgrammes of alcohol in 100 millilitres of breath, contrary to Section 5(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988. The panel noted that Mr Jones entered a guilty plea in respect of that offence.

In respect of the offence, Mr Jones was fined £440 and disqualified from driving for a period of 20 months, to be reduced to 15 months upon completion of an approved rehabilitation course by 4 August 2006. His driving licence was also endorsed.

The panel heard live evidence from Mr Jones that the circumstances around the 2005 convictions were that a friend of his had gone to another person's home and had informed Mr Jones that he had been unable to get a taxi home. Mr Jones had been drinking alcohol but agreed to go and collect the friend to bring them home.

Mr Jones was pulled over by police before he was able to collect the friend. He expressed his "*deep regret*" at those actions, although when asked by the presenting officer to describe what he learned from the experience of that offence and entering his guilty plea, Mr Jones responded "*explicitly, I'm not sure*". He did emphasise his view that he is a "*very different person now*".

On examination of the documents before it, including the certificate of conviction, the panel found allegation 3 proven.

**4. On 18 March 2019, you were convicted of 'On 3 March 2019 at [REDACTED] drove a motor vehicle [REDACTED] after consuming so much alcohol that the proportion of it in your breath, namely 78 microgrammes of alcohol in 100 millilitres of breath, exceeded the prescribed limit'.**

The panel considered Mr Jones' representations in an email from his legal representative dated 2 May 2024, as well as Mr Jones' oral submissions in live evidence. Mr Jones admitted the conviction and the facts behind it and confirmed that he had pleaded guilty to driving whilst over the prescribed alcohol limit. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the evidence available to it.

The panel noted page 8 of the Advice which states that where there has been a conviction at any time of a criminal offence, the panel will accept the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction, unless exceptional circumstances apply. The panel did not find that any exceptional circumstances applied in this case.

The panel had been provided with a memorandum of conviction from Southern Derbyshire Magistrates' Court dated 18 March 2019, which recorded that Mr Jones had been convicted of driving a motor vehicle on 3 March 2019 after consuming alcohol in excess of the prescribed limit, namely 78 microgrammes of alcohol in 100 millilitres of

breath, contrary to Section 5(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988. The panel noted that Mr Jones entered a guilty plea in respect of that offence.

In respect of the offence, Mr Jones was fined £710 and disqualified from holding or obtaining a driving licence for a period of 20 months, with the potential for that period to be reduced by 22 weeks upon satisfactory completion of a course approved by the Secretary of State. His driving record was also endorsed.

The panel heard live evidence from Mr Jones of the circumstances around the 2019 conviction. Those were that he had been at a pub in Repton and parked in a busy car park. When he went to leave the pub at the end of the evening, he noticed the car park was no longer busy but that his car was blocking a door used by the pub. He recalled that he "*stupidly decided to drive home 200m away*", and also that he offered to drive a colleague home who lived 500m away. Mr Jones confirmed that both of these houses were located on the Repton School site and accepted that this meant he had driven onto the School site while exceeding the legal limit of alcohol consumption. Mr Jones submitted that he had driven past his house when, as he submitted, "*the police saw me speeding*".

The panel heard evidence that he self-reported the incident to a senior member of staff at the earliest opportunity, with the panel understanding he approached the deputy headmistress of the School within 24 hours of being released from police custody.

The panel heard further evidence that Mr Jones felt "*great regret*" at the circumstances, expressing that it triggered him to engage with a life coach to access support following his realisation that he had made "*such a stupid mistake*". He submitted that, following the second offence, it was something he had "*totally learned from*", that his alcohol intake is now "*much less*" than it had been in the past and that he has "*never set foot in a car with alcohol in my system*" since the 2019 incident.

On examination of the documents before it, including the certificate of conviction, the panel was satisfied that allegation 4 was proven.

### **Findings as to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and/or conviction of a relevant offence**

Having found a number of the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted, in respect of allegations 3 and 4, to conviction of a relevant offence.

#### Conviction of a relevant offence

The panel made this finding in respect of allegations 3 and 4 only. Having found the facts of those allegations proven in that Mr Jones had been convicted of the two offences, the panel went on to consider the relevance of the convictions to Mr Jones' ongoing suitability to teach.

The panel specifically considered paragraph 32 of the Advice, which confirmed that an offence can be considered relevant even if it did not involve misconduct in the course of teaching. It further noted that it needed to consider all facts of the case including the nature and gravity of the offence and the circumstances surrounding it, including any mitigating circumstances.

With reference to the bullet points set out at paragraph 32 of the Advice, the panel did not consider the convictions were relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting, nor that they would be likely to affect public confidence in the teaching profession if Mr Jones were allowed to continue teaching.

However, the panel did consider that the convictions were contrary to the standard of personal and professional conduct expected of teachers and would be likely to have an impact on the safety or security of pupils or members of the public.

With respect to the standard of personal and professional conduct expected of teachers, the panel noted that Mr Jones himself appeared to acknowledge that the convictions demonstrated behaviour below those standards. The panel considered that this was particularly evidenced by the steps Mr Jones had taken following the 2019 incident to access self-help and support to correct the mindset he was in which had led to the conduct. The panel further recognised that Mr Jones had self-reported the 2019 incident to a senior member of staff, providing some indication that he recognised the seriousness of the matter.

The panel considered the nature and circumstances of the offences committed in 2005 and 2019 and found them to be strikingly similar. Both offences were related to drinking beyond the legal limit and to some degree related to providing a lift to a friend or colleague. The panel noted its concern about repetition of nearly exactly the same offence, notwithstanding that it recognised Mr Jones' actions taken after the 2019 incident which were seemingly motivated by a desire to never repeat such actions again.

The panel concluded that the repetition of a near-identical offence of drink-driving – albeit with a 14-year gap between the offences – was indicative of a prevailing attitude and was contrary to the standard of personal and professional conduct expected of teachers.

With respect to the likelihood of the conduct associated with the conviction having an impact on safety or security of pupils or members of the public, the panel specifically noted that the circumstances of the 2019 incident included driving onto the School site while under the influence of alcohol. The panel considered this to be a clear example which could likely have had an impact on the safety or security of pupils. While the panel noted Mr Jones' submission that there were no pupils around at the time of the offence, it

did not consider this submission to negate what it perceived to be a serious potential risk to the safety or security of pupils.

The panel noted Mr Jones' evidence that the 2005 incident occurred while he was on his way to collect a friend to be a passenger in the car, and the 2019 incident occurred while he did in fact have a colleague as a passenger in the car. The panel considered that these served as clear examples of safety risks to the passengers or intended passengers in the car.

Additionally, the panel considered that the act of driving while exceeding the legal limit of alcohol in one's system inherently creates a significant safety risk to members of the public such as pedestrians and other drivers. It was the view of the panel that this inherent risk was one of the fundamental reasons behind the criminalisation of such conduct in the first place.

The fact that no physical harm was ultimately caused to anyone – be this in reference to pupils, passengers or intended passengers in Mr Jones' car, members of the public, or Mr Jones himself – did not mitigate the panel's conclusion that Mr Jones' conduct associated with these offences was likely to impact on the safety and security of those groups.

The panel noted that Mr Jones' behaviour did not lead to a sentence of imprisonment, which was indicative that the offence was at the less serious end of the possible spectrum.

The panel also considered the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice, noting that offences that relate to or involve any of the behaviours included on that list will likely be considered a relevant offence. The panel noted that one of the offence types included on that list was serious driving offences, particularly those involving alcohol or drugs.

Considering the same factors set out above in connection with how the panel concluded the convictions were contrary to the personal and professional conduct of teachers and that the conduct was likely to have had an impact on the safety or security of pupils or members of the public, the panel concluded that these offences were 'serious'.

The panel considered it was necessary to find that these convictions constituted relevant offences, to reaffirm clear standards of conduct and maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

Accordingly, the panel concluded that Mr Jones had committed a relevant offence in respect of allegations 3 and 4.

## Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of a conviction of a relevant offence, it was necessary for it 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. The panel recognised that 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. Having done so, it found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and protection of other members of the public and the declaring and upholding of proper standards of conduct.

The panel considered that there was a strong public interest engaged in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and protection of members of the public, given the nature of the offences. The panel again had in mind its previous considerations when determining that the offences were 'relevant', with focus on safety and security of pupils and the public.

The panel found that Mr Jones' conduct created clear and significant risks to the safety and wellbeing of pupils and the wider public. In particular, driving onto the School site while over the legal alcohol limit presented a direct potential danger to pupils, regardless of whether any were present at the time.

Both incidents also involved carrying, or intending to carry, passengers, exposing colleagues or friends to avoidable harm. More broadly, drink-driving inherently endangers other road users and pedestrians, reflecting a disregard for public safety.

The panel concluded that, even though no actual harm occurred, the behaviour posed a substantial and foreseeable risk to pupils, passengers, and the public, undermining their safety and wellbeing.

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

The panel found that Mr Jones' conduct fell below the standards expected of teachers, a position he himself appeared to accept. This was reflected in his efforts after the 2019 incident to seek support and address the underlying mindset, as well as his decision to

self-report the matter to a senior colleague, indicating some recognition of its seriousness.

The panel placed weight on the fact that the offences in 2005 and 2019 were highly similar. Both involved drink-driving after consuming alcohol beyond the legal limit, in circumstances where Mr Jones was transporting or intending to transport others. This repetition, despite the lengthy gap between incidents, raised concerns that the behaviour was not isolated but could be indicative of an underlying and persistent behaviour.

The panel concluded that this pattern of conduct conflicted with the professional standards expected of teachers. In particular, it demonstrated a failure to consistently exercise responsible decision-making, uphold the law, and model safe and appropriate behaviour. Such expectations are fundamental to maintaining public trust in the profession, and the recurrence of similar offences could suggest a prevailing attitude incompatible with those standards.

In addition to the public interest considerations set out above, the panel went on to consider whether there was a public interest in retaining Mr Jones in the profession. The panel considered that there was some public interest consideration in retaining Mr Jones in the profession, since it was satisfied, he is able to make a valuable contribution to the profession and had in fact done so in the past. For example, the panel had regard to a character reference included in the bundle from [REDACTED]. He stated as follows:

“Martin and I go back to the very founding of [REDACTED], which was established through our joint efforts. The club was Martin's vision, and it was my privilege to support him in bringing it to life, [REDACTED]. Martin served as Head of Hockey from the club's founding until his departure in January 2023, carrying responsibility for all on-field matters — including coaching players, recruiting coaches, and overseeing player development.”

In view of the public interest considerations that were present, the panel considered carefully whether or not it would be proportionate to impose a prohibition order, taking into account the effect that this would have on Mr Jones.

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

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards; and,
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution.

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the behaviour, noting that the Advice states that it is important to consider the influential role that a teacher can play in the

formation of pupils' views and behaviours. The panel also recognised the level of trust and responsibility that members of the teaching profession hold and noted the expectation of both the public and pupils that members of the teaching profession maintain an exemplary level of integrity and ethical standards at all times.

As set out in its previous analysis, the panel was in no doubt that the misconduct associated with the convictions was serious and Mr Jones himself did not dispute this. However, the panel considered that it fell at the less serious end of the spectrum.

The panel noted that Mr Jones' behaviour did not lead to a sentence of imprisonment, which was indicative of, and further supported the panel's view that, that the offence was at the less serious end of the possible spectrum.

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order may 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 Jones' actions were not deliberate.

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

The panel did not find that Mr Jones had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct, nor that he had contributed significantly to the education sector in the context of how these standards are applicable in the Advice.

In considering mitigation, the panel took into account the extent of Mr Jones' insight and any evidence of remorse.

The panel considered that Mr Jones had displayed insight into the seriousness of his actions and their potential impact, particularly noting that he had displayed candour and honesty with respect to the convictions on multiple occasions. Examples included: entering a guilty plea in respect of both charges at the earliest opportunity; informing a senior member of staff as soon as possible after the 2019 incident; disclosing to his current employer the nature of the convictions (of which the panel had seen evidence in the bundle) and, admitting the allegations relating to the convictions from the outset of these TRA proceedings.

The panel also recognised that Mr Jones had taken active steps to access support and self-help following the 2019 incident, such as engaging with a life coach. The panel heard that Mr Jones recognised this was a "dark time" in his life and that he has subsequently reduced his general alcohol intake and specifically stated he had not operated a motor vehicle after having consumed any alcohol whatsoever since the 2019 incident. The panel considered these actions indicated a level of remorse, accountability, and a desire to prevent recurrence.

The panel considered a character reference in the bundle provided by Mr Jones' present employer, for whom he has worked since 2024. The panel considered it was clear from the reference that Mr Jones had candidly disclosed the circumstances around the convictions to his employer and that the employer was fully aware of the circumstances in which he prepared the reference i.e. for these misconduct proceedings.

In his character reference in support of Mr Jones, [REDACTED] said:

"I write in my capacity on the Board at [REDACTED] in respect of Martin Jones in relation to his fitness to practise hearing before the Teaching Regulation Agency." [...] "At the time of Martin's appointment in May 2024, the Club was aware that allegations had been raised [...] Martin addressed those matters openly with the Club during the recruitment process."

The panel noted Mr Jones repeated expressions his written statement and oral evidence of "deep regret" and characterisation of his misconduct as "*stupid*" as strong evidence of remorse relating to the misconduct.

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, the recommendation of no prohibition order would be a proportionate and appropriate response. The panel specifically considered the quote from the judgment from ***Wallace v Secretary of State for Education* [[2017] EWHC 109 (Admin)]**, to be applicable in this case i.e.: "There was a failure to explain how prohibiting [the teacher] for a period of at least two years would produce any material change or serve any useful purpose".

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 was not necessary and would not be proportionate or appropriate in this case.

The panel considered that the publication of the adverse findings it had made would be sufficient to send an appropriate message to the teacher as to the standards of behaviour that are not acceptable, and the publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession. The panel therefore recommended that no prohibition order be made.

## 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 allegations 3 and 4 proven and found that those proven facts amount to a relevant conviction. In this case, the panel has found allegations 1 and 2 not proven, and I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Martin Jones should not be the subject of a prohibition order. The panel has recommended that the findings of a relevant conviction should be published and that such an action is proportionate and in the public interest.

In particular, the panel has found that the behaviour of Mr Jones represented a serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards. The panel said that the "convictions were contrary to the standard of personal and professional conduct expected of teachers and would be likely to have an impact on the safety or security of pupils or members of the public."

The findings of misconduct are serious as they involve 2 convictions for the relevant offence of driving a motor vehicle whilst exceeding the legal alcohol limit.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case, I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself whether a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of a relevant conviction, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Mr Jones, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

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

"The panel found that Mr Jones' conduct created clear and significant risks to the safety and wellbeing of pupils and the wider public. In particular, driving onto the School site while over the legal alcohol limit presented a direct potential danger to pupils, regardless of whether any were present at the time.

Both incidents also involved carrying, or intending to carry, passengers, exposing colleagues or friends to avoidable harm. More broadly, drink-driving inherently endangers other road users and pedestrians, reflecting a disregard for public safety.

The panel concluded that, even though no actual harm occurred, the behaviour posed a substantial and foreseeable risk to pupils, passengers, and the public, undermining their safety 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 has set out as follows:

“The panel considered that Mr Jones had displayed insight into the seriousness of his actions and their potential impact, particularly noting that he had displayed candour and honesty with respect to the convictions on multiple occasions. Examples included: entering a guilty plea in respect of both charges at the earliest opportunity; informing a senior member of staff as soon as possible after the 2019 incident; disclosing to his current employer the nature of the convictions (of which the panel had seen evidence in the bundle) and, admitting the allegations relating to the convictions from the outset of these TRA proceedings.

The panel also recognised that Mr Jones had taken active steps to access support and self-help following the 2019 incident, such as engaging with a life coach. The panel heard that Mr Jones recognised this was a “dark time” in his life and that he has subsequently reduced his general alcohol intake and specifically stated he had not operated a motor vehicle after having consumed any alcohol whatsoever since the 2019 incident. The panel considered these actions indicated a level of remorse, accountability, and a desire to prevent recurrence.”

I have therefore given this element some 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. I am particularly mindful of the finding of convictions for serious driving offences involving alcohol in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

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

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of a relevant conviction, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mr Jones himself. The panel has commented that “there was some public interest consideration in retaining Mr Jones

in the profession, since it was satisfied, he is able to make a valuable contribution to the profession and had in fact done so in the past.” The panel’s report cites 2 positive character references.

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

I have noted the panel’s comments that there was no evidence that Mr Jones’ actions were not deliberate, nor that he was acting under extreme duress. However, in this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments on the level of insight and remorse shown by Mr Jones.

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that “the nature and severity of the behaviour were at the less serious end of the possible spectrum”.

For these reasons, I have concluded that a prohibition order is not proportionate or in the public interest. I consider that the publication of the findings made would be sufficient to send an appropriate message to the teacher as to the standards of behaviour that were not acceptable and that the publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D Oatley', written in a cursive style.

**Decision maker: David Oatley**

**Date: 2 June 2026**

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