



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Jack Smith: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

August 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	4
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	8
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	12

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

Teacher: Mr Jack Smith

Teacher ref number: 1859834

Teacher date of birth: 13 July 1995

TRA reference: 24459

Date of determination: 14 August 2026

Former employer: Lincolnshire

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ('the panel') of the Teaching Regulation Agency ('the TRA') convened on 14 August 2026 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Jack Smith.

The panel members were Mrs Julie Wells (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Sofia McGreavy (lay panellist) and Dr Lee Longden (former teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr James Corrish of Birketts LLP Solicitors.

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Smith that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Smith provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted conviction of a relevant offence. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, Ms Leah Redden of Browne Jacobson LLP, Mr Smith or any representative of Mr Smith.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 27 May 2026.

It was alleged that Mr Smith was guilty of having been convicted, at any time, of a relevant offence, in that:

1. On 26 November 2024, he was convicted at Lincoln Crown Court of 9 counts of sexual communication with a child under 13.
2. On 26 November 2024, he was convicted at Lincoln Crown Court of 17 counts of sexual assault of a child.
3. On 26 November 2024, he was convicted at Lincoln Crown Court of 13 counts of sexual assault.

Mr Smith admitted the allegations, including that the offences for which he was convicted were relevant offences, as set out in the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Smith on 6 March 2026.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Notice of meeting and notice of referral response – pages 4 to 5

Section 2: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 7 to 26

Section 3: TRA documents – pages 28 to 82

Section 4: Teacher documents – page 83

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

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

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Smith on 6 March 2026 and subsequently signed by the presenting officer on 19 March 2026.

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

Mr Smith qualified as a teacher in 2019. He commenced employment as a humanities teacher Lincolnshire on 1 September 2019.

On 8 March 2024, two pupils at the School reported allegations that Mr Smith had touched them inappropriately. Mr Smith was suspended on the same day, and the School commenced an internal investigation.

On 6 June 2024, Lincolnshire police informed the School that Mr Smith had been charged with 11 sexual offences including sexual assault on a child under 13 and sexual communication with a child.

Mr Smith was dismissed by the School on 17 July 2024.

The matter was referred to the TRA on 1 September 2024.

On 26 November 2024, Mr Smith was tried and convicted of nine counts of sexual communication with a child under 13, 17 counts of sexual assault of a child and 13 counts of sexual assault.

On 17 January 2025 at Lincoln Crown Court, Mr Smith was sentenced in respect of the offences to a total of 7 years and 6 months imprisonment, [REDACTED], and subject to police notification requirements. Mr Smith was further sentenced to an indefinite sexual harm prevention order and indefinite restraining order in respect of his victims.

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:

- 1. On 26 November 2024, you were convicted at Lincoln Crown Court of 9 counts of sexual communication with a child under 13.**

- 2. On 26 November 2024, you were convicted at Lincoln Crown Court of 17 counts of sexual assault of a child.**
- 3. On 26 November 2024, you were convicted at Lincoln Crown Court of 13 counts of sexual assault.**

The panel considered the statement of agreed facts, in which Mr Smith admitted the allegations and further admitted that the facts of the allegations amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the facts available to it.

The panel noted page 8 of the document 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 any exceptional circumstances applicable in this case.

The panel had been provided with a certificate of conviction from Lincoln Crown Court, which detailed that Mr Smith had been tried and convicted on 26 November 2024 of nine counts of sexual communication with a child under 13, 17 counts of sexual assault of a child, and 13 counts of sexual assault.

On 17 January 2025 at Lincoln Crown Court, Mr Smith was sentenced in respect of the offences to a total of 7 years and 6 months imprisonment, [REDACTED], and subject to police notification requirements. Mr Smith was further sentenced to an indefinite sexual harm prevention order and indefinite restraining order in respect of his victims.

Noting the Advice and having considered the admitted facts and the supporting evidence, including the certificate of conviction, the panel found allegations 1, 2 and 3 proved.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

Having found all of the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to convictions of relevant offences.

In doing so, the panel had regard to the Advice.

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

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
 - showing [...] respect for the rights of others
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect...
- 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 considered that Mr Smith's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting. The panel had regard to the statement of agreed facts which set out that Mr Smith's 39 counts of sexual offending were against 14 pupils at the School. The panel noted the Judge's sentencing remarks which set out that Mr Smith had groomed pupils, talked to them about sexual matters under the pretence of sexual education, and touched them sexually by putting his hand inside their trousers.

The panel concluded that the behaviour involved in committing the offences could have had an impact on the safety and/or security of pupils and/or members of the public. The panel noted, with concern, apparent evidence before it that Mr Smith contacted victims whilst on bail.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Smith's behaviour in committing the offences would affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community and that the offences were concerned with sexual assaults on children and had occurred at the School, whilst those children were under his care.

The panel noted that Mr Smith's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment of 7 years and 6 months, which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed.

The panel also considered the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

This was a case concerning offences involving sexual activity and sexual communication with a child, which the Advice states are likely to be considered relevant offences.

The panel considered that the offences for which Mr Smith had been convicted were extremely serious. The panel considered the judge's sentencing remarks which set out the impact of Mr Smith's behaviour on pupils. In particular, the panel noted that pupils continued to feel worried and nervous at school because of Mr Smith's behaviour, their trust was affected and they felt betrayed.

The panel was not made aware of any mitigating circumstances in Mr Smith's case. The panel did not see any evidence of insight or remorse from Mr Smith regarding his conduct.

The panel saw no evidence that Mr Smith's teaching proficiency was of note and found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the convictions was relevant to Mr Smith's ongoing suitability to teach.

The panel considered that a finding that convictions were for relevant offences was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

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

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be made, the panel had to consider whether it would be an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it would be in the public interest to do so. Prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely, the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, the protection of other members of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and the declaring and upholding of proper standards of conduct.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Smith, which involved his having been found guilty of 39 counts of offending behaviour including offences against children under his care as a teacher over a number of years, there was a very strong public interest consideration engaged in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and protection of other members of the public.

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

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Mr Smith 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 Smith in the profession.

There was no evidence before the panel regarding Mr Smith's abilities as an educator, and the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Smith in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher and he sought to exploit his position of trust by grooming pupils.

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. The panel noted that a teacher's behaviour that seeks to exploit their position of trust should be viewed very seriously in terms of its potential influence on pupils and be seen as a possible threat to the public interest.

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 Smith.

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

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of the Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);

- an abuse of any trust, knowledge, or influence gained through their professional position in order to advance a romantic or sexual relationship with a pupil or former pupil;
- sexual misconduct, e.g. involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature and/or that use or exploit the trust, knowledge or influence derived from the individual's professional position;
- failure in their duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk or failing to promote the safety and welfare of the children (as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE);
- violation of the rights of pupils;
- [...] deliberate behaviour that undermines pupils, the profession, the school or colleagues;
- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour;

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.

Mr Smith's actions were clearly deliberate and there was no evidence to suggest that Mr Smith was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation.

It was clear to the panel that Mr Smith did not demonstrate exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct, and it had no evidence that he had contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel had no evidence before it to demonstrate that the incident was out of character, and saw evidence that Mr Smith was previously subject to a disciplinary warning, as concerns had been raised regarding Mr Smith needing to establish appropriate physical boundaries with pupils in January 2023.

The panel was not provided with any meaningful evidence in mitigation. The panel did not have any evidence before it to demonstrate that Mr Smith demonstrated any level of insight or remorse for his actions.

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

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings would be sufficient would

unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Smith of prohibition.

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Smith. The seriousness of the offending behaviour which involved repeated sexual offences against various pupils at the School, over a prolonged period, in gross breach of trust were significant factors in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

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

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

- serious sexual misconduct e.g. where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons, particularly where the individual has used their professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons; and
- any sexual misconduct involving a child.

The panel considered that these were clearly evidenced from the facts behind the relevant offences for which Mr Smith had been convicted.

The Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate. None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel's findings.

The panel considered that there was no evidence of mitigation in this case and no evidence that Mr Smith showed any insight or remorse into his actions and the lasting effect his offending behaviour had on pupils. The panel noted that Mr Smith's very serious offending had taken place over a number of years, in gross breach of trust, on the School's premises and noted that he had committed sexual offences against pupils "*on a minimum of 57 separate occasions*". The panel considered that there was a high risk of repetition.

The panel considered that Mr Smith's actions and gross breaches of trust breached every fundamental tenet of safeguarding and what it meant to be a teacher. It considered that his actions were entirely incompatible with his ever returning to the teaching profession.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended without provisions for a review period.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

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

In this case, the panel has found all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to a relevant conviction.

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

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
 - showing [...] respect for the rights of others
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect...
- 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 was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Smith involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE).

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include convictions for the relevant offences of sexual communication with and sexual assault of a child, which resulted in a sentence of 7 years and 6 months imprisonment.

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 Smith, 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:

“In the light of the panel’s findings against Mr Smith, which involved his having been found guilty of 39 counts of offending behaviour including offences against children under his care as a teacher over a number of years, there was a very strong public interest consideration engaged in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and protection of other members of the public.”

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 was not provided with any meaningful evidence in mitigation. The panel did not have any evidence before it to demonstrate that Mr Smith demonstrated any level of insight or remorse for his actions.”

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

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel has observed:

“The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Smith’s behaviour in committing the offences would affect public confidence in the teaching profession, given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community and that the offences were concerned with sexual assaults on children and had occurred at the School, whilst those children were under his care.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of convictions for offences involving sexual communication and activity with a child 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 Smith himself. The panel has commented:

“It was clear to the panel that Mr Smith did not demonstrate exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct, and it had no evidence that he had contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel had no evidence before it to demonstrate that the incident was out of character, and saw evidence that Mr Smith was previously subject to a previous disciplinary warning, as concerns had been raised regarding Mr Smith needing to establish appropriate physical boundaries with pupils in January 2023.”

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments concerning the “seriousness of the offending behaviour which involved repeated sexual offences against various pupils at the School, over a prolonged period, in gross breach of trust”.

I have also noted the panel’s findings that “Mr Smith’s actions were clearly deliberate and there was no evidence to suggest that Mr Smith was acting under extreme duress”.

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

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended that no provision should be made for a review period.

The panel has noted that the Advice states that where cases involve serious sexual misconduct or any sexual misconduct involving a child, the public interest will weigh in favour of not offering a review period. The panel has commented that “these were clearly evidenced from the facts behind the relevant offences for which Mr Smith had been convicted.”

I have considered the panel’s comments on the lack of evidence of mitigation, the risk of repetition and the serious breach of trust in this case. The panel has said:

“The panel considered that there was no evidence of mitigation in this case and no evidence that Mr Smith showed any insight or remorse into his actions and the lasting effect his offending behaviour had on pupils. The panel noted that Mr Smith’s very serious offending had taken place over a number of years, in gross breach of trust, on the School’s premises and noted that he had committed sexual offences against pupils “on a minimum of 57 separate occasions”. The panel considered that there was a high risk of repetition.

The panel considered that Mr Smith’s actions and gross breaches of trust breached every fundamental tenet of safeguarding and what it meant to be a teacher. It considered that his actions were entirely incompatible with his ever returning to the teaching profession.”

I have considered whether not allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate response to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the very serious nature of the offences of which Mr Smith was convicted, the lack of evidence of insight and remorse, and the risk of repetition.

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

This means that Mr Jack Smith is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. Furthermore, in view of the seriousness of the allegation found proved against him, I have decided that Mr Smith shall not be entitled to apply for restoration of his eligibility to teach.

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

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

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D Oatley', with a large, sweeping loop at the end.

Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 18 August 2026