



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Jonathan Clayton: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

June 2021

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	6
Documents	6
Witnesses	7
Decision and reasons	7
Findings of fact	7
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	9
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	13

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

Teacher:	Mr Jonathan Clayton
Teacher ref number:	1582182
Teacher date of birth:	11 January 1993
TRA reference:	18495
Date of determination:	28 June 2021
Former employer:	Vision for Education, a supply teacher agency

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened remotely via Microsoft Teams on 28 June 2021 to consider the case of Mr Jonathan Clayton.

The panel members were Ms Karen McArthur (lay panellist – in the chair), Mr Neil Hillman (teacher panellist) and Mr Stephen Chappell (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Delme Griffiths of Blake Morgan LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Michael O'Donohoe of Browne Jacobson solicitors.

Mr Clayton was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Proceedings dated 29 April 2021.

It was alleged that Mr Clayton was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:

- 1. On or around 4 February 2020 he was convicted at Teeside Crown Court of the following offences;**
 - a. Assault on a female child under 13 by penetration of vagina/anus with part of body/object on 21/03/19- 03/05/19 contrary to Section 6 of the Sexual offences Act 2003 for which he was sentenced on 27 April 2020 to 54 months imprisonment, an indefinite sexual harm prevention order and indefinite registration on the sex offenders list. He was also sentenced to pay £170.00 victim surcharge.**
 - b. 12 counts of Sexual Assault of female child under 13 on 21/03/19 03/05/19 contrary to Section 7 of the Sexual offences Act 2003 for which he was sentenced on 27 April 2020 to 24 months imprisonment to be served consecutively.**

Mr Clayton did not admit the facts of the allegations or that his conviction was for a relevant offence.

Preliminary applications

Application to proceed in the absence of Mr Clayton

The panel considered an application from the presenting officer to proceed in the absence of Mr Clayton. It had careful regard to the submissions made and took account of all documents relevant to the application.

The panel accepted the legal advice provided and took account of the various factors referred to it.

The panel was satisfied that the Notice of Proceedings dated 29 April 2021 ("the Notice") had been sent in accordance with rules 4.11 and 4.12 of the Teacher Misconduct: Disciplinary Procedures for the Teaching Profession ("the Procedures") and that the requirements for service had been satisfied.

The Notice was sent to Mr Clayton in prison. Mr Clayton was currently serving the sentence imposed upon him following his conviction for the offences that were the

subject of the allegations before the panel. Mr Clayton had formally responded to the Notice, thereby evidencing his awareness of these proceedings and this hearing.

The panel went on to consider whether to proceed in Mr Clayton's absence or to adjourn, in accordance with the Procedures.

The panel had regard to the fact that its discretion to continue in the absence of a teacher should be exercised with caution and with close regard to the overall fairness of the proceedings. The panel gave careful consideration to the fact that Mr Clayton is not in attendance and will not be represented at this hearing, should it proceed, and the extent of the disadvantage to him as a consequence.

On balance, the panel decided that the hearing should continue in the absence of Mr Clayton for the following reasons:

- Mr Clayton had not sought an adjournment.
- The panel was satisfied that Mr Clayton's absence was voluntary, and he had waived his right to attend in person. He signed a form of authority to that effect.
- Although Mr Clayton had alluded to his intention to be represented at the hearing, this had been followed up on behalf of the TRA and it was apparent that Mr Clayton had not been able to secure representation. A letter from [redacted] a solicitor named by Mr Clayton, confirmed that he was not instructed and had no awareness of any steps Mr Clayton may have taken to seek representation. Although it was possible that Mr Clayton may have been uncertain as to precisely what was required of him, ultimately it was incumbent on him to make appropriate arrangements. On balance, the panel was satisfied that he had sufficient time to do so.
- In any event, the panel had firmly in mind that any disadvantage to Mr Clayton was limited in this case. The factual allegations were confined to the fact of Mr Clayton's conviction. Although Mr Clayton continued to maintain his innocence, the panel will not be able to go behind the fact of that conviction. As such, the panel concluded that the risk of reaching the wrong conclusion was minimal.
- Further, the panel considered that any prejudice to Mr Clayton was outweighed by the public interest in these proceedings being concluded. The allegations raised important public interest considerations and there was a need for finality. An adjournment was not necessary or appropriate in this case.

Having decided that it was appropriate to proceed, the panel would strive to ensure that the proceedings are as fair as possible in the circumstances, bearing in mind that Mr Clayton is neither present nor represented.

Request for the hearing to be held in private

In his response to the Notice, Mr Clayton requested that the hearing should proceed in private.

The panel therefore proceeded to consider that request and to determine whether, on the facts of this case, there was any reason for holding all or part of the hearing in private.

In determining this request the panel accepted the legal advice provided.

The panel took into account the fact that there is a presumption that these proceedings will take place in public and there is a public interest in the openness and transparency of the disciplinary process.

The panel also noted that the outcome of the hearing will be announced in public.

On balance, the panel did not consider that it was appropriate for the hearing to take place in private. The public interest in the hearing taking place in public outweighed any concerns on the part of Mr Clayton. A key factor in arriving at that conclusion was that Mr Clayton's conviction was a matter of public record. In addition, Mr Clayton had not put forward any specific reasons in support of his request.

The panel therefore directed that the hearing would proceed in public.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Notice of Proceedings and response – pages 2 to 25

Section 2: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 27 to 131

Section 3: Teacher documents – pages 133 to 137

In addition, the panel accepted a supplementary bundle, comprising 7 pages, containing correspondence and related documents post-dating the Notice. These documents were relevant to the panel's decision as to whether to proceed in the absence of Mr Clayton. There was no prejudice to Mr Clayton, given the documents were procedural and not evidential in nature.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all the documents.

Witnesses

The panel did not hear oral evidence from any witnesses on behalf of the TRA or from Mr Clayton, given his non-attendance.

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 Clayton was previously engaged on an agency basis by Vision for Education, a supply teaching agency ("Vision").

The TRA received notification in this case that Mr Clayton had been charged with various offences against children. It was confirmed that the allegations were of sexual assault involving multiple victims, aged between 7 and 11 years. The offences were said to have taken place between 21 March 2019 and 3 May 2019 at a Primary School in North Yorkshire ("the School"). Mr Clayton had been placed at the School by Vision to provide cover for a member of staff absent due to sickness. All of the alleged victims were said to be pupils at the School.

Mr Clayton was subsequently charged with sexual offences against children and appeared at Teeside Crown Court to be tried.

On 4 February 2020, Mr Clayton was convicted of assault of a child under 13 by penetration and 12 counts of assault of a child under 13. He was sentenced on 27 April 2020.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

- 1. On or around 4 February 2020 you were convicted at Teeside Crown Court of the following offences;**
 - a. Assault on a female child under 13 by penetration of vagina/ anus with part of body/object on 21/03/19- 03/05/19 contrary to Section 6 of the Sexual offences Act 2003 for which you were sentenced on 27 April 2020 to 54 months imprisonment, an indefinite sexual harm prevention order and indefinite registration on the sex offenders list. You were also sentenced to pay £170.00 victim surcharge.**
 - b. 12 counts of Sexual Assault of female child under 13 on 21/03/19 03/05/19 contrary to Section 7 of the Sexual offences Act 2003 for**

which you were sentenced on 27 April 2020 to 24 months imprisonment to be served consecutively.

The panel considered allegations 1(a) and 1(b) together.

It was apparent from Mr Clayton's response to the Notice that he continued to maintain his denial in relation to these offences.

However, the panel was presented with a certificate of conviction from the Teeside Crown Court.

This confirmed that Mr Clayton was convicted, on 4 February 2020, of each of the offences particularised in allegations 1(a) and 1(b). The sentence received by Mr Clayton on 27 April 2020 was clearly set out.

The panel accepted the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of the commission of these offences by Mr Clayton and the sentence received.

It accordingly found allegations 1(a) and (b) proved.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

Having found the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether Mr Clayton's conviction was for a relevant offence.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Clayton, in relation to the facts it found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that by reference to Part 2, Mr Clayton was in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach ...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel determined that Mr Clayton's actions were clearly and unarguably relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting. Each of these offences were extremely serious in nature and occurred in the course of Mr Clayton's

duties at the School. They are sexual offences against young children in his care during the course of the school day. In relation to the offence that was the subject of allegation 1(a), which involved penetration, the pupil victim was just 7 years old at the time. Plainly, this was conduct at the most serious end of the spectrum.

This was, accordingly, a case involving offences that the Advice states are likely to be considered a relevant offence, namely sexual activity.

Mr Clayton's behaviour in committing these offences plainly engaged public and child protection issues. It directly impacted on the safety and security of children and raised serious safeguarding concerns. In short, Mr Clayton is a convicted sex offender who violated the rights and dignity of these young victims.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Clayton's behaviour in committing these offences would undoubtedly affect public confidence in the teaching profession, particularly given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. His conduct clearly and obviously ran counter to what should have been at the very core of his practice as a teacher with a duty of care towards children to keep them safe. By virtue of his position, Mr Clayton was also in a position of trust and responsibility. He had abused that position.

The panel also took account of the fact that Mr Clayton's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed. The public and child protection issues engaged by Mr Clayton's actions were also amply demonstrated by the other aspects of the Court's sentence. Not least, Mr Clayton has been placed on the sexual offenders register indefinitely.

The panel did not consider there to be any relevant mitigating circumstances in relation to the commission of these offences.

In conclusion and for all these reasons, the panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was directly relevant to Mr Clayton's ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding that this conviction was 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 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. 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 protection of pupils and other members of the public;
- the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In the light of the serious nature of the offences for which Mr Clayton was convicted, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils. These were serious offences involving children in his care. Mr Clayton was, as a consequence, a convicted sex offender. His actions raised obvious and significant public and child protection concerns, as clearly recognised by the Court when imposing a lengthy custodial sentence.

The panel considered that public confidence in the profession would undoubtedly be very seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Clayton was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession. This was conduct that was, very clearly, at the most serious end of the spectrum.

For the same reasons, the panel decided that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present.

No doubt had been cast upon Mr Clayton's abilities as a teacher. However, given the nature of the allegations in this case, the panel concluded that there was not a public interest consideration in retaining him in the profession. Mr Clayton had not provided any evidence of his practice in the form of references or testimonials.

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

In carrying out the balancing exercise, the panel had regard to the public interest considerations present as well as the interests of Mr Clayton. The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours of a teacher have been proved.

In the list of such behaviours, those that are relevant in this case are:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving vulnerable pupils) or violation of the rights of pupils;
- sexual misconduct, for example, 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;
- 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.

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors. Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

The panel considered that there were some mitigating factors present in this case, including:

- Mr Clayton appeared to have had an otherwise good record.
- Mr Clayton had engaged with the TRA to a limited extent in that he had, at least, responded to the Notice.

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

- Mr Clayton had been convicted of very serious sexual offences involving children. He had been sentenced to a lengthy term of imprisonment.
- His actions involved direct harm and abuse to children.
- There was no evidence of insight, regret or remorse. It was apparent that Mr Clayton continued to deny the allegations, which he was of course entitled to do. However, his conviction was a matter of fact, and the panel was not in a position to go behind it.
- His actions amounted to a clear breach of the Teachers' Standards and raised serious public and child protection concerns.
- Mr Clayton was in a position of trust and responsibility. He was also a role model. He had fallen very far short of the standards expected of him in that regard. He

had abused the trust placed in him by society, by the School and by the children and families involved.

- Mr Clayton's actions would have undoubtedly had a profound impact on the children and their families, not to mention the School and local community.

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

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings was sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Clayton of prohibition.

Mr Clayton was a convicted sexual offender. He had been convicted of multiple, serious sexual offences concerning children in his care. Mr Clayton's actions were fundamentally incompatible with his being an educator. This was conduct of the most serious nature. The nature and gravity of these offences was a matter of significant concern.

Mr Clayton's behaviour led to him receiving a lengthy sentence of imprisonment, which is indicative of the seriousness of the offence.

There were, accordingly, particularly strong public interest considerations in this case in terms of protecting children, public confidence in the teaching profession and the declaring and upholding of proper standards of conduct.

The panel was therefore of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Clayton.

Accordingly, it made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate to recommend that a review period of the order should be considered.

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

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

The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. These behaviours include serious sexual misconduct, such as 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 his professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons.

This was, clearly, directly applicable in this case and Mr Clayton's action involved harm and abuse to children.

Mr Clayton continued to deny his actions, which he was entitled to do. Admitting misconduct is not a precondition to demonstrating insight. However, in this instance, there was nothing before the panel to allow it to form any view as to whether Mr Clayton had any insight, regret or remorse in relation to any aspect of what occurred. There was no indication that he had an awareness that any aspects of his conduct raised, for example, safeguarding concerns. As a consequence, the panel concluded that Mr Clayton continues to present a risk to the public. That was reflected in Mr Clayton remaining on the sex offenders register indefinitely.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate.

The nature and seriousness of the offences in this case necessitated the prohibition order to be recommended without provision for a review period. The public interest considerations that Mr Clayton's conviction gives rise to were such that this was necessary, appropriate and proportionate. As a convicted sexual offender in relation to multiple offences involving children in his care, Mr Clayton's actions are fundamentally incompatible with his being a teacher.

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 Jonathan Clayton should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by:
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position.
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions.
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach.
- 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 Clayton fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a conviction of two offences, including assault of a child under the age of 13 and 12 counts of sexual assault of a child under 13, contrary to the sexual offences act. A conviction that led to a term of 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 unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may 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 Clayton, and the impact that will have on him, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children. The panel has observed, "Mr Clayton's behaviour in committing these offences plainly engaged public and child protection issues. It directly impacted on the safety and security of children and raised serious safeguarding concerns. In short, Mr Clayton is a convicted sex offender who violated the rights and dignity of these young victims". A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, "There was no evidence of insight, regret or remorse. It was apparent that Mr Clayton continued to deny the allegations, which he was of course

entitled to do". In my judgement, the lack of insight or remorse means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts children at risk. 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, "Mr Clayton's behaviour in committing these offences would undoubtedly affect public confidence in the teaching profession, particularly given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. His conduct clearly and obviously ran counter to what should have been at the very core of his practice as a teacher with a duty of care towards children to keep them safe. By virtue of his position, Mr Clayton was also in a position of trust and responsibility. He had abused that position". I am particularly mindful of the finding of the conviction involving children in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

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

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of unacceptable professional conduct, 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 Clayton himself and the panel comment "No doubt had been cast upon Mr Clayton's abilities as a teacher" and "Mr Clayton appeared to have had an otherwise good record." A prohibition order would prevent Mr Clayton from teaching. A prohibition order would also clearly deprive the public of his contribution to the profession for the period that it is in force.

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel's comments concerning the lack of insight or remorse. The panel has said, "Mr Clayton continued to deny his actions, which he was entitled to do. Admitting misconduct is not a precondition to demonstrating insight. However, in this instance, there was nothing before the panel to allow it to form any view as to whether Mr Clayton had any insight, regret or remorse in relation to any aspect of what occurred. There was no indication that he had an awareness that any aspects of his conduct raised, for example, safeguarding concerns. As a consequence, the panel concluded that Mr Clayton continues to present a risk to the public. That was reflected in Mr Clayton remaining on the sex offenders register indefinitely."

I have also given considerable weight to the protection of children "The panel determined that Mr Clayton's actions were clearly and unarguably relevant to teaching, working with

children and working in an education setting. Each of these offences were extremely serious in nature and occurred in the course of Mr Clayton's duties at the School. They are sexual offences against young children in his care during the course of the school day. In relation to the offence that was the subject of allegation 1(a), which involved penetration, the pupil victim was just 7 years old at the time. Plainly, this was conduct at the most serious end of the spectrum.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Clayton 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 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. In this case, the panel has recommended that no provision should be made for a review period.

I have considered the panel's comments “The nature and seriousness of the offences in this case necessitated the prohibition order to be recommended without provision for a review period. The public interest considerations that Mr Clayton's conviction gives rise to were such that this was necessary, appropriate and proportionate. As a convicted sexual offender in relation to multiple offences involving children in his care, Mr Clayton's actions are fundamentally incompatible with his being a teacher.”

I have considered whether allowing for no 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, two factors mean that a two-year review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the seriousness of the conviction involving young children who were in his care and the lack of either insight or remorse.

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 Jonathan Clayton 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 allegations found proved against him, I have decided that Mr Clayton 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 Jonathan Clayton has a right of appeal to the Queen's Bench Division of 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 'SABuxcey', with a horizontal line underneath.

Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey

Date: 30 June 2021

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