



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Kevin Regester: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

August 2018

Contents

A. Introduction	3
B. Allegations	4
C. Preliminary applications	4
D. Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Witnesses	5
E. Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Findings as to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute	10
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	11
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	14

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

Teacher:	Mr Kevin Regester
Teacher ref number:	0251837
Teacher date of birth:	22 June 1966
TRA reference:	16681
Date of determination:	07 August 2018
Former employer:	Thomas Estley Community College, Leicestershire (the 'College')

A. Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 6 to 7 August 2018 at 53 to 55 Butts Road, Earlsdon Park, Coventry, CV1 3BH to consider the case of Mr Kevin Regester.

The panel members were Ms Alison Walsh (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Ian Hughes (lay panellist) and Mr Tony Woodward (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr James Danks of Blake Morgan LLP.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Naomh Gibson of Browne Jacobson LLP.

Mr Regester was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

B. Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Proceedings dated 10 May 2018.

It was alleged that Mr Kevin Regester was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that:

Whilst employed as a Teacher at the Thomas Estley Community College from February 2016 to June 2017:

1. He made offensive and/or racist comments via Facebook on one or more occasions;
2. In undertaking allegation 1, he demonstrated a lack of tolerance and respect for the rights and/or beliefs of others;
3. He provided false and/or misleading and/or conflicting information to a recruitment agency when the matter set out in allegation 1 above was investigated;
4. His behaviour as may be found proven at 3 above demonstrated a lack of integrity and/or was dishonest.

Mr Regester denied all the allegations and was silent in respect of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, which were therefore also taken as being denied.

C. Preliminary applications

The panel considered an application from Ms Gibson to proceed in the absence of Mr Regester. Ms Gibson explained that the Notice of Proceedings had been sent to Mr Regester's last known address on 10 May 2018 and contained all of the information required by the rules. Ms Gibson also directed the panel's attention to pages 75 to 77 within the bundle, which set out Mr Regester's response to the Notice of Referral. Whilst this response was undated, Ms Gibson explained the Notice of Referral was sent in January 2018 and the response was received some time after that.

The response from Mr Regester included the phrases *"The allegations and my responses can be considered with or without a hearing. I will decline to attend...NCTL may proceed at any interval that can bring this matter to a close"*.

Ms Gibson also explained that correspondence from her office had been sent by recorded delivery to Mr Regester in July 2018. This correspondence reiterated the hearing date and that the hearing may proceed in Mr Regester's absence. Ms Gibson confirmed that the Royal Mail website stated the letter was signed for by 'Kev'.

In the panel's view, the necessary notice requirements had been met by the TRA. Mr Regester was clearly aware of the hearing date and that the hearing may proceed in his absence. There was no suggestion from his correspondence in (or around) January 2018 that he wished to participate or attend the hearing so there seemed no benefit in adjourning the hearing to a later date. The panel also had the benefit of Mr Regester's response to the Notice of Referral, which set out his defence to the allegations (as they were).

Taking all the circumstances into account, the panel allowed Ms Gibson's application to proceed in the absence of Mr Regester.

D. Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology – page 2

Section 2: Notice of Proceedings and Response – pages 4 to 9;

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 11 to 13

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 15 to 73;

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 75 to 77.

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

Witnesses

The panel heard oral evidence from:

- Witness A, Branch Manager of Celsian Education.

E. Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

The panel has carefully considered the case before us and have reached a decision.

The panel confirms that it has read all the documents provided in the bundle in advance of the hearing.

Mr Regester had been employed at Thomas Estley Community College ('the College') since February 2016, as a supply teacher. On 13 June 2017, the College received a

complaint from a parent regarding offensive material found on Facebook relating to an individual named Kev Raven, a known name that Mr Regester went by.

Following this complaint, the content of Mr Regester/Raven's Facebook page was investigated by Celsian Education ('Celsian'), through whom Mr Regester had been placed at the College, and racist comments were found to be present on his Facebook page. As a result, Mr Regester was suspended from working at the College.

Findings of fact

Our findings of fact are as follows:

The panel has found the following particulars of the allegations against you proven, for these reasons:

Whilst employed as a Teacher at the Thomas Estley Community College from February 2016 to June 2017:

1. You made offensive and/or racist comments via Facebook on one or more occasions

The panel first considered whether there was sufficient evidence to determine that Mr Raven was in fact Mr Regester.

The panel heard live evidence from Witness A, who confirmed that Kev Raven was a name, which Mr Regester was known to go by. Witness A also drew the panel's attention to a Facebook post from May 2017 regarding an extension to Mr Raven's work at a school, which coincided with Celsian confirming Mr Regester's extension to his temporary employment contract at the College. In addition, there was a message from a [redacted] on the Facebook page referring to [redacted] 'Kev Raven'.

The panel also noted that in Mr Regester's response to the Notice of Referral; he accepts making the remarks and does not deny the Facebook account of Kev Raven is his own account.

On balance, the panel was convinced that Kev Raven was Mr Regester and from now on will only refer to Mr Regester. In addition, the panel considered there was no ulterior motive to Mr Regester's wish to be known on Facebook by an alternative name.

In respect of the allegation, the panel heard live evidence from Witness A who explained that when he received the complaint from the College, he investigated the matter with his colleague, Individual A. Individual A, who was not a Facebook 'friend' with Mr Regester was able to access the relevant pages and view the comments that were present. Witness A later clarified that Individual A's Facebook profile kept crashing. As a result, Witness A had also searched for Mr Regester via his own profile and also had access,

despite not being 'friends'. This therefore meant the comments on Mr Regester's page were freely accessible to the public.

The panel had sight of screenshots from Mr Regester's Facebook account from pages 33 to 47. Comments that the panel were particularly drawn to included, but were not limited to:

- *"One seriously mixed day. 2nd set Y10. The kids are CUNTS... Y9set2 excelled themselves to piss off. One little scrote..."* (page 38); and
- *"Yesterday was about ripping new cunts & arseholes. Today: ripping off heads & shitting down necks! All in the name of education"* (page 41).

The panel also noted a number of photographs that Mr Regester had used on his page, the photographs portraying:

- A group of men appearing to be Muslim and holding, apparently photo-shopped placards stating, amongst other things, *"Fuck it! I want a ham sandwich"*, *"I love pork pies"* and *"Bum sex is very naughty"*; and
- A slogan stating *"What's the difference between cigarettes and Islamic Jihadists? You can only get 200 cigarettes into the UK before the authorities start asking questions"* (page 35).

For the purposes of this allegation, as Mr Regester had published these photographs showing the comments, the panel determined he had also 'made' the comments. The panel also determined that 'offensive' and 'racist' would be defined by the standard, English definition using the panel's own knowledge of generally appropriate language.

The panel noted Mr Regester's account that *"offence is a perspective issue...I may have expressed intolerance towards regimes and practices that themselves promote general intolerance...It is my belief that I, my family and friends, have the RIGHT to live in a society that is free from oppression"*.

The panel considered that this allegation (and the case as a whole) related to the expression of comments by Mr Regester in a public forum rather than any views that he may have held.

In the panel's view, the comments included extreme swear words used repeatedly, including direct reference to pupil year groups, and religious caricatures that could only be reasonably determined as racist considering their content. It was clear that the comments were offensive and racist and the panel therefore finds this allegation proved.

2. In undertaking allegation 1, you demonstrated a lack of tolerance and respect for the rights and/or beliefs of others

In the panel's view, all persons in society are entitled to respect for their rights and beliefs. The use of offensive and racist language, especially when directed at particular groups of people, including children whom he taught, would not be utilised by someone with tolerance and respect for others.

For the reasons above, and those examples and reasons given for allegation 1, the panel finds this allegation proved.

3. You provided false and/or misleading and/or conflicting information to a recruitment agency when the matter set out in allegation 1 was investigated

Mr Rogers explained that when he first telephoned Mr Regester to discuss the concerns as raised by the College, Mr Regester denied having a Facebook account. Mr Regester stated that his wife did have an account, which may have been hacked. Witness A denied that Mr Regester had asked him to clarify which Facebook account was being referred to and was clear in his recollection that Mr Regester had stated he had no such account.

In a second conversation, Witness A stated that Mr Regester asserted that [redacted] had created a fake Facebook account to discredit him following long-running issues between the two of them. These issues had escalated to such an extent that police had been called to intervene, both having made death-threats to one another. Witness A confirmed that Mr Regester had said the police had 'cautioned' him, which Witness A took to mean a formal police caution.

As a result of the complaint, Celsian had made investigations with the police regarding the feud between the two men, with the police confirming issues had existed for some time. Whilst no official caution had been given to either of the men, informal warnings about their behaviour had been given.

During this conversation, Mr Regester also suggested that as he had used computers in the library in the past, he might have left his Facebook account open, possibly allowing access to his account by an unknown person.

Witness A confirmed that in a third call with Mr Regester, he had asserted receiving an email from Facebook stating an attempt had been made to log-in to his Facebook account from a different location.

Mr Regester stated that his responses to Celsian had been "*deliberately or carelessly misquoted*". His initial response to Celsian was not a denial of having a Facebook page but rather, as he had a number of Facebook pages, a question of which specific page was being referred to. Mr Regester asserted that he was given no time to respond.

In the panel's view, Witness A gave evidence in a clear and consistent manner. He had opened himself up to cross-examination and the panel found his evidence to be reliable. Mr Regester had not offered himself open to questioning and, to that extent, the panel preferred Witness A's evidence over that of Mr Regester's written statement.

On balance, the panel therefore finds that in the first telephone call, Mr Regester did state he did not have a Facebook account, a false (and therefore misleading) statement in the light of the Facebook screenshots the panel had sight of and the later accounts given by Mr Regester. The comment made by Mr Regester in the third telephone call with Witness A was also contradictory to his initial account of not having a Facebook account.

The panel therefore finds the allegation proved in respect of the account given by Mr Regester to Witness A during the first telephone call.

In respect of the 'caution' comment, which the panel accepts was made by Mr Regester, in light of the ambiguity regarding whether Mr Regester was referring to a formal police caution or to an informal warning, the panel did not find the allegation proved in this regard.

4. Your behaviour as may be found proven at 3 above demonstrates a lack of integrity and/or was dishonest.

In the panel's view, Mr Regester was a regular, active user on Facebook, which included uploading of photographs and regular comments being made by him on the website.

Whilst the panel could not be entirely confident of the exact dates of Mr Regester's Facebook comments, Witness A confirmed that Mr Regester's employment contract was extended in May 2017, which coincided with a Facebook comment from Mr Regester reflecting the same. Similarly, the panel had sight of a privacy notice from Facebook dated 2017.

On balance, considering Mr Regester's recent proactive use of Facebook at the time of the first telephone call with Witness A, the panel determined that he was aware that he had a Facebook account but had instead denied it and fabricated multiple versions of events.

In the panel's view, a false and misleading account knowingly given by an employee to an employer when being questioned on serious matters (such as in this case), can only be regarded as dishonest and as an attempt to avoid possible disciplinary and regulatory proceedings. The panel therefore finds the allegation proved in respect of dishonesty and of Mr Regester's lack of integrity.

Findings as to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute

Having found all of the allegations to have been proven, the panel has gone on to consider whether the facts of those proven allegations amount to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In doing so, the panel has had regard to the document Teacher Misconduct: The Prohibition of Teachers, which the panel refers to as “the Advice”.

The panel is satisfied that the conduct of Mr Regester in relation to the facts found proven, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considers that by reference to Part Two, Mr Regester 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 and building relationships rooted in mutual respect
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others;
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs;
 - ensuring that personal beliefs are not expressed in ways which exploit pupils’ vulnerability.

The panel is satisfied that the conduct of Mr Regester amounts to misconduct of a serious nature, which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession. The panel has also considered whether Mr Regester’s conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 8 and 9 of the Advice and the panel has found that the offences of intolerance and serious dishonesty are relevant.

The Advice indicates that where behaviours associated with such an offence exist, a panel is likely to conclude that an individual’s conduct would amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel notes that the allegations took place outside of the education setting. Nevertheless, in light of the references to pupils, Mr Regester being a teacher and School activities, all of which were made on a website that was accessible to the public, the panel determined that the activities clearly impacted on Mr Regester’s role as a teacher.

Accordingly, the panel is satisfied that Mr Regester’s actions amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel has taken into account how the teaching profession is viewed by others and considered the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the

community. The panel has taken account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils' lives and that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way they behave.

The findings of misconduct are serious and the conduct displayed would likely have a negative impact on Mr Regester's status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public perception.

The panel therefore finds that Mr Regester's actions constitute conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, it is 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 has to consider whether it is an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it is 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 has considered the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and having done so has found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely:

- the protection of pupils;
- the protection of other members of the public;
- the maintenance of public confidence in the profession;
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct; and
- public confidence in the regulatory process.

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Regester, which involved his expression in a public domain of offensive and racist comments and his dishonest conduct arising from an investigation into the same, there is a strong public interest consideration in ensuring that pupils and the public are not exposed to such comments from a teacher in the future.

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

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

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 Regester. The panel noted his written statement at page 77 that:

- *"I am no longer employed as a teacher or in the educational sector as a whole. Further I have no intention or desire to return to education";* and
- *"I now work in the industrial sector, therefore this investigation bears no relevance to my current employment".*

The panel considered that the above comments clearly indicated Mr Regester's lack of interest in maintaining his career as a teacher.

In carrying out the balancing exercise, the panel has considered the public interest considerations both in favour of and against prohibition as well as the interests of Mr Regester. 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 proven. 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;
- actions or behaviours that undermine fundamental British values of democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty, and mutual respect and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs;
- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour;
- violation of the rights of pupils;
- dishonesty especially where it has been repeated and covered up;
- deliberate behaviour that undermines pupils, the profession, the school or colleagues;

Even though there were behaviours that would point to a prohibition order being appropriate, the panel went on to consider whether or not there were sufficient mitigating factors to militate against a prohibition order being an appropriate and proportionate measure to impose, particularly taking into account the nature and severity of the behaviour in this case.

In light of the panel's findings, the panel considered Mr Regester's actions as being clearly deliberate and there was no suggestion that he was acting under duress. Whilst the panel was told he had a previously good history, the panel was not presented with

any material by Mr Regester as to his qualities or strengths as a teacher nor any references as to his character.

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 is sufficient.

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

The panel is of the view that prohibition is both proportionate and appropriate. The panel has decided that the public interest considerations significantly outweigh the interests of Mr Regester. The repeated use of offensive and racist language by Mr Regester, and thereafter the dishonest conduct in attempting to divert blame away from himself, was a significant factor in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel makes 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 them to decide to recommend that a review period of the order should be considered. The panel were mindful that the Advice advises 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 proven, would militate against a review period being recommended. These behaviours include:

- intolerance on the grounds of race/religion; and
- serious dishonesty.

The panel has found that Mr Regester has been responsible for expressing offensive and racist comments and thereafter conducting himself in a dishonest manner when his employer was investigating these comments.

Mr Regester has not expressed any remorse for, or understanding of, the effect his actions may have had on pupils and wider society. On the contrary, the panel considered Mr Regester's written response as an attempt to justify his behaviour and divert blame away from himself. Mr Regester has not provided any material to indicate he has any intention to remediate his behaviour.

The panel felt 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 provision 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 sanction and review period.

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

In this case, the panel has found the majority of all the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. In the case of the third allegation the panel did not find the element relating to a police caution to be proven. I have therefore put that matter from my mind entirely when considering this case.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Regester 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 and building relationships rooted in mutual respect
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others;
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs;
 - ensuring that personal beliefs are not expressed in ways which exploit pupils' vulnerability.

The panel also considered whether Mr Regester's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 8 and 9 of the Advice and the panel has found that the offences of intolerance and serious dishonesty are relevant.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of intolerance and serious dishonesty.

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 or not 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 Regester, and the impact that will have on him, is proportionate.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children. The panel has observed, "in the light of the references to pupils, Mr Regester being a teacher and School activities, all of which were made on a website that was accessible to the public, the panel determined that the activities clearly impacted on Mr Regester's role as a teacher." 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, "Mr Regester has not expressed any remorse for, or understanding of, the effect his actions may have had on pupils and wider society. On the contrary, the panel considered Mr Regester's written response as an attempt to justify his behaviour and divert blame away from himself. Mr Regester has not provided any material to indicate he has any intention to remediate his behaviour."

In my judgement, the lack of insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this risks the future well being of pupils and others. 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 that the, "findings of misconduct are serious and the conduct displayed would likely have a negative impact on Mr Regester's status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public perception."

I am particularly mindful of the findings of intolerance and dishonesty 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 failure to impose a prohibition order might be regarded by the public 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 Regester himself. I have noted the panel's comments concerning Mr Regester in that, "Whilst the panel was told he had a previously good history, the panel was not presented with any material by Mr Regester as to his qualities or strengths as a teacher". The panel also report Mr Regester's own comments that, "

- *"I am no longer employed as a teacher or in the educational sector as a whole. Further I have no intention or desire to return to education"; and*
- *"I now work in the industrial sector, therefore this investigation bears no relevance to my current employment".*

The panel says that it "considered that the above comments clearly indicated Mr Regester's lack of interest in maintaining his career as a teacher."

Nonetheless, a prohibition order would prevent Mr Regester from teaching and 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 it regards, "Mr Regester's written response as an attempt to justify his behaviour and divert blame away from himself. Mr Regester has not provided any material to indicate he has any intention to remediate his behaviour."

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Regester 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 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 aims which a prohibition order is intended to achieve.

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

I have considered the panel's comments " The panel has found that Mr Regester has been responsible for expressing offensive and racist comments and thereafter conducting himself in a dishonest manner when his employer was investigating these comments."

I have considered whether allowing for no provision of a 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, there are three factors that

in my view mean that to allow for no review period is necessary to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the serious intolerance shown, the dishonesty found and the lack of either insight or remorse.

I consider therefore that allowing for no review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

This means that Mr Kevin Regester 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 Kevin Regester 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 Kevin Regester 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 'Alan Meyrick', with a vertical line to the right of the signature.

Decision maker: Alan Meyrick

Date: 8 August 2018

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