



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Raymond John Donnison: Professional conduct panel outcome**

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

**November 2019**

## Contents

A. Introduction	3
B. Allegations	4
C. Preliminary applications	4
D. Summary of evidence	6
Documents	6
Witnesses	7
E. Decision and reasons	7
Findings of fact	8
Findings as to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute	9
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	11
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 Raymond John Donnison

**Teacher ref number:** 0506324

**Teacher date of birth:** 14 December 1982

**TRA reference:** 17324

**Date of determination:** 20 November 2019

**Former employer:** Freebrough Academy, Saltburn-by-the-Sea

### **A. Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 20-21 November 2019 at Cheylesmore House, 5 Quinton Road, Coventry, CV1 2WT, to consider the case of Mr Raymond John Donnison.

The panel members were Mr Tony Heath (lay panellist – in the chair), Ms Mary Speakman (teacher panellist) and Mr Tony Woodward (former teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mrs Anna Marjoram of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Lisa Wright of Browne Jacobson solicitors.

Mr Raymond John Donnison 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 22 July 2019.

It was alleged that Mr Raymond John Donnison was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that:

Whilst working as Assistant Principal at Freebrough Academy (the "School"), between September 2017 and March 2018:

1. he made one or more changes to the attendance register in respect of one or more students which did not reflect the true position in terms of their attendance, including by:
  - a. changing one or more students recorded mark of 'O' (indicating an unauthorised absence) to '/' or '\' (indicating present, AM or PM);
  - b. changing one or more students recorded mark of '-' (indicating no mark recorded) to '/' or '\' (indicating present, AM or PM);
  - c. changing one or more students recorded mark of 'C' (indicating absence due to other authorised circumstances) to '/' or '\' (indicating present, AM or PM);
  - d. changing one or more students recorded mark of 'M' (indicating an absence for a medical or dental appointment) to '/' or '\' (indicating present, AM or PM);
  - e. changing one or more students recorded mark of 'I' (indicating an absence due to illness) to '/' or '\' (indicating present, AM or PM);
  - f. changing one or more students recorded mark of 'U' (indicating lateness, after registers have closed) to 'L' (indicating late, before registers have closed);
2. his conduct as may be found proven at allegation 1 above demonstrated a lack of integrity and/or was dishonest in that he deliberately made changes to the attendance register in an attempt to make the school's attendance figures seem better than they were.

Mr Donnison has admitted the facts of the allegations and that those facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, as set out in his Response to the Notice of Proceedings dated 23 July 2019 and in the Statement of Agreed Facts dated 22 March 2019.

## C. Preliminary applications

The panel considered an application from the presenting officer to proceed in the absence of Mr Donnison.

The panel has considered whether this hearing should continue in the absence of the teacher.

The panel is satisfied that the TRA has complied with the service requirements of paragraph 19 a to c of the Teachers' Disciplinary (England) Regulations 2012, (the "Regulations").

The panel is also satisfied that the Notice of Proceedings complied with paragraphs 4.11 and 4.12 of the Teacher Misconduct: Disciplinary Procedures for the Teaching Profession, (the "Procedures").

The panel has determined to exercise its discretion under paragraph 4.29 of the Procedures to proceed with the hearing in the absence of the teacher.

The panel understands that its discretion to commence a hearing in the absence of the teacher has to be exercised with the utmost care and caution, and that its discretion is a severely constrained one.

In making its decision, the panel has noted that the teacher may waive his right to participate in the hearing. The panel has taken account of the various factors drawn to its attention from the case of R v Jones [2003] 1 AC1. The panel is satisfied that the teacher has been made aware of the proceedings and was given requisite notice. Mr Donnison has responded and indicated that he will not attend. The hearing has been adjourned on a previous occasion, and Mr Donnison has again indicated that he does not wish to attend the hearing and that he does not wish for a representative to present. The panel therefore considers that the teacher has waived his right to be present at the hearing in the knowledge of when and where the hearing is taking place.

The panel has had regard to the requirement that it is only in rare and exceptional circumstances that a decision should be taken in favour of the hearing taking place. There is no indication that an adjournment might result in Mr Donnison attending the hearing. Mr Donnison has also indicated that he does not wish to be legally represented at the hearing.

The panel has had regard to the extent of the disadvantage to the teacher in not being able to give his account of events, having regard to the nature of the evidence against him. The panel has the benefit of representations made by Mr Donnison and a Statement of Agreed Facts. The panel has the teacher's evidence addressing mitigation and is able to take this into account at the relevant stage.

The panel has not identified any significant gaps in the documentary evidence provided to it and should such gaps arise during the course of the hearing, the panel may take such gaps into consideration in considering whether the hearing should be adjourned for such documents to become available and in considering whether the presenting officer has discharged the burden of proof. The panel is also able to exercise vigilance in

making its decision, taking into account the degree of risk of the panel reaching the wrong decision as a result of not having heard the teacher's account.

The panel has had regard to the seriousness of this case, and the potential consequences for the teacher and has accepted that fairness to the teacher is of prime importance. However, it considers that in light of the teacher's waiver of his right to appear, by taking such measures referred to above to address that unfairness insofar as is possible, that on balance, these are serious allegations and the public interest in this hearing proceeding within a reasonable time is in favour of this hearing continuing today.

The panel also considered an application from the presenting officer to admit additional documents into the bundle, specifically:

- email correspondence between Mr Donnison and the presenting officer dated 2 August 2019;
- the previous panel decision dated 2 April 2019;
- a letter from the TRA to Mr Donnison dated 15 November 2019, and his email response dated 18 November 2019; and
- a letter and email from the TRA to Mr Donnison dated 19 November 2019, and his email response dated 20 November 2019.

Those documents were not served in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 4.20 of the Procedures, and as such the panel is required to decide whether those documents should be admitted under paragraph 4.25 of the Procedures at the discretion of the panel. The panel took into account the representations from the representing officer and the teacher's agreement to admit those documents. The panel exercised caution in exercising this discretion given that it has determined to proceed with this hearing in the absence of the teacher.

Under paragraph 4.18 of the Procedures, the panel may admit any evidence, where it is fair to do so, which may reasonably be considered to be relevant to the case.

The panel is satisfied that the documents are relevant to the case and Mr Donnison's absence from the hearing.

## **D. Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section 1: Chronology and anonymised pupil list – pages 2 to 3

Section 2: Notice of Proceedings and Response, and Statement of Agreed Facts – pages 5 to 15

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 17 to 78

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 80 to 193

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 195 to 196

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

- email correspondence between Mr Donnison and the presenting officer dated 2 August 2019 (already referred to the updated index as new pages 11a and 11b)
- the previous panel decision dated 2 April 2019 (new pages 197 – 199);
- a letter from the TRA to Mr Donnison dated 15 November 2019 (new page 200), and his email response dated 18 November 2019 (new page 201); and
- a letter and email from the TRA to Mr Donnison dated 19 November 2019 (new pages 202 – 203), and his email response dated 20 November 2019 (new pages 204 – 206).

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

## **Witnesses**

No witnesses were called by either party.

## **E. Decision and reasons**

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

The panel confirmed it had read all of the documents provided in the bundle in advance of the hearing.

Mr Raymond Donnison had been employed at the School from 1 September 2014 as an Assistant Principal. As part of this role, Mr Donnison was the senior leadership link to the attendance team.

In or around March 2018, a colleague raised concerns with Mr Donnison regarding inaccuracies within attendance records. On 23 March 2018, Mr Donnison reported himself to the Principal regarding these irregularities and he confessed to having altered attendance records. Mr Donnison was suspended pending investigation on 26 March 2018.

As part of the School's investigation, Mr Donnison attended an investigation meeting on 20 April 2018. Following completion of this investigation, Mr Donnison attended a

disciplinary meeting on 23 May 2018. Mr Donnison was then summarily dismissed, confirmed by a letter dated 6 June 2018.

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

### **Whilst working as Assistant Principal at the School between September 2017 and March 2018:**

- 1. you made one or more changes to the attendance register in respect of one or more students which did not reflect the true position in terms of their attendance, including by:**
  - a. changing one or more students recorded mark of 'O' (indicating an unauthorised absence) to '/' or '\ (indicating present, AM or PM);**
  - b. changing one or more students recorded mark of '-' (indicating no mark recorded) to '/' or '\ (indicating present, AM or PM);**
  - c. changing one or more students recorded mark of 'C' (indicating absence due to other authorised circumstances) to '/' or '\ (indicating present, AM or PM);**
  - d. changing one or more students recorded mark of 'M' (indicating an absence for a medical or dental appointment) to '/' or '\ (indicating present, AM or PM);**
  - e. changing one or more students recorded mark of 'I' (indicating an absence due to illness) to '/' or '\ (indicating present, AM or PM);**
  - f. changing one or more students recorded mark of 'U' (indicating lateness, after registers have closed) to 'L' (indicating late, before registers have closed);**

On examination of the records before the panel, the panel was satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the allegation was proven. Whilst the panel recognised that some of the changes may have been genuine; the number of changes made to the attendance records and the time taken to make these number of changes, on the same date and at the same time, were indicative of a number of non-genuine changes. Multiple genuine changes could not have been made at the same time.

The panel had evidence of one specific example of where the change could not have been genuine. Pupil A's records had been amended in relation to a period of



unauthorised absence for a family holiday, to give the appearance that Pupil A was in fact present. Additional evidence showed that a fine for this unauthorised absence had been issued by the local education authority.

The panel also acknowledged Mr Donnison's admission of this allegation in the Statement of Agreed Facts.

**2. your conduct as may be found proven at allegation 1 above demonstrated a lack of integrity and/or was dishonest in that you deliberately made changes to the attendance register in an attempt to make the school's attendance figures seem better than they were.**

The panel found on the balance of probabilities that Mr Donnison had acted deliberately to make changes to attendance records. The large volume of changes, many of which were made on the same day, could not be attributed to error. Mr Donnison accepts that the number of changes made on 15 February 2018 is "significant", and that there would not be so many genuine changes made on one day.

Mr Donnison has explained that his intentions in making non-genuine changes to attendance records were to improve attendance figures for the School. The panel had regard to the fact that changes were made retrospectively, in some cases several months after the absence. The panel was of the view that this reinforced Mr Donnison's admission during the School's investigation that he was mindful of the safeguarding implications of making immediate changes to the attendance records, and this showed his actions to be both pre-meditated and deliberate.

The panel found that these actions would be regarded by the standards of ordinary, decent people to be dishonest, and indeed Mr Donnison admitted in his written statement to the panel that he was "an honest person doing something dishonest". He also referred to "the shame of facing up to my dishonest actions".

The panel also considered whether these actions showed a lack of integrity. Mr Donnison had a responsibility as Assistant Head for monitoring and improving attendance. He was expected to ensure accurate and up-to-date information about attendance throughout the School. By making non-genuine changes to registration documents Mr Donnison fell well below the standards expected of a teaching professional. Moreover, Mr Donnison admitted in the Statement of Agreed Facts that in making non-genuine changes he acted with dishonesty and/or with a lack of integrity. The panel therefore found that in addition to dishonesty, his actions as set out above demonstrated a lack of integrity.

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

Having found a number of the allegations proven, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proven allegations amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Donnison, in relation to the facts found proven, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considered that by reference to Part Two, Mr Donnison 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 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 was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Donnison amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel also considered whether Mr Donnison’s conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 8 and 9 of the Advice. The panel found that the offence of serious dishonesty was 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 regard Mr Donnison’s conduct as serious dishonesty because of the extent of the non-genuine changes, the extended period of time over which they were made, and Mr Donnison’s admission that the purpose of making the changes was to present the attendance figures more favourably.

The panel took into account the way 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 also took account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils’ lives and the fact that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way that they behave.

The distortion of the attendance records, in the view of the panel, opened the possibility of serious safeguarding consequences. This was highlighted by an Ofsted report following an inspection in April 2018, which stated that “safeguarding is not effective”, and that to improve urgently the School must ensure “attendance registers are accurately maintained”.

The panel therefore found that Mr Donnison’s actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Having found the facts of allegations 1 and 2 proven, the panel further found that Mr Donnison's conduct amounted to both unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

## **Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State**

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

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

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Donnison, which involved serious dishonesty, there was a strong public interest consideration in declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct, as the conduct found against Mr Donnison was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

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

The panel decided that there was a strong public interest consideration in retaining Mr Donnison in the profession, since no doubt had been cast upon his abilities as an educator or that he was able to make a valuable contribution to the profession.

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 Donnison.

In carrying out the balancing exercise, the panel had regard to the public interest considerations both in favour of and against prohibition as well as the interests of Mr Donnison. 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 were relevant in this case were:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or well-being of pupils; and
- dishonesty especially where there could have been serious consequences.

Even though some of the behaviours found proven 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 not appropriate or proportionate.

There was no evidence that the teacher's actions were not deliberate. There was no evidence to suggest that the teacher was acting under duress.

The panel saw no evidence to cast doubt on Mr Donnison's previous good history as a teacher, and the panel noted that no other misconduct issues were brought to their attention. Given this, and the fact that Mr Donnison had taught at the School for many years and had been promoted to a senior leadership role, the panel were willing to accept Mr Donnison's statement that his conduct was out of 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 would be sufficient.

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, the recommendation of no prohibition order would not be a proportionate and appropriate response. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings would be sufficient in the case would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for the teacher 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 Donnison. His serious dishonesty was a significant factor 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 behaviours that, if proven, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. One of these behaviours is serious dishonesty. The panel found that Mr Donnison was responsible for deliberately making non-genuine

changes to attendance records with the aim of presenting attendance figures more favourably.

However, the panel concluded that Mr Donnison had shown remorse for his actions and that he had reported himself to the School's Principal. He has accepted his wrongdoing and has cooperated with investigations undertaken by the School and the TRA into his misconduct.

The panel were conscious that Mr Donnison had no personal gain from his misconduct. Whilst Mr Donnison's actions met the threshold of serious dishonesty, it was not in the panel's experience at the most serious end of the spectrum of dishonesty.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a review period. The panel recommend a review period of 5 years to reflect the seriousness of Mr Donnison's actions and to give him time to further reflect on his actions, whilst not precluding the possibility of him returning to teaching and making a significant contribution to the profession.

## **Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State**

I have given very careful consideration to this case and to the recommendation of the panel in respect of 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 unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Donnison should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of five years.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Donnison 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 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 has said that it, “was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Donnison amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.”

The panel also “found that the offence of serious dishonesty was relevant.”

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of dishonesty and lack of integrity on the part of an Assistant Principal.

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 Donnison, 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, “The distortion of the attendance records, in the view of the panel, opened the possibility of serious safeguarding consequences. This was highlighted by an Ofsted report following an inspection in April 2018, which stated that “safeguarding is not effective”, and that to improve urgently the School must ensure “attendance registers are accurately maintained”.

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, “ However, the panel concluded that Mr Donnison had shown remorse for his actions and that he had reported himself to the School’s Principal. He has accepted his wrongdoing and has cooperated with investigations undertaken by the School and the TRA into his misconduct.”

I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision especially concerning the review period.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe that it, “took account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils’ lives and the fact that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way that they behave.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of dishonesty and lack of integrity 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 Donnison himself. The panel say it, “saw no evidence to cast doubt on Mr Donnison’s previous good history as a teacher, and the panel noted that no other misconduct issues were brought to their attention. Given this, and the fact that Mr Donnison had taught at the School for many years and had been promoted to a senior leadership role, the panel were willing to accept Mr Donnison’s statement that his conduct was out of character.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Donnison 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 repetition of the behaviour. The panel say , “.....regard Mr Donnison’s conduct as serious dishonesty because of the extent of the non-genuine changes, the extended period of time over which they were made, and Mr Donnison’s admission that the purpose of making the changes was to present the attendance figures more favourably.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Donnison 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 finding of serious dishonesty and lack of integrity is a serious matter in my view.

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 a 5 year review period.

I have considered the panel’s comments “Whilst Mr Donnison’s actions met the threshold of serious dishonesty, it was not in the panel’s experience at the most serious end of the spectrum of dishonesty.” The panel also say that they, “recommend a review period of 5 years to reflect the seriousness of Mr Donnison’s actions and to give him time to further reflect on his actions, whilst not precluding the possibility of him returning to teaching and making a significant contribution to the profession.”


I have considered whether a 5 year 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 factors which 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 serious dishonesty found, the lack of integrity found, and the extent of the changes made and the time frame over which they were made.

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

**This means that Mr Raymond Donnison is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England.** He may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 6 December 2024, 5 years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If he does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Mr Raymond Donnison remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr Raymond Donnison 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', is written over a vertical line.

**Decision maker: Alan Meyrick**

**Date: 26 November 2019**

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