



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Peter Gittins: Professional conduct panel outcome**

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

**May 2021**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	5
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	10
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**

<b>Teacher:</b>	Mr Peter Gittins
<b>Teacher ref number:</b>	7676134
<b>Teacher date of birth:</b>	13 March 1947
<b>TRA reference:</b>	18773
<b>Date of determination:</b>	21 May 2021
<b>Former employer:</b>	Hereford Sixth Form College, Hereford

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 21 May 2021, remotely via Microsoft Teams, to consider the case of Mr Peter Gittins.

The panel members were Ms Jo Palmer-Tweed (teacher panellist – in the chair), Ms Elizabeth Walters (lay panellist) and Mr Zubair Hanslot (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Phil Taylor of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP solicitors.

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Gittins that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Gittins provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer Ms Holly Quirk, Mr Gittins, or his representative Ms Victoria Rees.

The meeting took place in private, save for the announcement of the panel's decision, which was announced in public and recorded.

## Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 30 April 2021.

It was alleged that Mr Peter Gittins was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst employed and/or prior to his employment at Hereford Sixth Form College he:

1. Between 2004 and 2010 failed to maintain professional boundaries and/or engaged in an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A in that he on one or more occasions:
  - a. Text and/or called Pupil A;
  - b. Hugged Pupil A;
  - c. Met Pupil A after school;
  - d. Drove Pupil A in his car;
  - e. Went to Pupil A's home and/or invited Pupil A to his home;
  - f. kissed Pupil A on the head and/or lips and/or body;
  - g. touched Pupil A on the bottom and/or under her top and/or between her legs;
  - h. Masturbated Pupil A and/or allowed Pupil A to masturbate him;
  - i. engaged in oral sex and/or received oral sex from Pupil A;
  - j. had sexual intercourse with Pupil A;
  - k. bought and/or sent Pupil A a sex toy namely a 'midnight massager'.
2. Between 2004 and 2010 failed to maintain professional boundaries and/or engaged in an inappropriate relationship with Pupil B in that he on one or more occasions:
  - a. Text and/or called Pupil B;
  - b. Hugged Pupil B;
3. His behaviour as may be found proven at 1 above was conduct of a sexual nature and/or was sexually motivated.

Mr Gittins has admitted allegations 1.a – 1.k, and has accepted that between 2004 and 2010 he failed to maintain boundaries with Pupil A and engaged in an inappropriate relationship. Mr Gittins has admitted allegations 2.a and 2.b and has accepted that he failed to maintain appropriate boundaries with Pupil B and engaged in an inappropriate relationship. Mr Gittins has admitted allegation 3 and admits that his conduct was in pursuit of sexual gratification and a sexual relationship with Pupil A.

Mr Gittins has admitted that the facts of allegations 1, 2 and 3, which he has admitted, amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

## **Preliminary applications**

There were no preliminary applications.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section 1: Chronology and anonymised pupil list – page 2

Section 2: Notice of referral, response and Notice of meeting – pages 4 to 11b

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 13 to 20

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 22 to 30

Section 5: Teaching Regulation Agency documents, including police and LADO documents – pages 32 to 99

Section 6: Teacher documents, including character references – pages 101 to 117

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the meeting. In addition, during the meeting the panel was shown a video-recorded 'ABE' interview with Pupil A, conducted on 9 June 2019, which formed part of Section 5 of the bundle.

### **Statement of agreed facts**

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Gittins on 10 March 2021.

## **Decision and reasons**

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

The panel carefully considered the case and reached a decision.

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

Mr Gittins was employed at Hereford Sixth Form College (the “School”) as Head of Brass between 1 September 2012 and 31 December 2014, and again from 20 August 2016 to 25 June 2019. In this role he taught one-to-one lessons to students who played brass instruments and were studying A-Level music or were enrolled on the School’s instrumental scholarship programme. During the time of the alleged conduct, Mr Gittins worked as a peripatetic tutor at a number of primary and secondary schools within the local music service area.

Pupil A met Mr Gittins when she was a member of a youth concert band which he conducted. Pupil A was a pupil at the School between 2005 and 2006 while she studied for her A-Levels but was not taught by him then.

In 2018, [REDACTED], Pupil A made certain disclosures relating to Mr Gittins which dated back to 2004 but did not relate to any period when he was working at the School. Pupil A subsequently provided a written statement to the police, and was interviewed by the police on 9 June 2019. The police investigated the matter but ultimately took no further action. A LADO meeting was convened on 20 June 2019. On 25 June 2019, Mr Gittins resigned from his position at the School with immediate effect.

Pupil B did not receive tuition from Mr Gittins at the School but was a member of [REDACTED], and [REDACTED].

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

Whilst employed and/or prior to your employment at Hereford Sixth Form College you:

**1. Between 2004 and 2010 failed to maintain professional boundaries and/or engaged in an inappropriate relationship with Pupil A in that you on one or more occasions:**

**a. Text and/or called Pupil A;**

This allegation was admitted and supported by evidence presented to the panel. Although no text messages were provided in evidence, the panel noted in particular the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Gittins, as well as the video-recorded police interview with Pupil A and consistent written statements from Pupil A provided in the bundle. No evidence was provided which cast any doubt on the facts having taken place as alleged. The allegation was therefore found proved.

**b. Hugged Pupil A;**

**c. Met Pupil A after school;**

**d. Drove Pupil A in your car;**

**e. Went to Pupil A's home and/or invited Pupil A to your home;**

**f. Kissed Pupil A on the head and/or lips and/or body;**

**g. Touched Pupil A on the bottom and/or under her top and/or between her legs;**

**h. Masturbated Pupil A and/or allowed Pupil A to masturbate you;**

These allegations were admitted and supported by evidence presented to the panel, in particular the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Gittins, as well as the video-recorded police interview with Pupil A and consistent written statements from Pupil A provided in the bundle. No evidence was provided which cast any doubt on the facts having taken place as alleged. The allegations were therefore found proved.

**i. engaged in oral sex and/or received oral sex from Pupil A;**

In the signed statement of agreed facts, Mr Gittins admitted that he gave oral sex to Pupil A. This was supported by the evidence provided by Pupil A. The panel also noted that Pupil A had provided consistent compelling evidence, both video-recorded and written, to support the allegation that Mr Gittins received oral sex from her. The allegation was therefore found proved in its entirety.

**j. had sexual intercourse with Pupil A;**

The allegation was admitted and supported by evidence presented to the panel, notably the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Gittins, as well as other written evidence in the bundle including the video-recorded police interview with Pupil A and her written statements. No evidence was provided which cast any doubt on the facts having taken place as alleged. The allegation was therefore found proved.

**k. bought and/or sent Pupil A a sex toy namely a 'midnight massager'.**

The allegation was admitted, although Mr Gittins could not recall the name of the specific product, and supported by evidence presented to the panel, notably the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Gittins, as well as other evidence in the bundle including accounts from Pupil A. No evidence was provided which cast any doubt on the facts having taken place as alleged. The allegation was therefore found proved.

**2. Between 2004 and 2010 failed to maintain professional boundaries and/or engaged in an inappropriate relationship with Pupil B in that you on one or more occasions:**

**a. Text and/or called Pupil B;**

**b. Hugged Pupil B;**

The panel noted that it had not been provided with a statement from Pupil B. However, the panel considered and gave weight to relevant elements of a detailed statement provided by Pupil A. The panel also noted that no evidence had been provided which would indicate that the events as alleged had not occurred. In addition, these allegations were admitted by Mr Gittins in the signed statement of agreed facts. The allegations were therefore found proved.

### **3. Your behaviour as may be found proven at 1 above was conduct of a sexual nature and/or was sexually motivated.**

The panel took time to consider whether, on the balance of probabilities, reasonable persons would think the actions found proven at 1 could be sexual. The panel was satisfied that this was the case. The descriptions of a number of the activities at 1 were, in the panel's view, plainly sexual.

The panel then asked itself whether, in all the circumstances of the conduct in the case, it was more likely than not that Mr Gittins' purpose of such actions was sexual. The panel again concluded that this was the case.

The panel carefully considered all the circumstances of the case, and determined that on the balance of probabilities, sexual motivation on the part of Mr Gittins could be inferred. The panel considered that it had been provided with strong evidence to support this conclusion. This included that the allegation had been unequivocally admitted in full by Mr Gittins in the signed statement of agreed facts, in which he agreed that his conduct in relation to allegation 1 was conduct of a sexual nature and was sexually motivated. The allegation was also supported by other evidence in the bundle, notably Pupil A's video-recorded and written statements. The panel therefore found this allegation to be proved.

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

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

In doing so, the panel took account of its own knowledge, understanding and experience of the teaching standards in 2004 to 2010. The panel noted that the current Teachers' Standards were not in place at the time the conduct occurred.

In the panel's experience, it considers that Mr Gittins' behaviour would not have been regarded as appropriate and that it fell far short of the standards expected of the profession at the time, particularly the failure to maintain proper professional boundaries with Pupils A and B, and the failure to safeguard pupils' wellbeing.

Although the conduct complained of, took place outside of a school setting where the interactions might be less formal, the panel nonetheless took the view that Mr Gittins was



in a teaching role and therefore subject to the relevant standards and expectations for the profession. The panel considered that Mr Gittins was in a position of trust and had a duty of care towards Pupils A and B.

The panel also considered whether Mr Gittins' conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 10 and 11 of the current Teacher Misconduct: the Prohibition of Teachers ("the Advice"). The current Advice is relevant in that it explicitly codifies professional standards and expectations at the time it was issued. 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. In this case, the panel found that the offence of sexual activity was relevant.

The panel also considered that Mr Gittins' conduct may have had the potential to expose pupils to harm or influence them in a harmful way.

In addition, Mr Gittins was a very experienced teacher, with a career of more than 40 years, and should have been well aware of the conduct expected of him. Nevertheless he behaved in an entirely inappropriate way with respect to two children under his care. The panel noted that Mr Gittins has accepted that he breached boundaries and acceptable standards.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mr Gittins is guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

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 they behave.

The findings of misconduct were serious and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public perception. The panel considered that in some cases Mr Gittins had shown a disregard of the risks to other children, as well as Pupils A and B, for example by way of his conduct towards Pupil A during a coach trip while other pupils were nearby.

The panel therefore found that Mr Gittins' actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Having found the facts of allegations 1, 2 and 3 proved, the panel further found that Mr Gittins' 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 protection of pupils, the protection of other members of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession, and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

The panel's findings against Mr Gittins involved failing to adhere to professional boundaries and breaches of trust. The panel found there to be a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils particularly given the serious findings of inappropriate conduct of a sexual nature relating to one of his pupils.

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

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present, as the conduct found against Mr Gittins was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated. The panel considered that, whilst no doubt had been cast on Mr Gittins' ability as an educator, any interest in retaining him in the profession is outweighed by his breach of the trust placed in him.

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 Gittins.

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 Gittins. 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 non-exhaustive 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;
- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour;
- 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;

In relation to the first point, the panel noted that it had found that Mr Gittins' conduct fell far short of the standards expected of the profession at the time.

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.

It was noted that Mr Gittins had cooperated with the TRA including by making full admissions. The panel took note of Mr Gittins' written mitigation and two references provided by former colleagues.

However, there was no evidence to suggest that Mr Gittins was acting under duress, and, in fact, the panel found his actions to be deliberate, calculated and motivated.

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 potential severity of the consequences for Mr Gittins 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 Gittins despite the submissions which had been made in his support. The fact that Mr Gittins had been in a position of trust and responsibility towards Pupil A and had nevertheless embarked on a sexually motivated relationship with her 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 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. 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. The panel had found a number of allegations of sexual misconduct proven against Mr Gittins. The panel noted that Pupil A had provided compelling and credible evidence of the way in which Mr Gittins exploited his position and her vulnerability over a sustained period, in pursuit of a sexual relationship, and the ongoing damage that Mr Gittins' behaviour has caused to her. The panel additionally noted that it had been provided with evidence that it had been alleged that Mr Gittins had made an inappropriate comment to another school pupil in 2010 and that a LADO investigation had taken place at that time. The panel took note of comments made by the LADO that allegations against Mr Gittins involved 'grooming style behaviours'.

The panel considered written statements made by Mr Gittins and by his legal representative on his behalf. The panel was unconvinced by Mr Gittins' expressions of remorse and considered that he had not shown real insight into his behaviour and the harm it had caused to Pupils A and B. The panel noted the comment that Mr Gittins had not had specific safeguarding training at the time and that there was a lack of guidance and support in relation to policies. The panel took note of the submissions made as to Mr Gittins' mental health in the period prior to the incidents. However, the panel did not find these points convincing when weighed against the seriousness of the conduct found proven.

Accordingly, and despite Mr Gittins' statements that he had no intention of returning to teaching, the panel was not satisfied that Mr Gittins would approach the situation differently should he find himself in a similar situation in future.

The panel considered the two character references provided by former colleagues. While these indicated that Mr Gittins is of good character and 'upright and moral' in his dealings, and that no 'criticism' or 'negative feedback' had been received about him, the panel was not able to test this evidence and therefore gave this material less weight.

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

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

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

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

In this case, the panel has found all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to 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 Peter Gittins should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel has commented:

“In the panel’s experience, it considers that Mr Gittins’ behaviour would not have been regarded as appropriate and that it fell far short of the standards expected of the profession at the time, particularly the failure to maintain proper professional boundaries with Pupils A and B, and the failure to safeguard pupils’ wellbeing.”

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of sexual misconduct.

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 Gittins, 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, “found there to be a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils particularly given the serious findings of inappropriate conduct of a sexual nature relating to one of his pupils.”

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, “The panel was unconvinced by Mr Gittins’ expressions of remorse and considered that he had not shown real insight into his behaviour and the

harm it had caused to Pupils A and B. The panel noted the comment that Mr Gittins had not had specific safeguarding training at the time and that there was a lack of guidance and support in relation to policies. The panel took note of the submissions made as to Mr Gittins' mental health in the period prior to the incidents. However, the panel did not find these points convincing when weighed against the seriousness of the conduct found proven.

Accordingly, and despite Mr Gittins' statements that he had no intention of returning to teaching, the panel was not satisfied that Mr Gittins would approach the situation differently should he find himself in a similar situation in future."

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

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe that it, "considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Gittins were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession."

I am particularly mindful of the finding of sexual misconduct 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 Gittins. I note the panel's comment, "While these indicated that Mr Gittins is of good character and 'upright and moral' in his dealings, and that no 'criticism' or 'negative feedback' had been received about him, the panel was not able to test this evidence and therefore gave this material less weight."

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Gittins 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 behaviour. The panel has said, "The panel had found a number of allegations of sexual

misconduct proven against Mr Gittins. The panel noted that Pupil A had provided compelling and credible evidence of the way in which Mr Gittins exploited his position and her vulnerability over a sustained period, in pursuit of a sexual relationship, and the ongoing damage that Mr Gittins' behaviour has caused to her. The panel additionally noted that it had been provided with evidence that it had been alleged that Mr Gittins had made an inappropriate comment to another school pupil in 2010 and that a LADO investigation had taken place at that time. The panel took note of comments made by the LADO that allegations against Mr Gittins involved 'grooming style behaviours'."

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Gittins 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 full remorse or complete 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 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 Gittins despite the submissions which had been made in his support. The fact that Mr Gittins had been in a position of trust and responsibility towards Pupil A and had nevertheless embarked on a sexually motivated relationship with her was a significant factor in forming that opinion."

I have considered whether allowing for a 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, there are factors which mean that a no review prohibition order is necessary and in the public interest. These factors are the seriousness of the sexual misconduct and the lack of full remorse or complete insight.

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 Peter Gittins 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 Peter Gittins 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 Peter Gittins 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', written over a vertical line.

**Decision maker: Alan Meyrick**

**Date: 24 May 2021**

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