



National College for
Teaching & Leadership

Mr James Eaton: Professional Conduct Panel outcome

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

July 2014

Contents

A. Introduction	3
B. Allegations	4
C. Preliminary applications	5
D. Summary of evidence	6
Documents	6
Witnesses	6
E. Decision and reasons	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	13
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	15

Professional Conduct Panel decision and recommendations, and decision on behalf of the Secretary of State

Teacher:	Mr James Eaton
Teacher ref no:	0635621
Teacher date of birth:	15 September 1976
NCTL Case ref no:	9972
Date of Determination:	16 July 2014
Former employer:	The Petersfield School, Hampshire

A. Introduction

A Professional Conduct Panel (“the Panel”) of the National College for Teaching and Leadership (“the National College”) convened on 14, 15 and 16 July 2014 at 53-55 Butts Road, Earlsdon Park, Coventry, CV1 3BH to consider the case of Mr James Eaton.

The Panel members were Professor Helen Valentine (Lay Panellist – in the Chair), Dr Robert Cawley (Teacher Panellist) and Mr Martin Greenslade (Lay Panellist).

The Legal Adviser to the Panel was Mr Thomas Whitfield of Eversheds LLP Solicitors.

The Presenting Officer for the National College was Ms Hannah Eales of Kingsley Napley LLP Solicitors.

Mr James Eaton 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 8 April 2014.

It was alleged that Mr James Eaton was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the teaching profession into disrepute, in that:

1. Whilst the Director of Music at Romsey Abbey in 2008 and 2009 he failed to demonstrate an understanding of his obligation to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with children and young people in that:
 - a. he attended a choir trip to Exeter in 2008 and during that trip was overly familiar with boy choristers;
 - b. he planned a choir trip to Bruges and Brussels in 2009 and:
 - (i) made arrangements to sleep with boy choristers in a dormitory without other adults present;
 - (ii) did not carry out a risk assessment to ensure that the adult to child ratios were correct.
2. Whilst employed at The Petersfield School, Hampshire from 2008 to July 2011 he failed to demonstrate an understanding of his obligation to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with children and young people in that;
 - a. he arranged a trip to Splashdown Swimming Centre in 2010 and:
 - (i) did not arrange for another adult to be present on the trip
 - (ii) did not obtain authorisation from his employer in advance of undertaking the trip
 - b. he attended a trip to Avon Tyrell Residential Course in June 2011 and:
 - (i) allowed an explicit song to be rehearsed and performed at the residential talent show
 - (ii) allowed a system of punishments or forfeits to occur which involved male students having cold showers in their underclothes or swimming trunks and/or placing ice-cubes in their underwear or under their arms
 - (iii) instructed the male students involved in the punishments or forfeit scheme to keep it secret from other attendees on the trip
 - (iv) placed himself in a situation where he was alone with male students after 'lights out'

(v) used a personal digital video/camera during the trip to take images of students without obtaining the prior consent of the parents or the School

(vi) issued cameras to students and encouraged them to take photos of each other undertaking various activities including swimming

- c. he contacted pupils via personal social networking sites and/or his personal email, contrary to the School's E-Safety Policy.

In his written response to the notice of proceedings, Mr Eaton indicated that he admitted allegations 2.b. and 2.c but that he did not admit allegation 1 or allegation 2.a.

In the same response, Mr Eaton also accepted that the facts that he had admitted amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute

C. Preliminary applications

The Panel considered whether to proceed in the absence of Mr Eaton. The Panel found that Mr Eaton had been sent an effective notice of proceedings and that he had deliberately and voluntarily absented himself from the hearing. The Panel found no indication that an adjournment might result in Mr Eaton attending voluntarily. The Panel also took into consideration the public interest in hearings taking place within a reasonable time of the events to which they relate, the effect of delay on the memories of witnesses and the indication from the Presenting Officer that some of the witnesses were somewhat reluctant. On the basis of all of this, the Panel decided to proceed in Mr Eaton's absence.

The Panel considered the Presenting Officer's application for two children to give evidence, for that evidence to be given by video link and for the names of the children not to be revealed. The Panel was satisfied that the children's welfare would not be prejudiced by their giving evidence, but considered it necessary for them to give their evidence anonymously and for a video link to be used to safeguard the children's interests.

The Panel considered Mr Eaton's request (in his response to the notice of proceedings) that the hearing be held in private. The Panel decided that the public interest required that the hearing should be held in public, save for any evidence given by children.

D. Summary of evidence

Documents

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

- Section 1: Chronology, anonymised pupil list and list of key people, with page numbers from 1 to 7.
- Section 2: Notice of Proceedings and response, with page numbers from 8 to 15.
- Section 3: National College for Teaching and Leadership Witness Statements, with page numbers from 16 to 78.
- Section 4: National College for Teaching & Leadership Documents, with page numbers from 79 to 255.

Mr Eaton did not provide any documents for the Panel to consider (although the documents identified above included a response from Mr Eaton to the notice of proceedings).

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 – Head Teacher, the Petersfield School;
- Witness B – Assistant Principal and Child Protection Officer, the Petersfield School;
- Witness C – Reverend of Romsey Abbey; and
- Witness D – at the relevant time a Cover Supervisor at the Petersfield School.

Note that, in the event, no oral evidence was given by the children referred to in the “Preliminary applications” section above.

E. Decision and reasons

The Panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

We have now carefully considered the case before us and have reached a decision.

We confirm that we have read all the documents provided in the bundle in advance of the hearing.

Summary of Evidence

Mr James Eaton was employed as Head of the Music Department of Petersfield School, Hampshire from Spring 2008. In October 2008, whilst still employed by Petersfield School, Mr Eaton also took up a role as Romsey Abbey's Assistant Organist.

In his role at Romsey Abbey, Mr Eaton attended a choir trip to Exeter in August 2008. In early 2009 Mr Eaton planned a choir trip to Bruges and Brussels, that was due to take place between 24 and 27 May 2009. On 6 May 2009 e-mails were exchanged between Mr Eaton, Person B – parishioner at Romsey Abbey and head of Criminal Records Bureau checks at the Abbey, and Person C, senior organist at Romsey Abbey, regarding the adequacy of preparations for the forthcoming trip. On 9 May 2009 Mr Eaton withdrew from the organisation of the choir trip. On 27 June 2010 Mr Eaton resigned from his post as Assistant Organist of Romsey Abbey.

The Panel heard evidence that in mid July 2010 Mr Eaton took a group of students from the Petersfield School on a trip to Splashdown Swimming Centre.

Between 10 June 2011 and 13 June 2011 Mr Eaton attended a residential trip from the Petersfield School to Avon Tyrrell. Concerns were raised by a parent of one of the students on this trip and a teaching assistant present on the trip, which led to Witness B, Assistant Principal of the Petersfield School being appointed to act as investigating officer on 21 June 2011. On 5 July 2011 James Eaton was invited to an investigatory interview but did not attend. On 8 July 2011 Mr Eaton resigned from the Petersfield School.

Findings of Fact

Our findings of fact are as follows:

We have found the following particulars of the allegations against Mr Eaton proven, for these reasons:

It was alleged that Mr James Eaton was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the teaching profession into disrepute, in that:

- 1. Whilst the Director of Music at Romsey Abbey in 2008 and 2009 he failed to demonstrate an understanding of his obligation to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with children and young people in that:**

...

- b. he planned a choir trip to Bruges and Brussels in 2009 and:**

...

(ii) did not carry out a risk assessment to ensure that the adult to child ratios were correct.

This allegation is denied by Mr Eaton. The Panel has seen an e-mail from Mr Eaton, apparently to the company providing the trip, dated 27 April 2009 in which Mr Eaton refers to information being needed as part of the Abbey's risk assessment and child protection procedures. The Panel also considered an e-mail from Person B, parishioner and head of Criminal Records Bureau checks at Romsey Abbey, to Mr Eaton, sent on 6 May 2009, indicating that the trip required a more detailed risk assessment than previous choir holidays, given that the choristers were staying in a public hotel. The Panel has seen documentary evidence showing that the intended number of adults on this trip far exceeded the number of children. Notwithstanding this, the Panel has not seen any evidence that a written risk assessment was carried out and in particular to ensure that adult to child ratios were correct. The Panel therefore finds this allegation proved.

2. Whilst employed at The Petersfield School, Hampshire from 2008 to July 2011 he failed to demonstrate an understanding of his obligation to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with children and young people in that;

a. he arranged a trip to Splashdown Swimming Centre in 2010 and:

(i) did not arrange for another adult to be present on the trip

(ii) did not obtain authorisation from his employer in advance of undertaking the trip

Mr Eaton has not admitted allegation 2.a.(i) or 2.a.(ii).

Witness B stated in his witness statement that in late July 2010 he became aware that Mr Eaton had organised a trip to Splashdown Waterpark without following official school procedures. Witness B stated that he and Person A, Associate Principal of the Petersfield School, questioned Mr Eaton about this at the time and that Mr Eaton admitted that he had not followed protocol. Witness A stated in his witness statement that he found out about the trip from other teachers at the school, who had overheard students discussing it. Witness A states that he spoke to Mr Eaton separately to the discussions Mr Eaton had with Person A and Witness B and that Mr Eaton did not respond to Witness A's questions. Witness A also states that he subsequently found uncashed cheques in Mr Eaton's drawers dating back two years, some of which related to the Splashdown trip. The Panel notes that, although Mr Eaton has denied this allegation, he has not provided any explanation for the uncashed cheques, nor for his apparent admission to Witness B that he had not followed protocols for school trips, nor

for the information that came to Witness A about students discussing the trip, nor has Mr Eaton identified any adult that was on the alleged trip in addition to Mr Eaton.

In light of the evidence of Witness B and Witness A the Panel was satisfied on the balance of probabilities that Mr Eaton arranged a trip to Splashdown Swimming Centre in 2010, that he did not arrange for another adult to be present on the trip and that he did not obtain authorisation from his employer in advance of undertaking the trip. Accordingly the Panel found allegations 2.a.(i) and 2.a.(ii) proved.

b. he attended a trip to Avon Tyrell Residential Course in June 2011 and:

(i) allowed an explicit song to be rehearsed and performed at the residential talent show

This allegation is admitted by Mr Eaton and the first statement of Student A supports this allegation. The allegation is found proved.

(ii) allowed a system of punishments or forfeits to occur which involved male students having cold showers in their underclothes or swimming trunks and/or placing ice-cubes in their underwear or under their arms

This allegation is admitted by Mr Eaton and is supported by the evidence from students present at the time. The allegation is found proved.

(iii) instructed the male students involved in the punishments or forfeit scheme to keep it secret from other attendees on the trip

This allegation is admitted by Mr Eaton and is supported by the evidence from Student B, Student C and Student E. The allegation is found proved.

...

(v) used a personal digital video/camera during the trip to take images of students without obtaining the prior consent of the parents or the School

This allegation is admitted by Mr Eaton, is supported by the evidence from Student E and is not contradicted by any other student. The allegation is found proved.

(vi) issued cameras to students and encouraged them to take photos of each other undertaking various activities including swimming

This allegation is admitted by Mr Eaton and is supported by the evidence from Witness D and students present at the time. The allegation is found proved.

c. he contacted pupils via personal social networking sites and/or his personal email, contrary to the School's E-Safety Policy.

This allegation is admitted by Mr Eaton and, in relation to contact via personal social networking sites is supported by the evidence of students and the father of one of the students. This allegation is found proved.

We have found the following particulars of the allegations against Mr Eaton not proven, for these reasons:

1. Whilst the Director of Music at Romsey Abbey in 2008 and 2009 he failed to demonstrate an understanding of his obligation to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with children and young people in that:

a. he attended a choir trip to Exeter in 2008 and during that trip was overly familiar with boy choristers;

Mr Eaton denies this allegation. The only first-hand evidence presented to the Panel of Mr Eaton being overly familiar with boy choristers during this trip was the evidence of Witness C, who stated that when the choristers were shopping for clothes Mr Eaton became actively involved in pointing out items of clothing. The Panel was not satisfied on all the evidence before it that Mr Eaton's behaviour was overly familiar and therefore finds the allegation not proved.

b. he planned a choir trip to Bruges and Brussels in 2009 and:

(i) made arrangements to sleep with boy choristers in a dormitory without other adults present;

This allegation is denied by Mr Eaton. The Panel heard evidence from Witness C that Mr Eaton did not make arrangements to sleep in the same dormitory as boy choristers; he arranged a separate room close to the boys' dormitory. The Panel found this allegation not proved.

2. Whilst employed at The Petersfield School, Hampshire from 2008 to July 2011 he failed to demonstrate an understanding of his

obligation to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with children and young people in that;

...

b. he attended a trip to Avon Tyrell Residential Course in June 2011 and:

...

(iv) placed himself in a situation where he was alone with male students after 'lights out'

This allegation is admitted by Mr Eaton. The students present at the time, who have given evidence to the Panel (Students A, B and D), all state that Mr Eaton was in a bedroom used by male students, with the door open. However, the evidence of these students was not consistent with this event having occurred after "lights out". Student A expressly stated that it occurred before "lights out", Student B stated that he could see Mr Eaton despite being in the opposite room, with doors of each room open, which the Panel found to be indicative that the lights had not been turned off and Student D only stated that it occurred after "lockdown" (which the evidence suggested was a considerable amount of time before "lights out").

The Panel noted that it was obliged under paragraph 4.73 of the Procedures to consider all of the evidence available and decide whether the facts of the case have been proved. The Panel placed considerable weight on Mr Eaton's admission, but nonetheless, in light of the evidence referred to above, that the Panel found to be inconsistent with Mr Eaton's admission, the Panel found this allegation not proved.

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

In considering the allegations that the Panel has found proven, the Panel has had regard to the definitions in The Teacher Misconduct – Prohibition of Teachers Advice, which we refer to as the 'Guidance'.

The Panel finds that Mr Eaton's proven conduct, taken as a whole, is misconduct of a serious nature, falling significantly short of the standard of behaviour expected of a teacher. In making a judgment in this regard the Panel has drawn on its own knowledge and experience of the teaching profession and also the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards. In particular, the Panel finds that Mr Eaton's conduct has fallen significantly short of the following of the Teachers' Standards:

- *"Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by*

- *treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position;*

In this regard the Panel notes in particular allegations 2.b.ii, and 2.b.iii that have been found proven, ie that Mr Eaton allowed a system of punishments or forfeits to occur which involved male students having cold showers in their underclothes or swimming trunks and/or placing ice-cubes in their underwear or under their arms and that Mr Eaton instructed the male students involved in the punishments or forfeit scheme to keep it secret from other attendees on the trip.

- *“having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions;”*

In this regard the Panel notes in particular allegation 2.a.i. that has been found proven, ie that Mr Eaton arranged a trip to Splashdown Swimming Centre in 2010 and did not arrange for another adult to be present on the trip.

- *“Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality;”*

In this regard the Panel notes in particular allegations 2.a.i., 2.a.ii., 2.b.ii, 2.b.iii. 2.b.vi. and 2c, ie that Mr Eaton arranged a trip to Splashdown Swimming Centre in 2010, did not arrange for another adult to be present on the trip and did not obtain authorisation from his employer in advance of the trip; Mr Eaton allowed a system of punishments or forfeits to occur which involved male students having cold showers in their underclothes or swimming trunks and/or placing ice-cubes in their underwear or under their arms and that Mr Eaton instructed the male students involved in the punishments or forfeit scheme to keep it secret from other attendees on the trip; Mr Eaton issued cameras to students and encouraged them to take photos of each other undertaking various activities including swimming and contacted pupils via personal social networking sites and/or his personal e-mail, contrary to the School's E-Safety Policy.

- *“Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.”*

In this regard the Panel notes in particular allegations 2.a.i., ie that Mr Eaton arranged a trip to Splashdown Swimming Centre in 2010 and did not arrange for another adult to be present on the trip.

The Panel has also considered whether Mr Eaton's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 8 and 9 of the Guidance and has found that none of these offences are relevant.

The panel notes that allegation 1.b.ii. took place outside of the education setting. The Panel did not consider that this element of Mr Eaton's conduct affected the way that Mr

Eaton fulfilled his teaching role or may lead to pupils being exposed to or influenced by the behaviour in a harmful way. The Panel notes that no allegations have been made that Mr Eaton has failed to carry out risk assessments for activities related to his teaching roles.

In light of all of the above, the Panel is satisfied that Mr Eaton is guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

As to whether Mr Eaton's conduct is conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, 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 pupil's 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 the individual's status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public perception.

The Panel therefore finds that Mr Eaton'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/or 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 decision-maker acting on behalf of the Secretary of State.

The Panel has not been provided with any character references. The Panel has not been made aware of any disciplinary or criminal proceedings concerning Mr Eaton, other than the disciplinary proceedings relating to the events considered by the Panel in this decision notice.

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 Guidance and having done so has found a number of them to be relevant in this case,

namely the protection of pupils, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

There is a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils, given in particular the Panel's findings that Mr Eaton has arranged a trip for pupils to a swimming centre without arranging for another adult to be present on the trip; did not obtain authorisation from the school for this trip; on a further trip instructed students involved in a forfeit scheme to keep it secret from other attendees on a trip; and issued cameras to students and encouraged them to take photos of each other undertaking various activities including swimming.

The Panel also considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Eaton were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

Similarly, 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 Eaton was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

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 Eaton. The Panel was mindful of the fact that prior to these findings being made against him, Mr Eaton was, to the Panel's knowledge, a person of good character with no criminal or disciplinary sanctions record against him.

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 Eaton, the Panel took further account of the Guidance, which suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours of a teacher have been proven. In the list of such behaviours 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; and
- abuse of position or trust ... or violation of the rights of pupils.

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 did not find that Mr Eaton's actions were not deliberate, nor did it find that the teacher was acting under

duress. Based on the evidence before it, the Panel found that Mr Eaton had a previously good history.

The Panel is of the view that Prohibition is both proportionate and appropriate. We have decided that the public interest considerations outweigh the interests of Mr Eaton. The lack of insight or remorse shown by Mr Eaton 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 to recommend that any Prohibition Order should specify a period after which the Order may be reviewed. The Panel were mindful that the Guidance 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 two years.

The Guidance indicates that there are behaviours that, if proven, would militate against a review period being recommended. The Panel did not find any of these behaviours to be present in Mr Eaton's case. Notwithstanding this, the Panel noted that the list of behaviours referred to in the Guidance states that it is not exhaustive and considered Mr Eaton's conduct as a whole when deciding whether a review period was appropriate.

The Panel acknowledges that Mr Eaton admitted some of the allegations and that they amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. However, this was the limit of Mr Eaton's engagement with the process. The Panel believes this to be indicative of Mr Eaton's lack of appreciation of the seriousness of his actions, which occurred over several years, in a number of settings. The Panel believes this to be a pattern of behaviour which demonstrates a continuing potential risk. The lack of remorse and insight shown by Mr Eaton reinforces the Panel's view that this behaviour is likely to be repeated.

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 provisions for a review period.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

I have given careful consideration to the findings and recommendations of the panel in this case.

The panel have found a number of the allegations proven and judged that the facts proven amount to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Mr Eaton's actions and behaviours have fallen seriously short of the standards expected of a teacher as set out in the Teachers' Standards. In considering whether a prohibition order would be an appropriate and proportionate sanction the panel have given due regard to the public interest considerations. There are strong public interest considerations in play in this case, particularly the protection of pupils, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct. Notwithstanding this the panel considered whether or not there were sufficient mitigating factors to militate against a Prohibition Order being an appropriate and proportionate measure. The Panel did not find that Mr Eaton's actions were not deliberate, nor did it find that the teacher was acting under duress. Based on the evidence before it, the Panel did however find that Mr Eaton had a previously good history.

Mr Eaton has shown a lack of insight or remorse into his behaviour and the panel have judged that the public interest considerations outweigh the interests of Mr Eaton and that a prohibition order is an appropriate and proportionate sanction. I agree with this recommendation.

In considering whether to allow a period after which Mr Eaton could apply to have the order set aside, the panel have noted that he has not engaged with the process other than to admit some of the allegations. The Panel believes this to be indicative of Mr Eaton's lack of appreciation of the seriousness of his actions, which occurred over several years, in a number of settings. They have identified a pattern of behaviour which demonstrates a continuing potential risk. The lack of remorse and insight shown by Mr Eaton reinforces the Panel's view that this behaviour is likely to be repeated. In all the circumstances I agree with the Panel's recommendation that the order should be without provision for Mr Eaton to apply to have the order set aside.

This means that Mr James Eaton 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 James Eaton 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 James Eaton 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 'P Heathcote', with a large, sweeping flourish at the end.

NAME OF DECISION MAKER: Paul Heathcote

Date: 18 July 2014

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