



National College for
Teaching & Leadership

Mrs Faith Johnson & Mr Amos Johnson: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

June 2016

Contents

A. Introduction	3
B. Allegations	4
C. Preliminary applications	6
D. Summary of evidence	6
Documents	6
Statements of Agreed Fact	6
E. Decision and reasons	6
Findings of fact	7
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	10
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	14

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

Teacher: Mrs Faith Johnson

Teacher ref number: 1660660

Teacher date of birth: 30 August 1967

NCTL case reference: 14243

Teacher: Mr Amos Johnson

Teacher ref number: 1660661

Teacher date of birth: 13 March 1958

NCTL case reference: 14191

Date of determination: 24 June 2016

Former employer: Mustard School, London Borough of Hackney

A. Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the National College for Teaching and Leadership (“the National College”) convened on 24 June 2016 at 53 to 55 Butts Road, Earlsdon Park, Coventry CV1 3BH to consider the case of Mrs Faith Johnson and Mr Amos Johnson.

The panel members were Dr Geoffrey Penzer (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Ann Walker (lay panellist) and Mr Peter Cooper (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Eve Piffaretti of Blake Morgan LLP solicitors.

The panel convened as a professional conduct panel meeting without the attendance of any party.

The meeting took place in private, save for the announcement of the panel’s decision on facts and unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, which was announced in public and recorded.

B. Allegations

Mrs Faith Johnson

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Proceedings dated 7 June 2016.

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

Whilst proprietor of Mustard School she:

1. Failed to ensure an appropriate ratio of teachers to pupils on at least one occasion.
2. Failed to ensure staff are appropriately qualified and have appropriate safeguarding checks.
3. Failed to adequately safeguard pupils including but not limited to:
 - a. Failing to carry out an appropriate risk assessment in respect of the outdoor play area which has shared use with local residents;
 - b. Failing to carry out risk assessments in respect of off-site visits.
4. Failed to maintain health and safety of pupils including but not limited to:
 - a. Failing to ensure the safety of the outdoor play area;
 - b. Failing to ensure indoor areas are appropriately clean and maintained;
 - c. Failing to provide pupils with clean and safe resources;
 - d. Failing to provide suitable resources and accommodation to cater for pupils' medical needs.
5. Failed to implement appropriate policies, including policies on health and safety, behaviour and complaints.
6. Failed to keep appropriate records including one or more of admission/exit register, staff records, behaviour log, accident log and/or complaints log.

Mr Amos Johnson

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Proceedings dated 7 June 2016.

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

Whilst proprietor of Mustard School he:

1. Used or permitted inappropriate behaviour management methods on one or more occasions, including but not limited to:
 - a. Hitting one or more pupils on one or more occasions.
2. Failed to ensure an appropriate ratio of teachers to pupils on at least one occasion.
3. Failed to ensure staff are appropriately qualified and have appropriate safeguarding checks.
4. Failed to adequately safeguard pupils including but not limited to:
 - a. Failing to carry out a risk assessment in respect of the outdoor play area which has shared use with local residents;
 - b. Failing to carry out risk assessments in respect of off-site visits.
5. Failed to maintain health and safety of pupils including but not limited to:
 - a. Failing to ensure the safety of the outdoor play area;
 - b. Failing to ensure indoor areas are appropriately clean and maintained;
 - c. Failing to provide pupils with clean and appropriate resources;
 - d. Failing to provide suitable resources and accommodation to cater for pupils' medical needs.
6. Failed to implement appropriate policies, including policies on health and safety, behaviour and complaints.
7. Failed to keep appropriate records including admission/exit register, staff records, behaviour log, accident log and complaints log.

C. Preliminary applications

The panel decided to exercise its discretion, in the interests of justice to amend the allegations relating to Mr Johnson as set out at page 17D so that he is correctly referred to as the headteacher of the school, rather than proprietor. The panel was satisfied that this is a typographical error on the part of the NCTL and that the amendment would cause no prejudice to Mr Johnson.

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 – pages 2 to 4

Section 2: Notice of Referral , response and Notice of Meeting – pages 6 to 17F

Section 3: Statements of Agreed Facts and presenting officer representations – pages 19 – 27D

Section 4: NCTL documents – pages 29 to 154

Section 5: Teachers' documents – pages 156 to 161

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

Statements of Agreed Fact

The panel received a Statement of Agreed Facts signed by Mrs Faith Johnson on 4 April 2016 and by the presenting officer on 11 April 2016.

The panel received a Statement of Agreed Facts signed by Mr Amos Johnson on 12 December 2015 and by the presenting officer on 26 April 2016.

E. Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

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

Mr and Mrs Johnson were headteacher and proprietor respectively of Mustard School (“the School”) in the London Borough of Hackney. Mustard School was an independent

school that was originally registered to teach children aged 2 – 19 years. In 2013 this registration was changed to allow the teaching of students aged 2 -11 years old. At no time did the School teach across the whole age range it was allowed to. Both Mr and Mrs Johnson taught lessons at the School and undertook "teaching work" within the definition of the Education Act 2002.

In January 2015 allegations were made of physical chastisement by Mr Johnson. Mr and Mrs Johnson were advised by Hackney Child and Young Person's Service to suspend themselves pending the outcome of investigations. The school was subsequently closed on 29 January 2015.

Ofsted inspected the School on 26 September 2012 and raised concerns in relation to the general running of the School and the qualifications of staff at the School at that time. Further Ofsted inspections took place in May 2013, November 2013, May 2014 and January 2015. The allegations against Mr and Mrs Johnson refer to concerns raised during these inspections.

Findings of fact

Mrs Faith Johnson

Our findings of fact with respect to Mrs Johnson are as follows:

Whilst proprietor of Mustard School she:

- 1. Failed to ensure an appropriate ratio of teachers to pupils on at least one occasion.**
- 2. Failed to ensure staff are appropriately qualified and have appropriate safeguarding checks.**
- 3. Failed to adequately safeguard pupils including but not limited to:**
 - a. Failing to carry out an appropriate risk assessment in respect of the outdoor play area which has shared use with local residents;**
 - b. Failing to carry out risk assessments in respect of off-site visits.**
- 4. Failed to maintain health and safety of pupils including but not limited to:**
 - a. Failing to ensure the safety of the outdoor play area;**
 - b. Failing to ensure indoor areas are appropriately clean and maintained;**
 - c. Failing to provide pupils with clean and safe resources;**
 - d. Failing to provide suitable resources and accommodation to cater for pupils' medical needs.**

5. Failed to implement appropriate policies, including policies on health and safety, behaviour and complaints.

6. Failed to keep appropriate records including one or more of admission/exit register, staff records, behaviour log, accident log and/or complaints log.

Mrs Johnson has admitted the alleged facts and signed a Statement of Agreed Facts. The panel noted that the signed Statement of Agreed Facts refers to allegations 1 to 6 above as allegations 2 to 7. The Panel accepts the facts as proved on the basis of Mrs Johnson's Statement of Agreed Facts signed by her on 4 April 2016 and the evidence in the case papers.

Mr Amos Johnson

Our findings of fact with respect to Mr Johnson are as follows:

Whilst headteacher of Mustard School you:

1. Used or permitted inappropriate behaviour management methods on one or more occasions, including but not limited to:

a. Hitting one or more pupils on one or more occasions.

2. Failed to ensure an appropriate ratio of teachers to pupils on at least one occasion.

3. Failed to ensure staff are appropriately qualified and have appropriate safeguarding checks.

4. Failed to adequately safeguard pupils including but not limited to:

a. Failing to carry out a risk assessment in respect of the outdoor play area which has shared use with local residents;

b. Failing to carry out risk assessments in respect of off-site visits.

5. Failed to maintain health and safety of pupils including but not limited to:

a. Failing to ensure the safety of the outdoor play area;

b. Failing to ensure indoor areas are appropriately clean and maintained;

c. Failing to provide pupils with clean and appropriate resources;

d. Failing to provide suitable resources and accommodation to cater for pupils' medical needs.

6. Failed to implement appropriate policies, including policies on health and safety, behaviour and complaints.

7. Failed to keep appropriate records including admission/exit register, staff records, behaviour log, accident log and complaints log.

Mr Johnson has admitted the alleged facts and signed a Statement of Agreed Facts. The panel accepts the facts as proved on that basis and the evidence in the case papers.

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

Mrs Faith Johnson

Mrs Johnson admits that her conduct amounts to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel has taken this admission into account, but made its own judgement.

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

The panel is satisfied that the conduct of Mrs Johnson, in relation to the facts found proven, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considers that by reference to Part Two, Mrs Johnson 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 is satisfied that the conduct of Mrs Johnson fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession and therefore amounts to unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel has also considered whether Mrs Johnson's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 8 and 9 of the Advice and the panel has found that none is relevant.

The panel has taken into account how the teaching profession is viewed by others and considered the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel has taken account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils’ lives and that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the

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

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

Mr Amos Johnson

Mr Johnson also admits that his conduct amounts to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel has taken this admission into account, but made its own judgement.

In doing so, the panel has had regard to the Advice.

The panel is satisfied that the conduct of Mr Johnson, in relation to the facts found proven, involved the same breaches of the Teachers' Standards as set out for Mrs Johnson above. The panel also considers that Mr Johnson's conduct in relation to allegation 1(a) is in breach of the following Part Two standard:

- 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;

The panel is satisfied that the conduct of Mr Johnson fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession and therefore amounts to unacceptable professional conduct.

For the same reasons as set out for Mrs Johnson above, the panel therefore finds that Mr Johnson's actions constitute conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Mrs Faith Johnson

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

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be made, the panel has to consider whether it is an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it is in the public interest to do so. Prohibition orders should not be

given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

The panel has considered the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and having done so has found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely: the protection of pupils; the protection of other members of the public; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In light of the panel's findings against Mrs Johnson there is a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection, health, safety and well-being of pupils and members of the public would expect that as a teacher and proprietor she would give priority to these requirements. From the evidence before the panel it does not consider that Mrs Johnson has a deepseated attitude which has led to her potentially harmful behaviour but her misconduct seriously affected the education and well-being of pupils and her failure to ensure that the required statutory policies were in place and implemented presented a continuing risk to pupils at the School.

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

The panel considered that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Mrs Johnson 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 Mrs Johnson and having carefully considered her statement in mitigation at pages 156 to 158 of the case bundle. This was the only evidence in mitigation put forward by Mrs Johnson to this panel.

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 Mrs Johnson. The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours of a teacher have been proven. In the list of such behaviours, those that are relevant in this case are:

- Serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- Misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- Abuse of position or trust (particularly involving vulnerable pupils) or violation of the rights of pupils;

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.

Whilst the panel recognise that Mrs Johnson may have had a previously good record and may have had good intentions, she has failed to safeguard pupils in her care.

There was no evidence to suggest that the teacher was acting under duress

The panel is of the view that prohibition is both proportionate and appropriate. The panel has decided that the public interest considerations outweigh the interests of Mrs Johnson. The protection of pupils was of prime importance in reaching this conclusion. Accordingly, the panel makes a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate for them to recommend that a review period of the order should be considered. The panel were mindful that the Advice advises that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances in any given case that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 2 years.

Mrs Johnson has clearly expressed her remorse for her conduct but has not shown clear insight into the seriousness of her acknowledged behaviours.

The panel felt 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 after three years. The panel considers that this time period would be appropriate so that Mrs Johnson has the opportunity to gain greater insight into the prime importance of the range of safeguarding, health, safety and well-being of pupils' issues.

Mr Amos Johnson

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

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be made, the panel has to consider whether it is an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it is in the public interest to do so. Prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

The panel has considered the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and having done so has found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely: the protection of pupils; the protection of other members of the public; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Johnson which include hitting one or more pupils on one or more occasions, there is a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection, health, safety and well-being of pupils.

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

The panel considered that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Mr Johnson 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 Johnson and having carefully considered his statement in mitigation at pages 159 to 161 of the case bundle. This was the only evidence in mitigation put forward by Mr Johnson to this panel. The panel were concerned that Mr Johnson's mitigation statement contained evidence that he retains a deepseated attitude towards controlling behaviour of pupils which is harmful; in particular it was concerned about his justification for chastising a 5-year-old pupil physically.

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 Johnson. The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours of a teacher have been proven. In the list of such behaviours, those that are relevant in this case are:

- Serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- Misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- A deepseated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour;
- Abuse of position or trust (particularly involving vulnerable pupils) 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.

Whilst the panel recognise that Mr Johnson may have had a previously good record, his actions were deliberate and there was no evidence to suggest that the teacher was acting under duress

The panel is of the view that prohibition is both proportionate and appropriate. The panel has decided that the public interest considerations outweigh the interests of Mr Johnson. The protection of pupils was of prime importance in reaching this conclusion. Accordingly, the panel makes a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate for them to decide to recommend that a review period of the order should be considered. The panel were mindful that the Advice advises that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances in any given case that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 2 years.

Mr Johnson has expressed his remorse for his conduct but he has not understood the gravity of his actions or demonstrated insight into the seriousness of his acknowledged behaviours.

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 with no provisions for a review period .

Decisions and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

Mrs Faith Johnson

I have given very careful consideration to this case and to the recommendations of the panel both in respect of sanction and review period. The panel has found findings of fact and all the allegations have been found proven.

Mrs Johnson has been found guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In considering this case I have taken into account the need to balance the public interest with the interests of Mrs Johnson. I have also taken into account the guidance published by the Secretary of State.

I have taken into account the need to be proportionate.

In this case the panel has found that Mrs Johnson's conduct involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards, namely:

- 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.

I also note that the panel found the following behaviours relevant:

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

I agree with the panel's view that Mrs Johnson's behaviour was a serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards.

I have considered the public interest considerations set out in the Advice, and I agree with the panel that a number of them are 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.

I agree with the panel that there is a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection, health, safety and well-being of pupils and members of the public would expect that as a teacher and proprietor Mrs Johnson would give priority to these requirements. Mrs Johnson's misconduct seriously affected the education and well-being of pupils. Her failure to ensure that the required statutory policies were in place and implemented presented a continuing risk to pupils at the School.

The view of the panel is that prohibition is both proportionate and appropriate. I note that the panel has decided that the public interest considerations outweigh the interests of Mrs Johnson. I agree with the panel's view that the protection of pupils was of prime importance in reaching this conclusion, and I support the recommendation of the panel for a prohibition order.

Turning to the matter of a review period, I note the panel has given due regard to Mrs Johnson's remorse for her conduct, but that the panel considers she has not shown clear insight into the seriousness of her acknowledged behaviours.

The panel has recommended that a review period would be appropriate, and that the prohibition order is recommended with provisions for a review period after three years. I note the panel considers that this time period would be appropriate so that Mrs Johnson has the opportunity to gain greater insight into the prime importance of the range of safeguarding, health, safety and well-being of pupils' issues.

For the reasons set out above, I support the recommendation that a three review period is proportionate.

This means that Mrs Faith Johnson is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. She may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 6 July 2019, three years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If she does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Mrs Johnson remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mrs Johnson has a right of appeal to the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court within 28 days from the date she is given notice of this order.



Decision maker: Jayne Millions

Date: 28 June 2016

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

Mr Amos Johnson

I have given very careful consideration to this case and to the recommendations of the panel. The panel has found findings of fact and all the allegations have been found proven.

Mr Johnson has been found guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In considering this case I have taken into account the need to balance the public interest with the interests of Mr Johnson. I have also taken into account the guidance published by the Secretary of State.

I have taken into account the need to be proportionate.

In this case the panel, the panel is satisfied that the conduct of Mr Johnson, in relation to the facts found proven, involved the same breaches of the Teachers' Standards as set out for Mrs Johnson above. The panel also considers that Mr Johnson's conduct in relation to allegation 1(a) is in breach of the following Part Two standard:

- 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.

The panel is satisfied that the conduct of Mr Johnson fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession. I agree with this view.

I also note that the panel found the following behaviours relevant:

- 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 deepseated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour;
- Abuse of position or trust (particularly involving vulnerable pupils) or violation of the rights of pupils.

I agree with the panel's view that Mr Johnson's behaviour was a serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards.

I have considered the public interest considerations set out in the Advice, and I agree with the panel that a number of them are 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.

I agree with the panel that, in light of the findings against Mr Johnson, which include hitting one or more pupils on one or more occasions, there is a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection, health, safety and well-being of pupils.

I note the panel were concerned that Mr Johnson's mitigation statement contained evidence that he retains a deepseated attitude towards controlling behaviour of pupils which is harmful; in particular the panel was concerned about his justification for chastising a 5-year-old pupil physically.

The panel is of the view that prohibition is both proportionate and appropriate. The panel has decided that the public interest considerations outweigh the interests of Mr Johnson.

I note the protection of pupils was of prime importance in reaching this conclusion. I agree with the panel's view.

I note that Mr Johnson has expressed his remorse for his conduct, but he has not understood the gravity of his actions or demonstrated insight into the seriousness of his acknowledged behaviours.

The panel felt the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate, and as such they have decided that it would be proportionate in all the circumstances for the prohibition order to be recommended with no provisions for a review period.

I support the recommendation of the panel.

This means that Mr Amos Johnson 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 Johnson 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 Johnson 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 'JM', with a small dot at the end of the signature.

Decision maker: Jayne Millions

Date: 28 June 2016

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