



National College for
Teaching & Leadership

Mr Abdul Qayoom: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

March 2016

Contents

A. Introduction	3
B. Allegations	4
C. Preliminary applications	5
D. Summary of evidence	7
Documents	7
Witnesses	7
E. Decision and reasons	7
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	12
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 Abdul Qayoom
Teacher ref number: 0423155
Teacher date of birth: 1 March 1978
NCTL case reference: 10723
Date of determination: 15 March 2016
Former employer: Hurst Lodge School

A. Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the National College for Teaching and Leadership (“the National College”) convened on 14 to 15 March 2016 at 53 to 55 Butts Road, Earlsdon Park, Coventry CV1 3BH to consider the case of Mr Abdul Qayoom.

The panel members were Mrs Alison Robb-Webb (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Martin Greenslade (lay panellist) and Mr Keith Jackson-Horner (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Patricia D’Souza of Eversheds LLP.

The presenting officer for the National College was Mr Christopher Geering of 2 Hare Court chambers.

Mr Qayoom was present and was represented by Mr David Welch of Alexander Chambers.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

B. Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Proceedings dated 7 August 2015.

It was alleged that Mr Abdul Qayoom was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:

1. On 24 February 2015, at Reading Crown Court, he was convicted of dishonestly making a false representation to make a gain for himself or another or cause loss to another or expose another to risk between 1 March 2012 and 31 July 2012, contrary to Section 1(2)(a) and Section 2 of the Fraud Act 2006. On 10 April 2015, he was sentenced to eighteen months imprisonment suspended for eighteen months and an unpaid work requirement of 250 hours. He was ordered to pay compensation of £1,500;
2. On 24 February 2015, at Reading Crown Court, he was convicted of dishonestly making a false representation to make a gain for himself or another or cause loss to another or expose another to risk between 1 February 2012 and 24 May 2013, contrary to Section 1(2)(a) and Section 2 of the Fraud Act 2006. On 10 April 2015, he was sentenced to eighteen months imprisonment (concurrent) suspended for eighteen months and an unpaid work requirement of 250 hours (concurrent).
3. On 24 February 2015, at Reading Crown Court, he was convicted of dishonestly making a false representation to make a gain for himself or another or cause loss to another or expose another to risk between 8 April 2013 and 2 May 2013, contrary to Section 1(2)(a) and Section 2 of the Fraud Act 2006. On 10 April 2015, he was sentenced to eighteen months imprisonment (concurrent) suspended for eighteen months and an unpaid work requirement of 250 hours (concurrent). He was ordered to pay compensation of £1,000;
4. On 24 February 2015, at Reading Crown Court, he was convicted of dishonestly making a false representation to make a gain for himself or another or cause loss to another or expose another to risk between 1 June 2013 and 8 October 2013, contrary to Section 1(2)(a) and Section 2 of the Fraud Act 2006. On 10 April 2015, he was sentenced to eighteen months imprisonment (concurrent) suspended for eighteen months and an unpaid work requirement of 250 hours (concurrent). He was ordered to pay compensation of £1,000;

Mr Qayoom indicated in both the Notice of Referral form and Notice of Proceedings form that he admits the allegations set out in the Notice of Proceedings but he had instructed a lawyer to appeal against his convictions. These allegations have therefore not been admitted in full and this matter is proceeding as a disputed case.

C. Preliminary applications

Mr Qayoom made an application for this hearing to be postponed at the start of the hearing. Mr Qayoom's representative confirmed that Mr Qayoom has instructed a firm of solicitors which specialises in miscarriage of justice cases and he has also engaged a QC to consider an application to appeal to the Court of Appeal against the four convictions he has received from the Crown Court. Mr Qayoom's representative indicated that no appeal has yet been lodged. There is information from a government body and the Pakistani police which amount to new evidence which has only become available in the last two to three months. Also there are two to three additional witnesses that were not willing to appear at the Crown Court who may be willing to appear at the Court of Appeal. The timeframe for the appeal is 28 days from the date of sentence, 10 April 2015 and this has now passed. However, Mr Qayoom's representative indicated that, in legal terms, due to new evidence and new witnesses being available, it may still be possible to exercise a right of appeal with permission of the court.

Mr Qayoom's representative advised the panel that a decision will be made within 28 days of today as to whether an appeal will be lodged. Mr Qayoom is content to inform the panel whether an appeal has been made in 28 days. If an appeal is not lodged, Mr Qayoom's representative indicated to the panel that the adjourned hearing could be listed for one day, due to the fact that a limited portion of the hearing will be taken up with establishing matters of fact.

If an appeal is lodged, Mr Qayoom's representative reminded the panel that this may lead to one or more of the convictions being overturned.

The presenting officer opposed Mr Qayoom's application and indicated that the original notice of hearing in this matter was dated 7 August 2015. This matter was postponed due to Mr Qayoom being abroad. The presenting officer also submitted that the timeframe for appeal has long since passed and such an appeal is only possible with permission of the court.

The presenting officer submitted that the additional evidence from the government body is not relevant to the matters considered by the Crown Court and there is no evidence that additional witnesses will turn up at any appeal hearing. The presenting officer submitted that the evidence which Mr Qayoom considers is new evidence was already considered by the Crown Court and the jury refused to accept it. The presenting officer asks the panel to question why such evidence had not been raised previously. Mr Qayoom's representative submitted that such evidence only became available within the last two to three months and as late as 7 March 2016.

The panel were advised by the legal advisor to consider whether proceeding with this hearing could amount to an abuse of process namely, "something so unfair and wrong that the court should not allow a prosecutor to proceed with what is in all other respects a

regular proceeding”, and to consider whether it was possible for Mr Qayoom to have a fair hearing.

The panel were mindful that the concept of fairness takes into account each stage of the process, including the right of appeal, and the courts have held that a right of appeal to a court of full jurisdiction prevents a breach of Article 6 of the European Convention of Human Rights (the right to a fair hearing). Paragraph 5.1 of the Teacher Misconduct: Disciplinary Procedures for the Teaching Profession (“the Procedures”) and paragraph 17 of the Teachers’ Disciplinary (England) Regulations 2012 (“the Regulations”) provide a teacher with a right of appeal to the High Court. The panel therefore considered that there is control by a judicial body with full jurisdiction which guarantees the Convention rights.

The panel considers it should proceed with the hearing today as this matter has already been postponed once and an appeal against Mr Qayoom’s criminal convictions may never be lodged. The panel considered that if Mr Qayoom’s convictions were overturned at any stage by the Court of Appeal, there are sufficient safeguards built into the process that would enable Mr Qayoom to have the ability to either exercise a right of appeal or a claim before the High Court. The panel considered that such safeguards prevent there being an abuse of process. The panel agreed with the presenting officer that the public interest would be served by this matter proceeding in a timely manner today.

In addition, Mr Qayoom made an application to admit further documents to the hearing bundle. The presenting officer opposed the admission of additional documents by Mr Qayoom. Mr Qayoom’s representative indicates that these documents cast doubt on the conviction relating to allegations 3 and 4 which affect the totality of the dishonesty that is alleged against Mr Qayoom.

The presenting officer submitted that relevance and fairness should affect the panel’s decision as to whether to accept the documents that Mr Qayoom seeks to admit. The panel noted that the Teacher Misconduct: the prohibition of teachers document (“the Advice”) indicates that if there has been a conviction, at any time, of a criminal offence, the hearing will not re-examine the facts of the case and the panel will accept the convictions as conclusive proof that establishes relevant facts.

The panel consider there is a risk that the additional documents requested to be admitted could lead to the panel re-examining the facts of case. However, the panel, with the legal advisor’s and parties’ assistance, will ensure that this does not happen. In fairness to Mr Qayoom the panel has agreed to admit these documents in case they are relevant to the question of mitigation, to be considered at the appropriate stage. The panel paginated the documents as set out below.

D. Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology – pages 1 to 3

Section 2: Notice of Proceedings and Response – pages 4 to 10

Section 3: National College's documents – pages 11 to 35

Section 4: Teacher documents – pages 36 to 38

In addition the panel agreed to admit the following documents:

- extracts from the transcript of the hearing at the Reading Crown Court (pages 39 to 43);
- extracts from the judge's summing up at the Reading Crown Court which refer to allegations 3 and 4 (pages 44 to 45);
- a letter from the Pakistani police dated 7 March 2016 (relating to falsified documents) (pages 46 to 47);

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

In addition, the panel agreed to admit character statements and references provided by Mr Qayoom during the course hearing, which were paginated as pages 48 to 52. The panel read these documents prior to receiving submissions on mitigation.

Witnesses

No witnesses were called to give oral evidence on behalf of the National College. The panel heard oral evidence from Mr Qayoom.

E. Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

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

Mr Qayoom, an English teacher, worked at schools in Berkshire during the period February 2012 and 08 October 2013. In April 2015, Mr Qayoom was convicted of

providing schools with references which he knew to be false. He was sentenced to an 18 month term of imprisonment which was suspended due to personal reasons. Mr Qayoom was also ordered to pay compensation to three of the four schools that received such references. Mr Qayoom has completed the unpaid work requirement of his sentence and is complying with the compensation element of his sentence.

Findings of fact

Our findings of fact are as follows:

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

You are guilty of conviction, at any time, of a relevant offence in that:

- 1. On 24 February 2015, at Reading Crown Court, you were convicted of dishonestly making a false representation to make a gain for yourself or another or cause loss to another or expose another to risk between 1 March 2012 and 31 July 2012, contrary to Section 1(2)(a) and Section 2 of the Fraud Act 2006. On 10 April 2015, you were sentenced to eighteen months imprisonment suspended for eighteen months and an unpaid work requirement of 250 hours. You were ordered to pay compensation of £1,500;**

The panel had regard to the certificate of conviction included in the bundle which stated that on 24 February 2015 in the Crown Court sitting at Reading, Mr Qayoom was tried and convicted upon indictment of “Dishonestly make false representation to make gain for self/another or cause loss to other/expose other to risk x 4”. The panel regarded the reference “x 4” to there being four counts or charges on the indictment of which Mr Qayoom was convicted. Each count relates to the offences referred to in each of allegations 1 to 4.

The certificate of conviction also stated that on 10 April 2015 Mr Qayoom was sentenced to 18 months imprisonment suspended for 18 months – with an unpaid work requirement of 250 hours (on each count concurrent).

In addition, the panel noted from the Police National Computer (“PNC”) print out that Mr Qayoom was convicted of such an offence, under section 1(2)(a) and Section 2 of the Fraud Act 2006 relating to the period 01 March 2012 to 31 July 2012 and in addition, was ordered to pay compensation of £1,500. During the hearing Mr Qayoom admitted the facts of this allegation.

This allegation is therefore found proven.

- 2. On 24 February 2015, at Reading Crown Court, you were convicted of dishonestly making a false representation to make a gain for yourself or another or cause loss to another or expose another to risk between 1**

February 2012 and 24 May 2013, contrary to Section 1(2)(a) and Section 2 of the Fraud Act 2006. On 10 April 2015, you were sentenced to eighteen months imprisonment (concurrent) suspended for eighteen months and an unpaid work requirement of 250 hours (concurrent).

The panel noted the information from the certificate of conviction referred to under allegation 1 above, was also relevant to this allegation.

In addition, the panel noted from the PNC print out that Mr Qayoom was convicted of such an offence, under section 1(2)(a) and Section 2 of the Fraud Act 2006 relating to the period 01 February 2012 to 24 May 2013. During the hearing, Mr Qayoom admitted the facts of this allegation.

This allegation is therefore found proven.

3. On 24 February 2015, at Reading Crown Court, you were convicted of dishonestly making a false representation to make a gain for yourself or another or cause loss to another or expose another to risk between 8 April 2013 and 2 May 2013, contrary to Section 1(2)(a) and Section 2 of the Fraud Act 2006. On 10 April 2015, you were sentenced to eighteen months imprisonment (concurrent) suspended for eighteen months and an unpaid work requirement of 250 hours (concurrent). You were ordered to pay compensation of £1,000;

The panel noted the information from the certificate of conviction referred to above under allegation 1 was also relevant to this allegation.

In addition, the panel noted from the PNC print out that Mr Qayoom was convicted of such an offence, under section 1(2)(a) and Section 2 of the Fraud Act 2006 relating to the period 08 April 2013 to 02 May 2013 and in addition, was ordered to pay compensation of £1,000. During the hearing, Mr Qayoom admitted the facts of this allegation.

This allegation is therefore found proven.

4. On 24 February 2015, at Reading Crown Court, you were convicted of dishonestly making a false representation to make a gain for yourself or another or cause loss to another or expose another to risk between 1 June 2013 and 8 October 2013, contrary to Section 1(2)(a) and Section 2 of the Fraud Act 2006. On 10 April 2015, you were sentenced to eighteen months imprisonment (concurrent) suspended for eighteen months and an unpaid work requirement of 250 hours (concurrent). You were ordered to pay compensation of £1,000.

The panel noted the information from the certificate of conviction referred to under allegation 1 above, was also relevant to this allegation.

In addition, the panel noted from the PNC print out that Mr Qayoom was convicted of such an offence, under section 1(2)(a) and Section 2 of the Fraud Act 2006 relating to the period 01 June 2013 to 08 October 2013 and in addition, was ordered to pay compensation of £1,000. During the hearing, Mr Qayoom admitted the facts of this allegation.

This allegation is therefore found proven.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

Having found all of the allegations to have been proven, the panel has gone on to consider whether the facts of those proven allegations amount to convictions, at any time of relevant offences.

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

The panel is satisfied that the conduct of Mr Qayoom in relation to the facts it has found proven, involved breaches of and were contrary to the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considers that by reference to Part Two, Mr Qayoom 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,...
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards...

The panel noted that falsifying references relating to teaching positions were actions that were relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting. The panel noted that the schools that received the false references were put to additional expense and that pupils’ education was disrupted by Mr Qayoom accepting a job offer and then not taking that up, which led to the relevant school having to engage supply teachers. At the time Mr Qayoom was either working at another institution or claimed to be abroad.

The panel has also taken account of how the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Qayoom’s behaviour in committing the offences would affect the public confidence in the teaching profession given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. Mr Qayoom stated in his oral evidence that members of the public “look down” on those convicted of offences and he recognised that such behaviour was damaging to the profession.

The panel has noted that Mr Qayoom’s behaviour has ultimately led to him receiving a sentence of imprisonment, albeit suspended, which is indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed. The presenting officer submitted that Mr Qayoom’s sentence of imprisonment was suspended due to Mr Qayoom’s personal and family circumstances.

The panel considers that this is a case involving fraud or serious dishonesty offences, which the Advice states is likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel has taken into account that Mr Qayoom lost a relative approximately 4-5 months before the time period referred to in the allegations. Mr Qayoom's representative submitted that this is bound to have had an impact on Mr Qayoom at the time.

The panel also noted the positive comments relating to Mr Qayoom's teaching ability included in the sentencing remarks of the judge involved in the Crown Court proceedings. In particular, that at "classroom level" Mr Qayoom was a good teacher.

Although the panel finds the evidence of Mr Qayoom's teaching proficiency to be of note, the panel has found the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to his four convictions of offences under the Fraud Act 2006 is relevant to his ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considers that a finding that these convictions are relevant offences is necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of convictions of relevant offences, 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 the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct relevant in this case.

The panel considers that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Qayoom 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 Qayoom was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

Notwithstanding the 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 Qayoom.

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 Qayoom. 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 deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour;
- dishonesty especially where there have been serious consequences, and/or it has been repeated and/or covered up;

- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are ‘relevant matters’ for the purposes of The Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures.

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.

The presenting officer submitted that Mr Qayoom undertook a course of conduct over a significant period of time which was repeated four times. There was expense and disruption to schools which the judge referred to in his sentencing remarks.

The panel noted that the judge’s sentencing remarks indicated that the schools that received the false references were subject to a reputational risk in suffering this kind of fraud. The presenting officer considers that Mr Qayoom’s behaviour was an example of high culpability. His actions were deliberate and were at the serious end of possible the spectrum. A significant sentence of 18 months imprisonment was imposed due to the seriousness of Mr Qayoom’s behaviour.

The panel considered that Mr Qayoom’s actions in submitting false references in support of two job applications was deliberate, and even though Mr Qayoom had lost a relative 4-5 months prior to that, the panel considered that there was no evidence that Mr Qayoom was acting under duress. The panel acknowledged that Mr Qayoom was of previous good history, as he had no previous convictions to the ones referred to in the allegations. The presenting officer accepts that Mr Qayoom was an individual of previous good character and a good teacher which makes this case all the more “tragic”. He had been encouraged to apply for permanent positions by two of the schools that he had provided false references to as they had been pleased with his performance in their classrooms. The panel has also seen no evidence that Mr Qayoom was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings or warnings. This is further evidence of his previous good character.

Mr Qayoom’s representative submitted that Mr Qayoom has always accepted that his convictions substantiated the facts of the allegations referred to above. Mr Qayoom’s representative reminded the panel that Mr Qayoom has undertaken unpaid work to comply with the 250 hours requirement of his sentence. The panel also noted that Mr Qayoom has managed to pay £100 a month towards the compensation he was ordered to pay by the Crown Court.

In the course of the hearing, Mr Qayoom submitted character statements which the panel agreed to admit. These character statements indicated that upon resignation Mr Qayoom completed reports and provided learning tasks for students on a voluntary basis and that he is a “very honourable colleague” and that he has abilities as a good teacher. A

reference from a former tutor of Mr Qayoom indicated that Mr Qayoom is generous and dedicated, he has voluntarily taught more than 100 Skype lessons free of charge without remuneration. This referee considers that Mr Qayoom is truthful, faithful, sincere and honest.

The reference from a former line manager, states that the charges relating to false references were out of character for Mr Qayoom. Mr Qayoom had made a considerable contribution to raise the academic profile of his students and co-teachers at the school at which he taught. Mr Qayoom's consistency, integrity, "intellectuality", and sense of responsibility were the reasons why Mr Qayoom was repeatedly hired. His line manager regarded him as a very honest, hardworking and dedicated teacher.

Taking all the evidence and mitigation into account, 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 Qayoom. Honesty is a fundamental tenet of the teaching profession. Pupils and parents should be able to trust that the teachers they encounter have provided accurate information relating to their previous working history to the school at which they teach. Mr Qayoom's convictions for providing false references to four different institutions and acting dishonestly, is in the panel's view, a fundamental breach of the Teachers' Standards. The panel questioned whether Mr Qayoom had any serious intention to lodge an appeal before the Court of Appeal against any of his convictions. Whilst all such serious convictions are in place, it is appropriate for the panel to make a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate for it to decide to recommend 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 proven, would militate against a review period being recommended. One of these behaviours includes fraud or serious dishonesty and Mr Qayoom has been convicted of four offences under the Fraud Act 2006.

Mr Qayoom expressed during the hearing that his convictions have had a devastating effect on him. He has lost support from friends that have supported him in the past. He considers that society "looks down on" individuals who are convicted of offences. He considers that parents and members of the public would not like him to be part of the teaching profession as honesty is such a fundamental expectation. The presenting officer submitted that Mr Qayoom has not demonstrated sufficient insight into his behaviours to prevent him being a risk to the profession, given that he does not accept that he should have been convicted of these offences in the first place.

Mr Qayoom's representative submitted to the panel that Mr Qayoom would be a great loss to the profession as he had an otherwise good previous teaching history and he was a man of previous good character. Mr Qayoom is aware that a further sentence could be imposed if he committed a further offence and Mr Qayoom's representative gave assurances that such behaviour would not be repeated. Mr Qayoom's representative also asked the panel to take into account that Mr Qayoom does not seek to explain his behaviour as being caused by the loss of his family member, but this must have affected him nevertheless. Mr Qayoom's representative submitted that this is a case where an exception should be made and no prohibition order should be imposed.

The panel considers that the seriousness of Mr Qayoom's convictions, the repeated nature of his behaviour and the public interest, far outweigh the assurances that Mr Qayoom has made relating to his future conduct. 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 provision for a review period.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

I have given very careful consideration to this case and to the recommendation that has been made to me by the panel both in respect of sanction and review period.

This is a case where there have been convictions by the court and the panel has not sought to look behind the convictions. Rather the panel has sought to judge the relevance of the offences.

The panel has found that Mr Qayoom 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,...
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards...

The panel also noted that falsifying references relating to teaching positions were actions that were relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting. The panel noted that the schools that received the false references were put to additional expense and that pupils' education was disrupted by Mr Qayoom accepting a job offer and then not taking that up, which led to the relevant school having to engage supply teachers.

The panel went on to consider the guidance published by the Secretary of State. The advice 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 deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour;
- dishonesty especially where there have been serious consequences, and/or it has been repeated and/or covered up;
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of The Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures.

I have taken into account the guidance. I have also taken into account the need to balance the public interest and the interest of the teacher. I have taken into account the need to be proportionate.

For these reasons, I support the recommendation of the panel that a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest in this case.

I have gone on to consider the issue of a review period. I have noted the mitigation that the panel took into account. However, I support the panel's assessment that the seriousness of Mr Qayoom's convictions, the repeated nature of his behaviour and the public interest, far outweigh the assurances that Mr Qayoom has made relating to his future conduct.

I therefore support the recommendation that the prohibition should not allow for a review period.

This means that Mr Abdul Qayoom 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 Abdul Qayoom 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 Abdul Qayoom 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.

Al C M

Decision maker: Alan Meyrick

Date: 16 March 2016

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