



National College for
Teaching & Leadership

Mr Andrew Chambi (also known as Mr Andreas Chambi): Professional conduct panel outcome

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

February 2018

Contents

A. Introduction	3
B. Allegations	4
C. Preliminary applications	4
D. Summary of evidence	4
Documents	5
Witnesses	6
E. Decision and reasons	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	11
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	13

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

Teacher: Mr Andrew Chambi (also known as Mr Andreas Chambi)
Teacher ref number: 0964700
Teacher date of birth: 14 May 1983
NCTL case reference: 15483
Date of determination: 1 February 2018
Former employer: Kingsford Community School, London

A. Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the National College for Teaching and Leadership (“the National College”) convened on 1 February 2018 at 53 to 55 Butts Road, Earlsdon Park, Coventry CV1 3BH to consider the case of Mr Andrew Chambi.

The panel members were Mr Chris Rushton (lay panellist – in the chair), Ms Fiona Tankard (teacher panellist) and Mr Sathi Ariya (lay panellist).

The legal advisor to the panel was Ms Surekha Gollapudi of Eversheds Sutherland LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the National College was Ms Melinka Berridge of Kingsley Napley LLP solicitors.

Mr Chambi was not present and was not represented at the hearing.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

B. Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Proceedings dated 5 January 2018.

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

1. In relation to Child A (DOB 18.04.99) he:
 - a. communicated with her via social media including WhatsApp when she was around 15 years old
 - b. sent her messages in which he:
 - i. stated that he was 24 years old when he was in fact 31 years old
 - ii. suggested meeting up with her on one or more occasions
 - iii. discussed snuggling up with her in bed
 - iv. asked her what she wore in bed
 - v. told her what he wore in bed
 - vi. encouraged her to send him a photograph of herself which she did
 - vii. sent a picture of himself to her
3. His actions as set out at 1 above were sexually motivated.

Mr Chambi admits the facts of allegation 1 and denies the facts of allegation 3. Mr Chambi does not admit unacceptable professional conduct or conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute in respect of the allegations.

C. Preliminary applications

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

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

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

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

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

In making its decision, the panel noted that the teacher may waive his right to participate in the hearing. The panel took account of the various factors drawn to its attention from the case of *R v Jones* [2003] 1 AC1. The panel noted that the teacher responded and stated he would not attend and confirmed that he would prefer the hearing to proceed in his absence. The teacher provided written submissions and a statement to be considered instead. The panel therefore found that the teacher voluntarily waived his right to be present at the hearing in the knowledge of when and where the hearing was to take place.

The panel had regard to the seriousness of this case, and the potential consequences for the teacher and accepted that fairness to the teacher is of prime importance. However, it considered that in light of the teacher's waiver of his right to appear, on balance, these were serious allegations and the public interest was in favour of the hearing continuing.

The panel considered an application by the presenting officer to delete allegation 2 as no evidence would be put forward in respect of that allegation. The panel noted that there was only one written sentence relating to this allegation within the bundle of documents and this was of unclear authorship and date. The panel had not heard from the author of that statement, and was not able to test that evidence. The panel accepted the presenting officer's application to delete allegation 2.

As a consequence, the panel also amended allegation 3 to remove the words "and/or 2".

D. Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology and anonymised pupil list – pages 1 to 4

Section 2: Notice of Proceedings and response – pages 5 to 8

Section 3: NCTL witness statements – pages 9 to 16

Section 4: NCTL documents – pages 17 to 127

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

Submissions on behalf of Andrew Chambi – pages 133 to 138

Email chain between presenting officer and teacher’s representative – pages 139 to 144

Response to notice of proceedings – pages 145 to 148

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents in advance of the hearing and read the additional documents following their admission.

Witnesses

The panel did not hear oral evidence.

E. Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

Mr Chambi had been employed at Kingsford Community School (“the School”) from 2009 to 2016 as a science teacher, save for a short period in 2012 when he was employed by a university on a part-time basis.

In December 2015, Mr Chambi is alleged to have met Child A on Whisper, a social networking platform. It is then alleged that he sent inappropriate, sexually motivated messages to Child A via WhatsApp.

Findings of fact

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

1. In relation to Child A (DOB 18.04.99) you:

a. communicated with her via social media including WhatsApp when she was around 15 years old

This allegation was admitted by Mr Chambi in his statement dated 19 January 2018 in which he confirmed that he communicated with Child A on Whisper in December 2014 and WhatsApp in January 2015.

The panel was also provided with screenshots of WhatsApp conversations between Mr Chambi and Child A which took place on 3 January 2015 and 4 January 2015.

The panel found that Mr Chambi’s admission was consistent with the evidence and found allegation 1.a. proven on the balance of probabilities.

b. sent her messages in which you:

i. stated that you were 24 years old when you were in fact 31 years old

This allegation was admitted by Mr Chambi in his statement dated 19 January 2018.

The panel saw written evidence that Mr Chambi lied about his age to Child A and that his reason for doing so was that he did not want to admit to being 31 years old. The panel also had regard to the WhatsApp message in which Mr Chambi stated, "I'm 24," in response to Child A's question about his age.

The panel accepted that Mr Chambi was not aware of Child A's age when he stated he was 24.

The panel found that Mr Chambi's admission was consistent with the evidence and found allegation 1.b.i. proven on the balance of probabilities.

ii. suggested meeting up with her on one or more occasions

This allegation was admitted by Mr Chambi in his statement dated 19 January 2018.

The panel considered WhatsApp messages which included comments from Mr Chambi stating "I was going to suggest we watched coraline tonight" and "...You up to much this afternoon? We could hang out?" The panel found that these were clear suggestions for Child A to meet with Mr Chambi.

The panel found that Mr Chambi's admission was consistent with the evidence and found allegation 1.b.ii. proven on the balance of probabilities.

iii. discussed snuggling up with her in bed

This allegation was admitted by Mr Chambi in his statement dated 19 January 2018.

The panel considered an exchange of WhatsApp messages in which Mr Chambi said to Child A, "I wanna snuggle up and be warm with someone!!" Child A responded "We can snuggle haha." Mr Chambi went on to reply "That'd be good."

The panel found that Mr Chambi's admission was consistent with the evidence and found allegation 1.b.iii. proven on the balance of probabilities.

iv. asked her what she wore in bed

This allegation was admitted by Mr Chambi in his statement dated 19 January 2018.

The panel considered a WhatsApp message from Mr Chambi to Child A in which he asked her, “Are you someone that likes to wrap up warm for bed? Or do you wear less?” After Child A responded, Mr Chambi said, “Ahh, let me seeee!! xxx [sic]”

The panel found that Mr Chambi’s admission was consistent with the evidence and found allegation 1.b.iv. proven on the balance of probabilities.

v. told her what you wore in bed

This allegation was admitted by Mr Chambi in his statement dated 19 January 2018.

The panel considered WhatsApp messages from Mr Chambi to Child A in which he stated in response to Child A’s question about what he wore in bed “Depends, if it’s hot I may wear pants. But usually nothing. :)”

The panel found that Mr Chambi’s admission was consistent with the evidence and found allegation 1.b.v. proven on the balance of probabilities.

vi. encouraged her to send you a photograph of herself which she did

This allegation was admitted by Mr Chambi in his statement dated 19 January 2018.

The panel considered a series of WhatsApp messages in which Child A requested a photograph from Mr Chambi and he suggested that they swap photographs. The panel was satisfied that this initial exchange of photographs took place before Mr Chambi was aware of Child A’s age. The panel also noted that the photographs which were swapped were not indecent.

The panel also noted that Mr Chambi asked Child A for a photograph of her in her nightwear although Child A did not ultimately send this photograph despite a further request from Mr Chambi the following day.

The panel found that Mr Chambi’s admission was consistent with the evidence and found allegation 1.b.vi. proven on the balance of probabilities.

vii. sent a picture of yourself to her

This allegation was admitted by Mr Chambi in his statement dated 19 January 2018.

The panel considered a series of WhatsApp messages in which Child A requested a photograph from Mr Chambi and he suggested that they swap photographs. The panel was satisfied that this initial exchange of photographs took place before Mr Chambi was aware of Child A's age. The panel also noted that the photographs which were swapped were not indecent.

The panel found that Mr Chambi's admission was consistent with the evidence and found allegation 1.b.vii. proven on the balance of probabilities.

3. Your actions as set out at 1 above were sexually motivated.

The panel considered whether on the balance of probabilities reasonable persons would think the words and actions found proven could be sexual. The panel then considered whether, in all the circumstances of the conduct in the case, it was more likely than not that the teacher's purpose of such words and actions was sexual.

The panel considered whether, even in the absence of any direct evidence, sexual motivation should be inferred from all the circumstances of the case. The panel was reminded to have in mind the evidence of the teacher's character and considered whether any such evidence had any bearing on the teacher's credibility or propensity to have carried out the alleged facts or to the circumstances in which the teacher found himself.

Mr Chambi denied sexual motivation in his written evidence.

The panel went on to consider the WhatsApp messages exchanged by Child A and Mr Chambi after he became aware that Child A was 15 years old. The panel found a number of his messages to Child A were sexually suggestive including asking Child A how she could keep him warm if she was with him and requesting to see Child A in her t-shirt and underwear. There were also a number of suggestions from Mr Chambi that he and Child A should 'snuggle' with each other. Mr Chambi went further in saying, "Maybe some bed time exercises to warm up a little. ;) xxx."

The panel was particularly concerned that Mr Chambi appeared to be using his role as a teacher to develop a relationship with Child A. Child A used revision as a reason not to meet with Mr Chambi. Mr Chambi responded by offering to help Child A with her revision, commenting that he was a teacher and, "I could get you a good grade actually! ;)"

The panel considered that there was no credible, alternative explanation for the messages sent by Mr Chambi to Child A other than sexual motivation. Taking into

account all of the available evidence, the panel therefore found sexual motivation proven on the balance of probabilities.

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

Having found the allegations to have been proven, the panel has gone on to consider whether the facts of those proven allegations amount to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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 Chambi in relation to the facts found proven, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considers that by reference to Part Two, Mr Chambi 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
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher’s professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils’ well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions

The panel is satisfied that the conduct of Mr Chambi amounts to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel has also considered whether Mr Chambi’s conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 8 and 9 of the Advice and has found that the offences of sexual activity and attempting to obtain an indecent photograph from a child are relevant.

The Advice indicates that where behaviours associated with such an offence exist, a panel is likely to conclude that an individual’s conduct would amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel notes that the allegations took place outside of the education setting and at the start of the communications, Mr Chambi was not aware of Child A’s age. However the panel went on to consider that Mr Chambi continued to engage in conversation with Child A after he became aware of her age. This conversation included repeated attempts by Mr Chambi to meet Child A and sexually suggestive messages. Had this behaviour continued, it would have had a significant, negative impact on Child A.

The panel has taken into account the way the teaching profession is viewed by others and considered the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel 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.

Having found the facts of particulars 1 and 3 proved, we further find that Mr Chambi's conduct amounts to both unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, it 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 a punitive effect.

The panel has noted 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 maintenance of public confidence in the profession, and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

The panel's findings against Mr Chambi involved sexually motivated conversations on WhatsApp with a child aged 15 years old. The panel considers that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Chambi were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

The panel found there was a strong public interest in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession as the conduct found against Mr Chambi was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

In view of the clear public interest considerations that were present, the panel considered carefully whether or not it would be proportionate to impose a prohibition order taking into account the effect that this would have on Mr Chambi.

In carrying out the balancing exercise the panel has noted the public interest considerations both in favour of and against prohibition as well as the interests of Mr Chambi. 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
- sexual misconduct, eg involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature

Even though there were behaviours that would point to the appropriateness of a prohibition order, the panel went on to consider whether or not there were sufficient mitigating factors to militate against the appropriateness and proportionality of the imposition of a prohibition order, particularly taking into account the nature and severity of the behaviour in this case.

The panel was not provided with any evidence to show that the teacher's actions were not deliberate and there was also no evidence to suggest that the teacher was acting under duress. The panel did find that the teacher had a previously good history although it did not have the benefit of any character references from the teacher.

The panel first considered whether it would be proportionate to conclude this case with no recommendation of prohibition, and whether the publication of the findings made by the panel is sufficient.

The panel is of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, recommending no prohibition order is not a proportionate and appropriate response. Recommending that publication of adverse findings is sufficient in the case would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of consequences for the teacher of prohibition.

The panel is of the view that prohibition is both proportionate and appropriate. The panel has decided that the public interest outweighs the interests of Mr Chambi. Mr Chambi's sexually motivated actions in messaging Child A when he knew she was 15 years old were totally inappropriate. 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 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 the recommendation of a review period. One of these is serious sexual misconduct, eg where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons, particularly where the individual has used their professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons. The panel found that Mr Chambi sent a number of sexually motivated messages to Child A. The panel found that whilst this behaviour was serious, it was limited to a two day period in January 2015 and there was no evidence that Mr Chambi had engaged in similar behaviour previously. Therefore the panel did not find that Mr Chambi's actions were at the most serious end of the scale.

Mr Chambi did admit that his actions were inappropriate given Child A's age. The panel was not satisfied, however, that Mr Chambi showed sufficient insight into his actions.

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 provision for a review period after 5 years.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

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

In this case, the panel has found all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Chambi should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of five years.

In particular the panel has found that Mr Chambi 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
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions

The panel is satisfied that the conduct of Mr Chambi amounts to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel has also considered whether Mr Chambi's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 8 and 9 of the Advice and has found that the offences of sexual activity and attempting to obtain an indecent photograph from a child are relevant.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of sexual activity and a finding of attempting to obtain an indecent photograph from a child.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In considering that for this case I have considered the overall aim of a prohibition order which is to protect pupils and to maintain public confidence in the profession. I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order in this case would achieve that aim taking into account the impact that it will have on the individual teacher. I have also asked myself whether or not a less intrusive measure, such as the published finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, would itself be sufficient to achieve the overall aim. I have to consider whether the consequences of such a publication are themselves sufficient. I have considered therefore whether or not prohibiting Mr Chambi and the impact that will have on him, is proportionate.

In this case I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children. The panel has observed, "...Mr Chambi continued to engage in conversation with Child A after he became aware of her age. This conversation included repeated attempts by Mr Chambi to meet Child A and sexually suggestive messages. Had this behaviour continued, it would have had a significant, negative impact on Child A. "

A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present. I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse which the panel sets out as follows, " Mr Chambi did admit that his actions were inappropriate given Child A's age. The panel was not satisfied, however, that Mr Chambi showed sufficient insight into his actions."

In my judgement the lack of insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this risks the future well being of children. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, " 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. "

I am particularly mindful of the finding of sexual misconduct in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

I have had to consider that the public has a high expectation of professional standards of all teachers and that failure to impose a prohibition order might be regarded by the public

as a failure to uphold those high standards. In weighing these considerations I have had to consider the matter from the point of view of an “ordinary intelligent and well-informed citizen.”

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of unacceptable professional conduct, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mr Chambi himself. A prohibition order would prevent Mr Chambi from teaching and would also clearly deprive the public of his contribution to the profession for the period that it is in force.

In this case I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments concerning the lack of insight. I have also noted that the panel has said, “ The panel found that whilst this behaviour was serious, it was limited to a two day period in January 2015 and there was no evidence that Mr Chambi had engaged in similar behaviour previously. Therefore the panel did not find that Mr Chambi’s actions were at the most serious end of the scale.”

The panel has nonetheless found that Mr Chambi “sent a number of sexually motivated messages to Child A.” I am also concerned that even when he had discovered that Child A was 15 years old that Mr Chambi, “ continued to engage in conversation with Child A after he became aware of her age. This conversation included repeated attempts by Mr Chambi to meet Child A and sexually suggestive messages. Had this behaviour continued, it would have had a significant, negative impact on Child A. “

I have noted their panel’s reflections on Mr Chambi’s contribution as a teacher. They say, “The panel did find that the teacher had a previously good history although it did not have the benefit of any character references from the teacher.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Chambi has made and is making to the profession. In my view it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision that is not backed up by remorse or insight does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

For these reasons I have concluded that a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest in order to achieve the aims which a prohibition order is intended to achieve.

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case the panel has recommended a 5 year review period.

I have considered the panel’s comments “ The panel found that whilst this behaviour was serious, it was limited to a two day period in January 2015 and there was no evidence

that Mr Chambi had engaged in similar behaviour previously. Therefore the panel did not find that Mr Chambi's actions were at the most serious end of the scale. I have also considered the findings of the panel that they set out and which say, "The panel was particularly concerned that Mr Chambi appeared to be using his role as a teacher to develop a relationship with Child A. Child A used revision as a reason not to meet with Mr Chambi. Mr Chambi responded by offering to help Child A with her revision, commenting that he was a teacher and, "I could get you a good grade actually! ;)"

In addition the panel say, "The panel went on to consider the WhatsApp messages exchanged by Child A and Mr Chambi after he became aware that Child A was 15 years old. The panel found a number of his messages to Child A were sexually suggestive including asking Child A how she could keep him warm if she was with him and requesting to see Child A in her t-shirt and underwear."

Although I recognise that the photos exchanged were not indecent, nonetheless Mr Chambi continued to seek such photographs even after he knew that Child A was 15. Indeed the panel has found that, " attempting to obtain an indecent photograph from a child are relevant."

I have noted the comments of the panel, " 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 provision for a review period after 5 years."

In my view the panel has afforded too much weight to the fact that these events took place over a relatively short time period. I have given more weight to the seriousness of the incidents themselves, recognising that the photographs exchanged were not, in the end, indecent.

I have therefore considered whether a 5 year review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, there are three factors that in my view mean that a five year review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are; the fact that even once he knew that Child A was 15, Mr Chambi still sought a photograph of Child A, " in her t-shirt and underwear"; that even after he knew that Child A was 15 he continued to say, " Maybe some bed time exercises to warm up a little. ;) xxx."; and that he did not show sufficient insight.

I have looked carefully at the guidance published by the Secretary of State and in my view this case falls clearly within the guidance concerning sexual misconduct, as the panel themselves say, " Had this behaviour continued, it would have had a significant, negative impact on Child A. "

The panel also say that Mr Chambi's, " conversation included repeated attempts by Mr Chambi to meet Child A and sexually suggestive messages."

For these reasons therefore I consider therefore that a prohibition order in this case should not allow for a review period. In my view that is necessary to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

This means that Mr Andrew Chambi 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 Andrew Chambi 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 Andrew Chambi 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.



Decision maker: Alan Meyrick

Date: 7 February 2018

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