



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Stuart Alston: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

May 2018

Contents

A. Introduction	3
B. Allegations	4
C. Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Statement of agreed facts	5
D. Decision and reasons	5
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 Stuart Alston

Teacher ref number: 1080370

Teacher date of birth: 7 March 1987

TRA reference: 16282

Date of determination: 18 May 2018

Former employer: Harwich and Dovercourt High School, Essex
St Paul's Academy, London
Sudbury Upper School, Suffolk

A. Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the Agency”) convened on 10 April 2018 and 18 May 2018 at 53 to 55 Butts Road, Earlsdon Park, Coventry CV1 3BH to consider the case of Mr Stuart Alston.

The panel members were Ms Karen McArthur (lay panellist – in the chair), Mr Melvyn Kershaw (former teacher panellist) and Mr Colin Parker (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Surekha Gollapudi of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP solicitors.

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

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

B. Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Proceedings dated 2 March 2018.

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

1. Whilst employed as a teacher at Harwich and Dovercourt High School in or around 2016, engaged in sexual activity with Young Person A, who was an apprentice at the school, on one or more occasions
2. Lied on one or more occasions about his relationship with Young Person A when asked by one or more staff members at the school
3. When applying for a position at Harwich and Dovercourt High School in or around May 2015, provided inaccurate information on his application form, in particular he:
 - a. Provided an incorrect end date for his employment with Sudbury Upper School
 - b. Described his role whilst employed at Felixstowe Academy as that of a PE teacher, when in fact he was a member of support staff
 - c. Entered "N/A" when asked about breaks in his employment history, notwithstanding that he had in fact had breaks, including from:
 - i. July 2008 to May 2009
 - ii. May 2011 to September 2011
 - iii. August 2012 to December 2012
4. On or around 11 July 2012, when applying for an NQT position at St Paul's Academy, failed to declare that he had been the subject of any child protection concern either in his work or personal life, or disciplinary action in relation thereto, including any which is time expired, as was required on the "Catholic Education Service Teacher Application Form"
5. Whilst employed as a teacher at Sudbury Upper School, in or around 2011, engaged in inappropriate contact with:
 - a. Former Pupil B, who he had a romantic relationship with
 - b. Pupil C, who he had sexual contact with and / or kissed
 - c. Former Pupil D, who he kissed

6. His conduct at allegation 3.b. was dishonest in that he attempted to overstate his experience in order to improve his prospects of gaining employment
7. His conduct at allegations 3.a., 3.c.iii, and 4 was dishonest in that he attempted to conceal elements of his employment history

C. Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Anonymised pupil list – page 2

Section 2: Notice of Proceedings and Response – pages 4 to 11ii

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer statement – pages 13 to 21

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 23 to 285

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 287 to 295

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

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Alston on 6 February 2018.

D. Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

In advance of the meeting, the Agency agreed to a request from Mr Alston that the allegations be considered without a hearing. The panel has the ability to direct that the case be considered at a hearing if required in the interests of justice or in the public interest.

The panel considered at the outset whether the allegation should be considered at a public hearing at which the parties would be entitled to attend, or a private meeting without the parties present. The panel had regard to paragraph 4.90 of the Teacher Misconduct: Disciplinary Procedures for the Teaching Profession (“the Procedures”) and noted that the panel had to decide whether the public interest and/or the interests of justice required the allegations to be considered at a hearing.

The panel was advised that if it is the panel's view that there is sufficient information to warrant the inclusion of an allegation of "sexual motivation", it could be a serious procedural irregularity to omit the allegation if it removed an issue from consideration by the panel that could impact on the panel's decision as to its recommendation. At a hearing, the panel would have the power to amend the notice of proceedings, but could not do so at a meeting. The panel was advised that it did not need to determine whether sexual motivation would be proven, it need only decide whether it should adjourn for an amendment to the allegation to be considered.

In light of this advice, the panel was minded to adjourn to enable the allegation of "sexual motivation" to be considered. Upon communicating this to the Agency, the panel was informed that there would be an inevitable delay if a hearing needed to be convened, and was asked to consider if the amendment to the allegation was necessary in order to determine its recommendation in this case. The panel therefore considered whether there was any value in adjourning, given the delay and additional expense that would be caused.

Allegations 1 and 5.b., admitted by Mr Alston, refer to sexual activity with an apprentice at the school and sexual contact with a pupil respectively. The panel considered that if it was to find those allegations proven, depending on the panel's view of the allegations, it could be sufficient to amount to serious sexual misconduct. The panel noted that the definition contained in the "Teacher misconduct: The prohibition of teachers Advice" ("the Advice") refers to "Unacceptable Professional Conduct" as being "misconduct of a serious nature, falling significantly short of the standard of behaviour expected of a teacher". Conduct involving sexual activity or contact could fall short of Teachers' Standards regardless of whether such activity was sexually motivated. Furthermore, the Advice states that a teacher's behaviour will be considered likely to be incompatible with being a teacher if there is evidence of sexual misconduct. An example of sexual misconduct is given as "involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature and/ or that exploit the trust, knowledge or influence derived from the individual's professional position. It is therefore not a requisite that a teacher's actions be sexually motivated in order for a prohibition order to be recommended, nor in order for it to be recommended that a prohibition order be imposed with no provision for the teacher to apply for it to be set aside. The panel did not therefore consider that the inclusion of an allegation of sexual motivation would impact upon its decision on its recommendation.

The panel considered the interests of justice and given that the facts alleged have been admitted, that Mr Alston has requested a meeting and the panel has the benefit of Mr Alston's representations, justice would be adequately served by considering this matter at a meeting.

The panel carefully considered the public interest. The panel noted that if the case proceeded in a meeting, there would be a public announcement of the panel's decision. The panel also had in mind that if the meeting was adjourned for a hearing to

be convened, there would be a cost to the public purse, which would not be justified, given that the panel's assessment that an allegation of sexual motivation would not impact on its ability to decide whether the allegations amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, nor upon its recommendation. The panel also had regard to the delay that would be caused in convening a hearing and considered it to be in the public interest to reach a final determination in this matter without further delay. The panel therefore decided to proceed with the meeting, but noted that it could, at any stage of the meeting, reconsider this issue.

Findings of fact

Our findings of fact are as follows:

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

1. Whilst employed as a teacher at Harwich and Dovercourt High School in or around 2016, engaged in sexual activity with Young Person A, who was an apprentice at the school, on one or more occasions

Mr Alston admitted this allegation in the agreed statement of facts dated 6 February 2018 and this was further supported by admissions within correspondence exchanged with the presenting officer in the course of these proceedings.

The panel also had regard to the notes of the school's interviews with Young Person A in which she confirmed she had engaged in sexual activity with Mr Alston.

The panel found this allegation proven on the balance of probabilities.

2. Lied on one or more occasions about your relationship with Young Person A when asked by one or more staff members at the school

Mr Alston admitted this allegation in the agreed statement of facts dated 6 February 2018 and this was further supported by admissions within correspondence exchanged with the presenting officer in the course of these proceedings.

The panel carefully considered notes of the Mr Alston's interviews with the school which showed Mr Alston denied having a sexual relationship with Young Person A on at least one occasion.

The panel found this allegation proven on the balance of probabilities.

3. When applying for a position at Harwich and Dovercourt High School in or around May 2015, provided inaccurate information on your application form, in particular you:

- a. Provided an incorrect end date for your employment with Sudbury Upper School**
- b. Described your role whilst employed at Felixstowe Academy as that of a PE teacher, when in fact you were a member of support staff**
- c. Entered “N/A” when asked about breaks in your employment history, notwithstanding that you had in fact had breaks, including from:**
 - i. July 2008 to May 2009**
 - ii. May 2011 to September 2011**
 - iii. August 2012 to December 2012**

Mr Alston admitted this allegation in the agreed statement of facts dated 6 February 2018 and this was further supported by admissions within correspondence exchanged with the presenting officer in the course of these proceedings.

The panel considered the application form and noted that these inconsistencies were all present on Mr Alston’s application form.

The panel found this allegation proven on the balance of probabilities.

4. On or around 11 July 2012, when applying for an NQT position at St Paul’s Academy, failed to declare that you had been the subject of any child protection concern either in your work or personal life, or disciplinary action in relation thereto, including any which is time expired, as was required on the “Catholic Education Service Teacher Application Form”

Mr Alston admitted this allegation in the agreed statement of facts dated 6 February 2018 and this was further supported by admissions within correspondence exchanged with the presenting officer in the course of these proceedings.

The panel found this allegation proven on the balance of probabilities.

5. Whilst employed as a teacher at Sudbury Upper School, in or around 2011, engaged in inappropriate contact with:

- a. Former Pupil B, who you had a romantic relationship with**
- b. Pupil C, who you had sexual contact with and / or kissed**
- c. Former Pupil D, who you kissed**

Mr Alston admitted this allegation in the agreed statement of facts dated 6 February 2018.

The panel noted Mr Alston had, at the start of the Agency's investigation into these allegations, stated that they were "100% incorrect". However it considered the agreed statement of facts represented Mr Alston's acceptance that these allegations occurred.

The panel found this allegation proven on the balance of probabilities.

6. Your conduct at allegation 3.b. was dishonest in that you attempted to overstate your experience in order to improve your prospects of gaining employment

Mr Alston admitted this allegation in the agreed statement of facts dated 6 February 2018.

The panel considered the test for dishonesty as set by the Supreme Court in the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd.*

The panel therefore first considered the actual state of Mr Alston's knowledge or belief as to the facts. The panel went on to consider whether Mr Alston's conduct was dishonest, using the standards of ordinary decent people. The panel noted that there was no requirement that Mr Alston must appreciate that what he has done is by those standards, dishonest.

Having found allegation 3.b. proven, the panel found that, applying the test in *Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Limited*, Mr Alston's actions in attempting to overstate his experience, were dishonest.

The panel considered that Mr Alston overstated his experience in order to secure more favourable employment.

The panel found this allegation proven on the balance of probabilities.

7. Your conduct at allegations 3.a., 3.c.iii, and 4 was dishonest in that you attempted to conceal elements of your employment history

Mr Alston admitted this allegation in the agreed statement of facts dated 6 February 2018.

Having found allegation 3.a, 3.c.iii. and 4 proven, the panel found that, applying the test in *Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Limited*, Mr Alston's actions in attempting to conceal elements of his employment history, were dishonest.

The panel found that Mr Alston concealed his full employment history as it was unfavourable to his application, and could have impacted on his ability to secure employment.

The panel found allegation 7 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 Alston in relation to the facts found proven, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considers that by reference to Part Two, Mr Alston 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;
- 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 Mr Alston fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel has also considered whether Mr Alston’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 serious dishonesty and sexual activity 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 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.

Having found the facts of the allegations proven, we further find that Mr Alston'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 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 maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Alston, which involved inappropriate relationships with pupils, former pupils and other young people with whom he held a position of trust there is a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils given the serious findings of inappropriate relationships. The panel's findings against Mr Alston also included allegations of serious dishonesty and there is a further public interest consideration in ensuring this behaviour is not condoned.

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

The panel considered that there was a strong public interest in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession as the conduct found against Mr Alston 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 Alston.

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 Alston. 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;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving vulnerable pupils) or violation of the rights of pupils;
- dishonesty especially where there have been serious consequences, and/or it has been repeated and/or covered up;
- sexual misconduct, e.g. involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature and/or that use or exploit the trust, knowledge or influence derived from the individual's professional position;

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 panel considered that there was no evidence that the teacher's actions were not deliberate. There was no evidence to suggest that the teacher was acting under duress, and in fact the panel found the teacher's actions to be calculated and motivated.

The panel has seen evidence that shows the teacher was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings/warnings.

The panel was not provided with any evidence of Mr Alston's good character.

The panel first considered whether it would be proportionate to conclude this case with no recommendation of prohibition, considering whether the publication of the findings made by the panel 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 considerations outweigh the interests of Mr Alston. Mr Alston's lack of insight into his behaviour was a significant factor in forming that opinion. The panel also considered Mr Alston's incremental admissions of his relationship with Young Person A displayed a pattern of dishonest behaviour which was particularly troubling when considered together with the inaccurate and misleading information he provided on his application forms. Accordingly, the panel makes a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate to recommend that a review period of the order should be considered. The panel was 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.

The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proven, would militate against a review period being recommended. These behaviours include serious dishonesty and serious sexual misconduct, e.g. 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 has found that Mr Alston repeatedly abused his position of trust in pursuing relationships with pupils, former pupils and young people with whom he held a position of trust, that he lied about these relationships, and that he was dishonest in applying for two separate jobs within schools. The panel was concerned that Mr Alston had already been subject to disciplinary warning in relation to a child protection concern and had failed to declare this on a job application.

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

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

I have given 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 Alston should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular the panel has found that Mr Alston 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;
- 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.

In this particular case, the panel has also considered whether Mr Alston'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 serious dishonesty and sexual activity are relevant.

The panel finds that the conduct of Mr Alston fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include findings of both dishonesty and also sexual activity.

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 Alston, 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 that Mr Alston's behaviour, "involved inappropriate relationships with pupils, former pupils and other young people with whom he held a

position of trust there is a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils given the serious findings of inappropriate relationships.”

A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future. I have also taken into account the panel’s comments on insight and remorse which the panel sets out as follows, “Mr Alston’s lack of insight into his behaviour”. 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 pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

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

I am particularly mindful of the findings of both dishonesty and sexual activity in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession. The panel say, “Mr Alston repeatedly abused his position of trust in pursuing relationships with pupils, former pupils and young people with whom he held a position of trust, that he lied about these relationships, and that he was dishonest in applying for two separate jobs within schools. The panel was concerned that Mr Alston had already been subject to disciplinary warning in relation to a child protection concern and had failed to declare this on a job application.”

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 Alston himself. The panel observe two elements to this issue, firstly, “The panel has seen evidence that shows the teacher was previously subject to disciplinary proceedings/warnings.” Secondly, “The panel was not provided with any evidence of Mr Alston’s good character.”

I have considered that a prohibition order would prevent Mr Alston 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 or remorse. The panel has said, “These behaviours include serious

dishonesty and serious sexual misconduct, e.g. 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.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Alston has made to the profession. In my view it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision 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 that there should be no provision for a review period.

I have considered the panel’s comments “Mr Alston repeatedly abused his position of trust in pursuing relationships with pupils, former pupils and young people with whom he held a position of trust, that he lied about these relationships, and that he was dishonest in applying for two separate jobs within schools.”

I have considered whether allowing for no review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, there are three factors that in my view mean that allowing for no review period is proportionate and in the public interest. These elements are the serious dishonesty, the sexual misconduct and the lack of insight or remorse.

I consider therefore that allowing for no review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

This means that Mr Stuart Alston 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 Stuart Alston 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 Stuart Alston 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.

Handwritten signature of Alan Meyrick in grey ink.

Decision maker: Alan Meyrick

Date: 25 May 2018

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