



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Dr Dean Sibthorpe: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome**

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

**June 2021**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	5
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	6
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	10
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	14

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

<b>Teacher:</b>	Dr Dean Sibthorpe
<b>Teacher ref number:</b>	0737100
<b>Teacher date of birth:</b>	23 December 1963
<b>TRA reference:</b>	19379
<b>Date of determination:</b>	30 June 2021
<b>Former employer:</b>	Malvern College, Worcestershire

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 30 June 2021 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Dr Dean Sibthorpe.

The panel members were Mrs Marjorie Harris (former teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Neil Hillman (teacher panellist) and Mrs Emma Moir (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mrs Rebecca Utton of Birketts LLP solicitors.

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Dr Sibthorpe that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Dr Sibthorpe 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 Luke Berry, Dr Sibthorpe or his representative Mr John Otieno.

The meeting took place in private, and the decision was announced in public.

## Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 04 May 2021.

It was alleged that Dr Sibthorpe was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst employed as a teacher of Biology at Malvern College between 01 September 2007 and 19 June 2020:

1. He failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with respect of a vulnerable pupil, Pupil A, in that:
  - a. He provided his phone number to Pupil A;
  - b. He exchanged inappropriate and/or sexually explicit messages with Pupil A using WhatsApp, whilst he was working at the school, in particular;
    - i. 'Looking at yours gets me very hard' when referring to her photographs
    - ii. 'and now the thought of you getting [water drops emoji] has had that effect again!';
    - iii. 'super hard again!';
    - iv. 'I'm extremely aroused at the mo and have a TOK meeting at 2pm';
    - v. Receiving an explicit video of Pupil A touching herself in a sexual manner and responding 'OMG, [Pupil A]! Hot hot hot [Emoji] uhhhhhhh, wish that was (my) hand!' or words to that effect;
  - c. He sent photographs to Pupil A using WhatsApp, whilst he was working at the school, namely;
    - i. An image of a naked male showering which he purported to be an image of himself;
    - ii. An image of his lower abdomen;
    - iii. An image of him wearing bib shorts with his torso exposed
2. His behaviour as may be found proven at Allegation 1 above was conduct of a sexual nature and/or was sexually motivated.

Dr Sibthorpe admits the facts of allegations 1.a, 1.b)i-v, 1.c)i-iii and 2, as set out in the statement of agreed facts signed by Dr Sibthorpe on 01 June 2021.

Dr Sibthorpe admits his behaviour amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

## **Preliminary applications**

There were no preliminary applications.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

- section 1: Chronology and anonymised pupil list – pages 3 to 4
- section 2: Procedural documents – pages 6 to 27
- section 3: TRA witness statements – pages 29 to 40
- section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 56 to 122
- section 5: Teacher documents – pages 131 to 143

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

### **Statement of agreed facts**

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Dr Sibthorpe on 01 June 2021. It related to Dr Sibthorpe, who whilst employed at Malvern College (“the School”), failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with a vulnerable pupil, Pupil A, and engaged in conduct of a sexual nature and/or was sexually motivated. This included providing Pupil A with his personal phone number and using WhatsApp to exchange photographs and inappropriate and/or sexually explicit messages with Pupil A.

Dr Sibthorpe admitted in the statement of agreed facts that he failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries having engaged in the behaviour outlined above. Dr Sibthorpe further admitted that his conduct as described was of a sexual nature and was sexually motivated.

## Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

The panel carefully considered the case and reached a decision.

In advance of the meeting, the TRA agreed to a request from Dr Sibthorpe for the allegations to be considered without a hearing. The panel had 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 did not determine that such a direction was necessary or appropriate in this case.

In summary, Dr Sibthorpe was employed as a teacher of biology at the School from 01 September 2007.

On 04 June 2020, concerns were raised by three pupils regarding information which had been shared with them by Pupil A, including WhatsApp messages between Dr Sibthorpe and Pupil A.

Dr Sibthorpe was suspended on 05 June 2020 pending investigation and interviewed on 08 June 2020. A disciplinary meeting later took place on 17 June 2020 and on 19 June 2020, Dr Sibthorpe was dismissed.

## Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

The panel found the following particulars of the allegations against Dr Sibthorpe proved, for these reasons:

**1. You failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with respect of a vulnerable pupil, Pupil A, in that:**

**a. You provided your phone number to Pupil A;**

The panel noted that in the statement of agreed facts, signed by Dr Sibthorpe and dated 01 June 2021, Dr Sibthorpe admitted the facts of allegations 1.a.

Notwithstanding the above, the panel made its own determination on the facts of the allegations on all of the evidence before it.

On all the evidence before them the panel were satisfied that Dr Sibthorpe did provide his phone number to Pupil A. The panel did not consider it relevant who initiated contact, by virtue of exchanging messages with Pupil A, Dr Sibthorpe provided Pupil A with his phone number.

The panel found the particulars of allegations 1.a proved.

- b. You exchanged inappropriate and/or sexually explicit messages with Pupil A using WhatsApp, whilst you was working at the school, in particular;**
  - i. 'Looking at yours gets me very hard' when referring to her photographs**
  - ii. 'and now the thought of you getting [water drops emoji] has had that effect again!';**
  - iii. 'super hard again!';**
  - iv. 'I'm extremely aroused at the mo and have a TOK meeting at 2pm';**
  - v. Receiving an explicit video of Pupil A touching herself in a sexual manner and responding 'OMG, [Pupil A]! Hot hot hot [Emoji] uhhhhhhh, wish that was (my) hand!' or words to that effect;**

The panel noted that in the statement of agreed facts, signed by Dr Sibthorpe and dated 01 June 2021, Dr Sibthorpe admitted the facts of allegations 1.b)i-v.

Notwithstanding the above, the panel made its own determination on the facts of the allegations on all of the evidence before it.

In respect of allegations 1.b)i-v the panel was provided with screenshots of WhatsApp messages exchanged between Dr Sibthorpe and Pupil A. The panel deemed the messages exchanged via WhatsApp both inappropriate and sexually explicit.

The panel noted that neither Pupil A nor Dr Sibthorpe were physically on school premises. The panel was satisfied that irrespective of location, Pupil A remained a pupil of the School and Dr Sibthorpe was still carrying out his duties as both a teacher and [REDACTED].

The panel found the particulars of allegations 1.b)i-v proved.

- c. You sent photographs to Pupil A using WhatsApp, whilst you was working at the school, namely;**
  - i. An image of a naked male showering which you purported to be an image of yourself;**
  - ii. An image of your lower abdomen;**
  - iii. An image of you wearing bib shorts with your torso exposed**

The panel noted that in the statement of agreed facts, signed by Dr Sibthorpe and dated 01 June 2021, Dr Sibthorpe admitted the facts of allegations 1.c)i-iii.

Notwithstanding the above, the panel made its own determination on the facts of the allegations on all of the evidence before it.

In respect of allegations 1.c)i-iii, the panel was provided with screenshots of the WhatsApp photographs exchanged between Dr Sibthorpe and Pupil A. The panel noted that neither Pupil A nor Dr Sibthorpe were physically on school premises. The panel were satisfied that irrespective of location, Pupil A remained a pupil of the School and Dr Sibthorpe was still carrying out his duties as both a teacher and [REDACTED].

The panel found the particulars of allegations 1.c)i-iii proved.

## **2. Your behaviour as may be found proven at Allegation 1 above was conduct of a sexual nature and/or was sexually motivated.**

The panel noted that in the statement of agreed facts, signed by Dr Sibthorpe and dated 01 June 2021, Dr Sibthorpe admitted that he engaged in activity which was patently of a sexual nature and therefore admitted that he was sexually motivated when he engaged in that conduct.

Notwithstanding the above, the panel made its own determination on the facts of the allegations on all of the evidence before it.

The panel's attention was drawn to section 78 *Sexual Offences Act 2003* and to the cases of *Sait v The General Medical Council [2018]*, *Basson v General Medical Council [2018]* and *The General Medical Council v Haris [2020] EWHC 2518*. In respect of motivation, the panel considered that Dr Sibthorpe's conduct was done either in pursuit of sexual gratification and/or in pursuit of a sexual relationship.

In making this determination, the panel had particular regard to the fact that Dr Sibthorpe had exchanged several sexually explicit messages, photographs and a video with Pupil A.

On examination of the documents before the panel, the panel concluded that Dr Sibthorpe's conduct, as set out in allegations 1a, 1.b)i-v and 1.c)i-iii was sexually motivated. The panel noted that both the wording used, and the context in which the WhatsApp exchanges took place, plainly indicated conduct of a sexual nature and / or sexual motivation. The panel did not consider that Dr Sibthorpe's actions could be construed any other way.

The panel found the particulars of allegations 2 proved.



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

Having found a number of the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Dr Sibthorpe in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Dr Sibthorpe was 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 and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Dr Sibthorpe fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel was in no doubt, by the very nature of the evidence before it, that the exchanges via WhatsApp were wholly inappropriate given the role and position of trust that Dr Sibthorpe held as both a teacher and Pupil A’s [REDACTED]. The panel commented that the language used within the messages, was significant of a close sexual connection, whether physically possible or not.

The panel noted that in the statement of agreed facts, signed by Dr Sibthorpe and dated 01 June 2021, Dr Sibthorpe accepted that his conduct amounted to unacceptable unprofessional conduct. In addition, the panel noted that Dr Sibthorpe was an experienced teacher and [REDACTED] who had undertaken safeguarding training and confirmed to the School that he had read, understood and was willing to comply with the

policies contained within the Staff Handbook. The panel was therefore of the view that these policies and training should have been at the forefront of Dr Sibthorpe's mind.

The panel also considered whether Dr Sibthorpe's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 10 and 11 of the Advice. The panel found that none of these offences was relevant.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Dr Sibthorpe was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel took 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 also took account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils' lives and the fact that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way they behave.

The findings of misconduct were serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the Dr Sibthorpe's status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public perception.

The panel noted that in the statement of agreed facts, signed by Dr Sibthorpe and dated 01 June 2021, Dr Sibthorpe admitted that his conduct amounted to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel therefore found that Dr Sibthorpe's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Having found the facts of particulars 1 and 2 proved, the panel further found that Dr Sibthorpe's conduct amounted 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 was 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 had to consider whether it would be an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it would be 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 had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely: the protection of pupils, the protection of other members of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In the light of the panel's findings against Dr Sibthorpe, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils particularly given the serious findings of a failure to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with pupils and an inappropriate relationship with a pupil.

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

The panel decided that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Dr Sibthorpe 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 Dr Sibthorpe.

In carrying out the balancing exercise, the panel had regard to the public interest considerations both in favour of, and against, prohibition as well as the interests of Dr Sibthorpe. 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 proved. In the list of such behaviours, those that are relevant in this case are:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving vulnerable pupils) or violation of the rights of pupils;
- sexual misconduct, for example, 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 some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors. Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

In the light of the panel's findings there was no evidence that Dr Sibthorpe's actions were not deliberate. There was no evidence to suggest that Dr Sibthorpe was acting under duress.

The panel noted Dr Sibthorpe had been teaching for 14 years. He had a previously good record and was recognised by both colleagues and pupils for his teaching qualities.

The panel took into consideration that Dr Sibthorpe had admitted his conduct from the beginning and had expressed remorse, shame and embarrassment for his behaviour. The panel particularly noted that Dr Sibthorpe himself viewed his conduct as serious in that he has indicated that he knows he has let himself down and realised the fact that he may never teach again.

The panel was referred to positive references within the bundle which were given by Individual A [REDACTED] and Individual B [REDACTED]. These references attested to Dr Sibthorpe's good history as a teacher.

The panel also considered the witness statement of Individual C [REDACTED].

The panel considered that Dr Sibthorpe was under pressure at the time of the incident. [REDACTED]. Dr Sibthorpe had been asked to take on a greater number of lessons and subsequent increase in workload which he found difficult. Dr Sibthorpe indicated he felt there was a lack of support by the School given his personal situation and the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic.

The panel observed that [REDACTED]. The panel was not provided with any medical evidence in support of his mental state. The panel accepted that Dr Sibthorpe had received counselling from Individual C. It was stated that [REDACTED]. The panel commented that the mitigation relating to mental wellbeing would have been strengthened by supporting evidence such as medical evidence or evidence of Dr Sibthorpe's performance in school being affected.

The panel acknowledged that the WhatsApp messages and conduct were over a short period of time and that some of the contact and context of the exchanges were initiated by Pupil A. On at least one occasion Pupil A made sexualised comments towards Dr Sibthorpe to which he reciprocated. Dr Sibthorpe continued the contact in the same vein rather than bringing an end to the contact or reporting it as would have been expected in his position as an experienced teacher and [REDACTED].

Whilst the conduct of Dr Sibthorpe was a serious breach of trust the panel formed the opinion that his behaviour was towards the lower end on the spectrum of seriousness. The panel reached this conclusion based on the context in which the messages were exchanged: they took place over a relatively short period of time; once discovered the contact stopped; the contact was remote rather than in person; and Pupil A was aged 18 at the time. The panel considered that Dr Sibthorpe had made serious errors of judgement and he himself had recognised this.

The panel was not of the view on the evidence presented that Dr Sibthorpe has any interest in children in a sexual way and in the panel's opinion he does not pose a risk to children. Dr Sibthorpe, on this occasion, seriously exceeded the professional boundaries and knowingly disregarded statutory guidelines, school policies and good practice.

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 would be sufficient.

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

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Dr Sibthorpe. The fact that Dr Sibthorpe had engaged in a relationship of a sexual nature was a significant factor in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made 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 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 proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period but the panel did not consider that any of these applied to Dr Sibthorpe.

The panel considered that Dr Sibthorpe's actions were serious but considered that with the appropriate professional help he could gain sufficient insight and contrition, such that at a time in the future he may be able to contribute once again to the teaching profession.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate in all the circumstances for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a 3 year 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 both sanction and review period.

In considering this case, I have also given very careful attention to the Advice that the Secretary of State has published 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 Dr Sibthorpe should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of three years.

In particular, the panel has found that Dr Sibthorpe 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 and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was also, "satisfied that the conduct of Dr Sibthorpe fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession."

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 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 Dr Sibthorpe, and the impact that will have on him, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children. The panel has observed, “the exchanges via WhatsApp were wholly inappropriate given the role and position of trust that Dr Sibthorpe held as both a teacher and Pupil A’s [REDACTED]. The panel commented that the language used within the messages, was significant of a close sexual connection, whether physically possible or not.” 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, “The panel took into consideration that Dr Sibthorpe had admitted his conduct from the beginning and had expressed remorse, shame and embarrassment for his behaviour. The panel particularly noted that Dr Sibthorpe himself viewed his conduct as serious in that he has indicated that he knows he has let himself down and realised the fact that he may never teach again.”

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, “The panel also took account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils’ lives and the fact that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way they behave.”

I have had to consider that the public has a high expectation of professional standards of all teachers and that the public might regard a failure to impose a prohibition order 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 Dr Sibthorpe himself. The panel comment “The panel noted Dr Sibthorpe had been teaching for 14 years. He had a previously good record and was recognised by both colleagues and pupils for his teaching qualities.”

A prohibition order would prevent Dr Sibthorpe 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, “The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Dr Sibthorpe. The fact

that Dr Sibthorpe had engaged in a relationship of a sexual nature was a significant factor in forming that opinion.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Dr Sibthorpe 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.

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended a 3 year review period.

I have considered the panel’s comments “The panel considered that Dr Sibthorpe’s actions were serious but considered that with the appropriate professional help he could gain sufficient insight and contrition, such that at a time in the future he may be able to contribute once again to the teaching profession.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate in all the circumstances for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a 3 year review period.”

I agree. I have considered whether a 3 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, the finding of sexual misconduct, albeit that the panel said that it, “ was not of the view on the evidence presented that Dr Sibthorpe has any interest in children in a sexual way and in the panel’s opinion he does not pose a risk to children. Dr Sibthorpe, on this occasion, seriously exceeded the professional boundaries and knowingly disregarded statutory guidelines, school policies and good practice. “

I consider therefore that a 3 year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance.

**This means that Dr Dean Sibthorpe is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children’s home in England.** He may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 9 July 2024, 3 years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If he does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Dr Dean Sibthorpe remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Dr Dean Sibthorpe 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: 7 July 2021**

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