



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Dr Deborah Park: Professional conduct panel outcome**

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

**February 2022**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	6
Documents	6
Witnesses	6
Decision and reasons	6
Findings of fact	7
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:** Dr Deborah Park

**Teacher ref number:** 9244279

**Teacher date of birth:** 28 September 1965

**TRA reference:** 19057

**Date of determination:** 31 January 2022

**Former employer:** Axcis Education, Birmingham

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 6 September 2021, 29 and 30 November 2021, 31 January 2022, and 23 February 2022 by remote video link, to consider the case of Dr Deborah Park.

The panel members were Ms Jasmin Choudhury (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Shabana Robertson (lay panellist) and Mr Roger Woods (former teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Claire Watson of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Michael O’Donohoe of Browne Jacobson solicitors.

Dr Deborah Park was present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

## **Allegations**

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 30 June 2021.

It was alleged that Dr Deborah Park was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst employed as a supply teacher with the Jane Lane School:

1. On the 15 November 2019 she used excessive and/or unreasonable force against Pupil A in that she:
  - a. grabbed Pupil A by the wrists;
  - b. pulled Pupil A by both arms;
  - c. continued to pull on both of Pupil A's arms after he had fallen to the ground.
2. She engaged in conduct as may be found proven at 1 above when she knew or ought to have known that Pupil A was a vulnerable pupil.
3. Her conduct as may be found proven at 1 above demonstrated a lack of insight into a previous concern raised in respect of her manual handling of a pupil when employed at New Leaf School in or around 2018.

Dr Park did not admit the facts of the allegations or that they amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

## **Preliminary applications**

### **Additional documents**

On 6 September 2021, the presenting officer applied to admit correspondence between the presenting officer, the teacher and the TRA.

Those documents were not served in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 4.20 of the Procedures, and as such the panel was required to decide whether those documents should be admitted under paragraph 4.25 of the Procedures at the discretion of the panel. The panel took into account the representations from the presenting officer. The panel exercised caution in exercising this discretion given that the teacher was not present at the hearing on 6 September 2021.

Under paragraph 4.18 of the Procedures, the panel may admit any evidence, where it is fair to do so, which may reasonably be considered to be relevant to the case.

The panel was satisfied that the documents were relevant to the case, as the documents included correspondence with the teacher in relation to the hearing and referred to the teacher's reasons for her absence at the hearing. The panel considered it fair to admit the documents.

## **Proceeding in absence**

On 6 September 2021, the panel considered an application from the presenting officer to proceed in the absence of the teacher.

The panel took as its starting point, the principle from *R v Jones* [2003] 1 AC 1, that its discretion to commence a hearing in the absence of the teacher has to be exercised with the utmost care and caution, and that its discretion is a severely constrained one. In considering the question of fairness, the panel recognised that fairness to the professional is of prime importance but that it also encompasses the fair, economic, expeditious and efficient disposal of allegations against the professional, as was explained in *GMC v Adeogba & Visvardis* [2016] EWCA Civ 162.

The panel determined not to proceed with the hearing in the absence of the teacher. The panel did not consider that the teacher had waived her right to be present at the hearing.

The teacher was present at the rearranged dates of 29 and 30 November 2021.

## **Change of panellist**

Mr Christopher King (lay panellist) was a panel member and present at the hearing on 6 September 2021. Unfortunately, Mr King was not available for the resumed hearing on 29 November 2021. The TRA appointed Mrs Shabana Robertson (lay panellist) in his place. Mrs Robertson fully read the case papers and watched the CCTV footage, filmed on 15 November 2019.

## **Amending the allegations**

An application was made by the presenting officer to amend the Notice of Proceedings by amending allegation 3, to read 'Your conduct as may be found proven at 1 above demonstrated a lack of insight into a previous concern raised in respect of your manual handling of one or more pupils when employed at New Leaf School on or around 7 December 2017'. The panel has the power to, in the interests of justice, amend an allegation or the particulars of an allegation, at any stage before making its decision about whether the facts of the case have been proved.

Before making an amendment, the panel was required to consider any representations by the presenting officer and by the teacher, and the parties were afforded that opportunity. The teacher consented to the application.

The panel was concerned that this application was made at such a late stage in the proceedings, and exercised caution to ensure that there was no unfairness to the teacher. The panel considered that the amendment proposed reflected the intended meaning of allegation 3 and provided clarity. The panel had sight of notes from a 'position of trust' meeting, dated January 2018, which related to two incidents on 7 December 2017. The reference to more than one pupil had therefore been disclosed to the teacher

prior to the hearing. The panel did not consider that the teacher's response would have been different had the allegation referred to more than one pupil and 2017, rather than a pupil and an incident in or around 2018. The panel therefore decided to amend the allegation as proposed, as set out in the below allegations.

## **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 2 to 3

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 5 to 15

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 17 to 164

Section 4: Teacher documents – page 166

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

- Emails between the presenting officer and Dr Park – pages 167 to 169
- Letter from the TRA regarding change of panellist – page 170

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the hearing and the additional documents that the panel decided to admit.

### **Witnesses**

No witnesses were called by the presenting officer.

Dr Deborah Park gave evidence to the panel.

## **Decision and reasons**

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

Dr Deborah Park had been employed by Axcis Education as a class teacher from 6 September 2016 to 9 June 2017, and again from 1 May 2019 to 15 November 2019. When obtaining references, Axcis Education was notified by a previous employer that there was a safeguarding issue from an alleged mishandling of a pupil in December 2017. However, the case was unsubstantiated, and no further action had been taken. From 1 May 2019, Dr Park was contracted to work as a supply teacher at The Jane Lane School, Walsall ("the School"). On 15 November 2019, it was alleged that Dr Park had

grabbed Pupil A by the wrist, when they had tried to leave a gated area during lunchtime and pulled Pupil A by both arms. Dr Park was asked to leave the School premises and the School called Axcis Education to inform it of the incident.

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

- 1) On the 15 November 2019 you used excessive and/or unreasonable force against Pupil A in that you:**
  - a) grabbed Pupil A by the wrists;**
  - b) pulled Pupil A by both arms;**
  - c) continued to pull on both of Pupil A's arms after he had fallen to the ground.**

The panel had sight of the referral form to the Disclosure and Barring Service, which set out the incident on 15 November 2019. This stated that there had been a safeguarding allegation made by a pupil and the School had CCTV footage, in which Dr Park was seen grabbing Pupil A by the wrist as they tried to leave the astro turf and then pulled him by both arms. It is also stated that when Pupil A fell to the floor, Dr Park continued to pull on both arms.

The referral to the Walsall Safeguarding Children Board repeated these claims. It stated that the deputy headteacher and the assistant headteacher of the School had reviewed the CCTV footage and it showed Pupil A about to leave the gated astro turf area. It further stated that Dr Park pulled Pupil A by his arms to stop them leaving, that Pupil A then fell to the floor and Dr Park continued to pull Pupil A inside the astro turf pitch. The referral also stated that Pupil A had said that Dr Park had pulled him by the arm and his left wrist was slightly swollen.

The panel also had sight of a statement provided by Dr Park at the TRA's investigation stage. Dr Park stated that Pupil A tried to leave the compound and she had concerns for his welfare and safety were he to run off unsupervised, so she prevented Pupil A from leaving the compound by holding on to his wrists. In oral evidence, Dr Park expanded on the incident. She stated that there was a field and woodland area around the School, and the School backed on to a motorway, although the School had a fence around its perimeter. She further stated that, with hindsight, she should have let the pupil leave the compound. Dr Park admitted that the force used, in grabbing Pupil A by the wrists and pulling Pupil A, was "unnecessary".

The panel viewed the CCTV footage, in which Dr Park could be seen grabbing Pupil A by the wrists and pulling Pupil A back into the compound. Pupil A fell to the ground. The panel noted that, although the CCTV footage was brief, Dr Park was stood with her back to the gate. Pupil A was behind Dr Park. In oral evidence, Dr Park also explained that the School grounds were enclosed. The panel considered that there were alternative options available for Dr Park to use, such as using other de-escalation strategies or letting Pupil A leave the compound as it was still within the enclosed School grounds. The panel noted that there appeared to be limited interaction between Pupil A and Dr Park, prior to Dr Park grabbing Pupil A by the wrists.

The panel did not consider that Pupil A was at immediate or significant harm which may have justified the use of manual handling techniques. Even had Pupil A left the compound, the School was enclosed, and other staff members were on duty during the lunchtime break. The panel had sight of a chronology of the lunchtime break on 15 November 2019 and noted that other pupils had left the compound during that lunchtime. As such, the panel considered that the force Dr Park used was excessive and unreasonable.

The allegation was therefore, found proved.

**2) You engaged in conduct as may be found proven at 1 above when you knew or ought to have known that Pupil A was a vulnerable pupil.**

The panel had sight of Pupil A's Education Health and Care Plan ("EHCP"), which detailed Pupil A's requirements. The panel also had sight of Dr Deborah Park's curriculum vitae, which details her experience as a teacher and senior leader, spanning a number of years, working with vulnerable pupils. In oral evidence, Dr Park explained that all pupils in the School would have had an EHCP and that, although she did not usually cover primary classes, Pupil A was in the class she was covering on 15 November 2019. The panel considered that, with her experience and with the behaviours presented by Pupil A, that Dr Park knew that Pupil A was a vulnerable pupil.

The allegation was therefore, found proved.

**3) Your conduct as may be found proven at 1 above demonstrated a lack of insight into a previous concern raised in respect of your manual handling of one or more pupils when employed at New Leaf School on or around 7 December 2017.**

The panel noted that Axcis Education had requested a reference from New Leaf School. The reference, dated 18 June 2018, noted that there had been a safeguarding concern. A handwritten, signed note on the reference stated that contact had been made with the referee who stated that Dr Park had been investigated for a safeguarding issue after the mishandling of a pupil. It further stated that the case was 'unsubstantial' and was not taken further.



The panel also had sight of minutes from a meeting following a referral to LADO on 7 December 2017, which set out two complaints relating to the handling of pupils. The panel accepted that these two complaints were not substantiated and noted that Dr Park had not been present during the LADO meeting. However, the panel noted that, during the investigation at the time, these complaints were brought to the attention of Dr Park.

The panel accepted that no findings were made against Dr Park in relation to any of these investigations. However, as a result of these allegations, Dr Park ought to have had a heightened sense of awareness around the handling of pupils and behaviour management strategies.

Despite this, during her oral evidence, Dr Park confirmed that her manual handling training was not up to date. The panel considered that this demonstrated a lack of insight into previous concerns that had been raised.

This allegation was therefore, found 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 Deborah Park, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Dr Deborah Park 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
- showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others

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 acknowledged that, during evidence, Dr Park stated that she was instructed verbally to ensure that no pupils left the compound. However, the panel considered that the manner in which Dr Park did so, using excessive and unreasonable force, failed to treat Pupil A with dignity and show respect for Pupil A. The panel considered that there were alternative actions available to Dr Park in the circumstances to have safeguarded Pupil A and de-escalate the situation.

The panel had sight of the 'Keeping Children Safe in Education' statutory guidance and the School's safeguarding advice for visitors. The panel found that Dr Park's actions contravened such guidance, in that everyone working in the School shared a responsibility to make pupils safe.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Dr Deborah Park amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel also considered whether Dr Park'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 were relevant.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Dr Deborah Park 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 that they behave.

The findings of misconduct are serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public perception. The panel noted that, in the minutes of the 'position of trust' meeting, dated 15 November 2019, Pupil A was observed to be extremely upset, coming into the primary department 'screaming' and 'threw himself on the floor', reporting that Dr Park had 'hurt him'. It is also stated that first aid was administered. The panel considered that the public would have a negative perception of the distress caused to Pupil A by Dr Park when there appeared to be no immediate risk of harm.

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

Having found the facts of particulars 1, 2 and 3 proved, the panel further found that Dr Park'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 maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct. The panel also found the interest of retaining the teacher in the profession to be relevant.

In the light of the panel's findings against Dr Deborah Park, which involved using excessive and unreasonable force against a vulnerable pupil, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils, given the serious findings of using excessive and unreasonable force.

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

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Dr Deborah Park was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

The panel decided that there was a strong public interest consideration in retaining the teacher in the profession.

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 Dr Deborah Park.

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 Park. 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 were relevant in this case were:

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

Even though 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.

There was no evidence that Dr Park's actions were not deliberate or that Dr Park was acting under duress. The panel accepted that Dr Park had followed an instruction to keep pupils within the gated astro turf area but considered that she had used excessive and unreasonable force to do so.

Dr Park did have a previously good history. While the panel saw evidence of a previous concern raised in relation to Dr Park's manual handling techniques, the panel accepted that these concerns led to no sanction.

Although the panel saw evidence of good character provided by referees as part of Axcis Education's recruitment process, it noted that no character references were provided as part of these proceedings. The panel had sight of minutes from a position of trust meeting, in which it was noted that Pupil A's family were happy for Dr Park to continue to teach Pupil A. The panel noted that Dr Park had a long and extensive career, with a background of working with vulnerable pupils. In light of this, the panel considered that Dr Park should have been aware of a number of de-escalation strategies that she could have used with Pupil A, without resorting to physical force. The panel had found that Dr Park had used excessive and unreasonable force. In hindsight, Dr Park accepted that she should have allowed Pupil A to leave the gated area.

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 would be sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Dr Park 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 Park.

The unreasonable force used against a pupil 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 for it to decide to recommend a review period of the order. 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. One of these behaviours includes violence. The panel found that Dr Park was responsible for using excessive and unreasonable force against a pupil. However, the panel noted that Dr Park's actions were not malicious and did not intend to harm Pupil A.

The panel considered that Dr Park had shown remorse for her actions and had accepted that with hindsight, there were alternative strategies available to her to keep Pupil A safe, without the use of physical force. However, the panel considered that Dr Park's remorse for her actions was focused on the impact on her teaching career and that she had demonstrated limited insight into the impact of her actions on the pupil and the use of de-escalation strategies.

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 two 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 Park should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of two years.

In particular, the panel has found that Dr Park 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
- showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others

Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies, and practices of the school in which they teach

Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

I 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 Park, and the impact that will have on her, 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 panel found that Dr Park's actions contravened such guidance, in that everyone working in the School shared a responsibility to make pupils safe."

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 considered that Dr Park had shown remorse for her actions and had accepted that with hindsight, there were alternative strategies available to her to keep Pupil A safe, without the use of physical force. However, the panel considered that Dr Park's remorse for her actions was focused on the impact on her teaching career and that she had demonstrated limited insight into the impact of her actions on the pupil and the use of de-escalation strategies."

In my judgement, the lack of full insight and remorse means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour, and this puts at risk the future wellbeing 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 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 that 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 Park herself. The panel comment “Although the panel saw evidence of good character provided by referees as part of Axcis Education’s recruitment process, it noted that no character references were provided as part of these proceedings. The panel had sight of minutes from a position of trust meeting, in which it was noted that Pupil A’s family were happy for Dr Park to continue to teach Pupil A. The panel noted that Dr Park had a long and extensive career, with a background of working with vulnerable pupils. In light of this, the panel considered that Dr Park should have been aware of a number of de-escalation strategies that she could have used with Pupil A, without resorting to physical force.”

A prohibition order would prevent Dr Park from teaching and would also clearly deprive the public of her 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 found that Dr Park was responsible for using excessive and unreasonable force against a pupil. However, the panel noted that Dr Park’s actions were not malicious and did not intend to harm Pupil A.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Dr Park 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, in light of the circumstances in this case, that is not backed up by full 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 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 2 year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments, "that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a two year review period."

I consider therefore that a two year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

**This means that Dr Deborah Park is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England.** She may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 2024, 2 years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If she does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Dr Deborah Park remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

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

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Alan Meyrick', followed by a vertical line.

**Decision maker: Alan Meyrick**

**Date: 28 February 2022**

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