



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Alexander Martin (formerly Daniel Chapman): Professional conduct panel 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	5
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

Teacher:	Mr Alexander Martin (formerly Daniel Chapman)
Teacher ref number:	0956591
Teacher date of birth:	8 February 1988
TRA reference:	18470
Date of determination:	4 June 2021
Former employer:	Hilltop Infant School, Essex

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened virtually on 4 June 2021, to consider the case of Mr Alexander Martin.

The panel members were Mr Ian Carter (former teacher panellist – in the chair), Ms Claudette Salmon (teacher panellist) and Ms Oluremi Alabi (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Delme Griffiths of Blake Morgan 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 Mr Martin that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Martin provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted conviction of a relevant offence. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, Mr Martin 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.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 27 May 2021.

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

1. On 21 October 2019, at Chelmsford Crown Court, he was convicted of:
 - a. Two counts of Making indecent photograph or pseudo photograph of children on 08/08/17, contrary to the Protection of Children Act 1978 s.1(a);
 - b. One count of Making indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of children on 27/01/19, contrary to the Protection of Children Act 1978 s.1(a);
 - c. Three counts of Making indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of children on 25/05/19, contrary to the Protection of Children Act 1978 s.1(a);
 - d. One count of Possess prohibited images of children on 25/05/19, contrary to the Coroners and Justice Act 2009 s.62(1);
 - e. One count of Publish obscene article on 24/09/18 - 29/04/19, contrary to the Obscene Publications Act 1959 s.2(1);
 - f. One count of Publish obscene article on 11/01/19 - 29/04/19, contrary to the Obscene Publications Act 1959 s.2(1);
 - g. One count of Publish obscene article on 11/09/18 - 13/02/19, contrary to the Obscene Publications Act 1959 s.2(1);
 - h. One count of Possession of extreme pornographic images – of intercourse/ oral sex with dead/ alive animal on 20/05/19, contrary to the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008 s.63(1)(7)(d);
 - i. One count of Possession of extreme pornographic images – of intercourse/ oral sex with dead/ alive animal on 11/01/19, contrary to the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008 s.63(1)(7)(d).
2. On 20 November 2019, at Chelmsford Crown Court, he was sentenced to:
 - a. imprisonment for 30 months;
 - b. an indefinite Sex offenders notice;
 - c. a Sexual harm prevention order for 10 years;
 - d. forfeiture of an Apple iPhone and HP laptop computer;

e. a victim surcharge of £140.

Mr Martin admitted the facts of the allegations and that his conviction was for a relevant offence.

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, anonymised pupil list and list of key people – pages 3 to 5

Section 2: Notice of Referral, response and Notice of Meeting – pages 6 to 14

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 15 to 18

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 19 to 115

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 116 to 120

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 on behalf of Mr Martin on 26 February 2021.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

In advance of the meeting, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Martin 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.

The panel proceeded to consider the case carefully, having read all of the documents, and reached a decision. It accepted the legal advice provided.

Mr Martin (formerly Daniel Chapman) was previously employed as the head of school at Hilltop Infant School ("the School"). He commenced that role on 1 November 2017.

The relevant chronology was as follows:

- On 20 May 2019, Mr Martin was arrested and charged with three counts of 'Making Indecent Photograph or Pseudo-Photograph of Children'.
- On 18 June 2019, Mr Martin was remanded in custody in Chelmsford Crown Court.
- On 20 June 2019, the TRA received a notification from Essex police in relation to Mr Martin.
- On 25 July 2019, Mr Martin was dismissed by the School for gross misconduct.
- On 21 October 2019, Mr Martin was convicted at Chelmsford Crown Court on multiple counts.
- On 20 November 2019, Mr Martin was sentenced.

The School formally referred Mr Martin to the TRA on 26 July 2019.

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 21 October 2019, at Chelmsford Crown Court, you were convicted of:**
 - a. Two counts of Making indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of children on 08/08/17, contrary to the Protection of Children Act 1978 s.1(a);**
 - b. One count of Making indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of children on 27/01/19, contrary to the Protection of Children Act 1978 s.1(a);**
 - c. Three counts of Making indecent photograph or pseudophotograph of children on 25/05/19, contrary to the Protection of Children Act 1978 s.1(a);**
 - d. One count of Possess prohibited images of children on 25/05/19, contrary to the Coroners and Justice Act 2009 s.62(1);**

e. One count of Publish obscene article on 24/09/18 - 29/04/19, contrary to the Obscene Publications Act 1959 s.2(1);

f. One count of Publish obscene article on 11/01/19 - 29/04/19, contrary to the Obscene Publications Act 1959 s.2(1);

g. One count of Publish obscene article on 11/09/18 - 13/02/19, contrary to the Obscene Publications Act 1959 s.2(1);

h. One count of Possession of extreme pornographic images – of intercourse/ oral sex with dead/ alive animal on 20/05/19, contrary to the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008 s.63(1)(7)(d);

i. One count of Possession of extreme pornographic images – of intercourse/ oral sex with dead/ alive animal on 11/01/19, contrary to the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008 s.63(1)(7)(d).

2. On 20 November 2019, at Chelmsford Crown Court, you were sentenced to:

a. imprisonment for 30 months;

b. an indefinite Sex offenders notice;

c. a Sexual harm prevention order for 10 years;

d. forfeiture of an Apple iPhone and HP laptop computer;

e. a victim surcharge of £140.

The panel considered allegations 1 and 2 together.

Mr Martin admitted both allegations. The panel was presented with a statement of agreed facts, signed on Mr Martin's behalf, to that effect.

The panel was also presented with a certificate of conviction from the Chelmsford Crown Court.

This confirmed that Mr Martin had pleaded guilty to all matters charged and was convicted, on 21 October 2019, of the following offences:

a. Six counts of 'Making indecent photograph or pseudo-photograph of children', contrary to the Protection of children Act 1978 s.1(a) (particulars of allegation 1(a) – (c) above);

b. One count of 'Possess prohibited images of children', contrary to the Coroners and Justice Act 2009 s.62(1) (particular of allegation 1(d) above);

- c. Three counts of 'Publish obscene article', contrary to the Obscene Publications Act 1959 s.2(1) (particulars of allegation 1(e) – (g) above);
- d. Two counts of 'Possession of extreme pornographic images – of intercourse/ oral sex with dead/ alive animal', contrary to the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008 s.63(1)(7)(d) (particulars of allegation 1(h) – (i) above).

Mr Martin was committed to Chelmsford Crown Court for sentencing. On 20 November 2019, he was sentenced to:

- a. Imprisonment for 30 months;
- b. An indefinite sex offenders notice;
- c. A sexual harm prevention order for 10 years;
- d. Forfeiture of mobile telephone and laptop; and
- e. A victim surcharge of £140.00.

In passing sentence, the Judge [Redacted] noted the aggravating features of this case as being the age and vulnerability of the children shown, the distress and pain, the content of the chats and Mr Martin's position and role at the School.

In Mr Martin's favour was the fact that he entered a guilty plea. It was also confirmed that the evidence before the Crown Court was to the effect that Mr Martin had been in possession of a low number of images.

The panel accepted the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of the commission of these offences by Mr Martin and the sentence received.

It accordingly found allegations 1 and 2 proved.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

Having found the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether Mr Martin's conviction was for a relevant offence, which he admitted.

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 Mr Martin's conduct in relation to the facts found proved involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that by reference to Part 2, Mr Martin 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
 - 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
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs
- 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 determined that Mr Martin's actions were clearly relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting. Each of these serious offences were very disturbing in nature. The majority of the offences directly involved children although it is important to record that there was no direct link with the School. The age and vulnerability of the children shown and the distress and pain evidenced were, on any assessment, such that Mr Martin's actions were at the most serious end of the spectrum.

This was accordingly a case involving the following offences that the Advice states are likely to be considered a relevant offence:

- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or pseudo photograph or image of a child, or permitting any such activity, including one off incidents.

Mr Martin's behaviour in committing these offences plainly engaged public and child protection issues. It had the potential to impact on the safety or security of members of the public. In short, Mr Martin is [redacted] convicted [redacted].

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Martin's behaviour in committing these offences would undoubtedly affect public confidence in the teaching profession, particularly given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. His conduct ran counter to what should have been at the very core of his practice as a teacher with a duty of care towards children. It was notable that Mr Martin was the designated safeguarding lead for the School. Mr Martin clearly failed in his duty to act as a role model. By virtue of his position, Mr Martin was also in a position of trust and responsibility. He had abused that position.

The panel also took account of the fact that Mr Martin's behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed. The public and child protection issues engaged by Mr Martin's actions were also amply demonstrated by the other aspects of the Court's sentence.

The panel did not consider there to be any relevant mitigating circumstances in relation to the commission of these offences.

In conclusion and for all these reasons, the panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was directly relevant to Mr Martin's ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding that this conviction was for relevant offences was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of a conviction of a relevant offence, it was necessary for it 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 and 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 nature of the offences for which Mr Martin was convicted, there was an extremely strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils and other members of the public, especially considering the serious offences involving children. Mr Martin was, as a consequence, [redacted] convicted [redacted]. His actions raised obvious and significant public and child protection concerns, as was clearly recognised by the Court when imposing sentence.

The panel considered that public confidence in the profession would undoubtedly be very seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Martin was not treated with

the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession. This was conduct that was, very clearly, at the most serious end of the spectrum.

For the same reasons, the panel decided that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present.

Whilst no doubt had been cast upon Mr Martin's abilities as an educator and there was evidence he was very well regarded, given the nature of the allegations in this case the panel concluded that there was not a strong public interest consideration in retaining him in the profession.

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 Martin.

In carrying out the balancing exercise, the panel had regard to the public interest considerations present as well as the interests of Mr Martin. 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:

- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or pseudo photograph or image of a child, or permitting such activity, including one-off incidents;
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of The Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures.
- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- actions or behaviours that undermine fundamental British values of democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty, and mutual respect and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs;
- abuse of position and trust; and
- 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.

The panel considered that the following mitigating factors are present in this case:

- Mr Martin appeared to have had an otherwise unblemished record.
- The panel was presented with some positive evidence as to Mr Martin as a teacher and as a school community leader, which it carefully considered.
- Mr Martin had fully engaged with the TRA and made full admissions.
- There was some evidence of regret and shame on his part, as there should be.

Weighed against this, the aggravating features in this case were that:

- Mr Martin's actions were deliberate.
- There was no clear evidence of insight. It was apparent that Mr Martin did not plead guilty at the first available opportunity and appeared to still contest aspects of the charges against him.
- His actions amounted to a clear breach of the Teachers' Standards and raised serious public and child protection concerns.
- Mr Martin has been convicted of very serious offences, the majority of which involved children, and was sentenced to lengthy term of imprisonment, an indefinite sex offenders notice and a sexual harm prevention order for 10 years.
- His actions involved harm and abuse to children.
- Mr Martin was the designated safeguarding lead for the School.
- Mr Martin was in a leadership position and a position of trust and responsibility. He was also a role model. He had fallen very far short of the standards expected of him in that regard.
- Mr Martin's actions undoubtedly had a detrimental impact on the School, its pupils and the local community.

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 Mr Martin of prohibition.

Mr Martin was [redacted] convicted [redacted]. His actions were fundamentally incompatible with his being an educator. This was conduct of the most serious nature. The nature and gravity of these offences was a matter of significant concern. There were, accordingly, particularly strong public interest considerations in this case in terms of protecting the public, public confidence in the teaching profession and the declaring of proper standards of conduct in this case.

Mr Martin's behaviour led to him receiving a lengthy sentence of imprisonment, which is indicative of the seriousness of the offence. The panel noted the following remarks from the sentencing judge in particular, which amply demonstrate both the seriousness of Mr Martin's actions and the public and child protection issues this gives rise to:

- In relation to the content of chats engaged in by Mr Martin, *"they are not repeated in open court because the courts are not about the business of publicising that which is so revolting that it should not be published, but you and I know the content of those chats and you and I know now depraved and revolting and how bordering on sadistic they are."*
- *"What paedophiles like yourself tend to do, is to think that because they are looking at images on a screen, that it is not real children who are being abused, physically, sexually depraved, their innocence ripped away from them and it filmed so that paedophiles like you can get some sexual pleasure. And that's the seriousness of these offences because the damage that it does to the children is not only the physical damage, not only the deprivation of their innocence, but it is the fact that as they grow up and grow older, they have to live with the fact that paedophiles like yourself have watched them being depraved and abused, and that is why these offences are so serious. And that is why the content of those chats is so despicable, particularly when one factors in that it's all for your sexual pleasure, when they think that people can sink no lower than to get sexual enjoyment through the pain, suffering and deprivation of children."*
- *"So that's why these offences are so serious, and it's also very serious that by virtue of your job as a head teacher in an infant school, you have let down the community generally. Parents, people who had trust in you, your own family who sit in court supporting you, although that is serious, make no mistake it's secondary to the damage that's done to the children."*

The panel was therefore of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Martin.

Accordingly, it 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. These behaviours include any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or pseudo photograph or image of a child. This was, clearly, directly applicable in this case and Mr Martin's action involved harm and abuse to children.

Whilst Mr Martin appeared to be remorseful and there was some evidence that he was ashamed of his actions, there was no clear evidence of insight in this case.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate.

The nature and seriousness of the offences in this case necessitated the prohibition order to be recommended without provision for a review period. The public interest considerations that Mr Martin's conviction gives rise to were such that this was necessary, appropriate and proportionate. The panel repeats that, [redacted] Mr Martin's actions are fundamentally incompatible with his being a teacher.

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 this case, the panel found all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to a relevant conviction.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Martin should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel found that Mr Martin's conduct, was, "very clearly, at the most serious end of the spectrum."

The panel found that Mr Martin 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

- 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
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs
- 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 felt that Mr Martin's "actions were fundamentally incompatible with his being an educator".

I have noted that the panel took 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 within the Advice, the panel deemed those that are relevant in this case to be:

- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or pseudo photograph or image of a child, or permitting such activity, including one-off incidents.
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of The Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures.
- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards.
- actions or behaviours that undermine fundamental British values of democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty, and mutual respect and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs.
- abuse of position and trust.
- 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.

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 Mr Martin, 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. I have placed weight on the panel's view that:

- Mr Martin's behaviour led to him receiving a lengthy sentence of imprisonment, which is indicative of the seriousness of the offence.
- The nature and gravity of these offences was a matter of significant concern.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows. "There was no clear evidence of insight. It was apparent that Mr Martin did not plead guilty at the first available opportunity and appeared to still contest aspects of the charges against him."

The panel found that Mr Martin's "actions were deliberate, his actions involved harm and abuse to children and undoubtedly had a detrimental impact on the School, its pupils and the local community."

In my judgement, the lack of insight means that there is some risk of repetition of this behaviour and this puts pupils at risk. 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 that 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 Mr Martin of prohibition."

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 conduct that has been found proven in this case.

The panel say that, “whilst no doubt had been cast upon Mr Martin's abilities as an educator and there was evidence he was very well regarded, given the nature of the allegations, in this case the panel concluded that there was not a strong public interest consideration in retaining him in the profession.” A prohibition order would clearly deprive the public of his contribution to the profession for the period that it is in force, however I have placed considerable weight on the panel's observations that Mr Martin's “actions were fundamentally incompatible with his being an educator.”

In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, 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 that no provision should be made for a review period.

I have considered that the panel referred to the Advice, in particular where it refers that “there are behaviours that, if proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. These behaviours include any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or pseudo photograph or image of a child.”

The panel observed that “this was, clearly, directly applicable in this case and Mr Martin's action involved harm and abuse to children.”

The panel also observed that “whilst Mr Martin appeared to be remorseful and there was some evidence that he was ashamed of his actions, there was no clear evidence of insight in this case.”

I have noted that the panel decided “that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate.”

I have considered whether a 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, I have placed weight on the panel's view that “the nature and seriousness of the offences in this case necessitated the prohibition order to be recommended without provision for a review period.”

I have therefore concluded that a prohibition order is necessary with no provision for a review period. I consider that allowing for no review period is necessary to maintain public confidence and is proportionate and in the public interest.

This means that Mr Alexander Martin 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 allegation's found proved against him, I have decided that Mr Martin 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 Alexander Martin 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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'John Knowles', written in a cursive style.

Decision maker: John Knowles

Date: 9 June 2021

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