



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr James David Bell

Professional conduct

panel meeting outcome

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

19 August 2019

Contents

A. Introduction	3
B. Allegations	4
C. Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Statement of agreed facts	5
D. Decisions and reasons	5
Background	6
Findings of fact	7
Findings as to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.	9
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	10
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	13

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

Teacher:	Mr James David Bell
Teacher ref number:	0463324
Teacher date of birth:	28 May 1983
TRA reference:	17666
Date of determination:	19 August 2019
Former employer:	A school in the Northeast of England ("the School")

A. Introduction

A professional conduct panel ("the panel") of the Teaching Regulation Agency ("the TRA") convened on 19 August 2019 at Cheylesmore House, 5 Quinton Road, Coventry, CV1 2WT, to consider the case of Mr James David Bell.

The panel members were Mr Mike Carter, former teacher panellist in the chair, Mrs Alison Robb-Webb, teacher panellist, and Ms Karen McArthur, Lay Panellist.

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Matthew Corrie, Associate (Barrister) of Blake Morgan solicitors.

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

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

B. Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Meeting dated 17 June 2019.

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

1. Whilst employed as a Teacher “The school” you engaged in inappropriate behaviour in that:
 - a. On or around the night of 1 September 2018, you:
 - i. Bought drinks for Individual A, a female former student, and her friends and got drunk with them;
 - ii. Made sexually suggestive comments about Individual A;
 - iii. Kissed Individual A;
 - iv. Touched Individual A intimately;
 - v. Contacted Individual A via Facetime and invited her to your house.
 - b. On or around 2 September 2018, you:
 - i. made sexual advances towards Individual A; and
 - ii. had sexual intercourse with Individual A at your house.
 - c. On or around 3 September 2018, you told Individual A what to say to the School should they investigate the matter.
 - d. On or around 3 September 2018, you misled the School about the extent of the events which may be found proven at allegation 1(a), and (b) above.
 - e. On or around 3 November 2018, you sent a series of sexually explicit messages to Individual A.
 - f. On or around 5 November 2018, you sent messages to Individual A asking her not to tell anyone what had happened.
2. Your behaviour as may be found proven at allegation 1, took place in circumstances whereby you knew or ought to have known that Individual A had been a [Redacted] student.
3. Your behaviour as may be found proven at allegation 1 (a)(1-v), (b) and (e) was conduct of a sexual nature and/or was sexually motivated.
4. Your behaviour as may be found proven at allegation 1(c), (d) and (f) demonstrated a lack of integrity and/or was dishonest.

Mr Bell has admitted these allegations and that his conduct amounts to both unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

C. 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 1 to 2

Section 2: Notice of Proceedings, Statement of Agreed Facts and Submissions on PCPM – pages 3 to 17

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 18 to 28

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 29 to 104

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 105 to 125

An additional document was supplied by Mr Bell which was provided to the panel at the start of proceedings on 19 August 2019. This is a letter dated 30 July 2019. This letter has been inserted into Section 5 of the Documents at pages 120 to 124.

The panel also admitted, at page 125, representations from the TRA to the effect that no objection was made to the admission of the letter dated 30 July 2019.

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

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Bell on 14 July 2019.

D. Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

The panel carefully considered the case and reached a decision.

The panel confirmed that it had read all of the documents provided in the bundle in advance of the meeting.

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

Background

Mr Bell was employed as the Year 11 Director of Learning and Teacher of Science at the School from 1 January 2006 until his resignation with immediate effect on 6 November 2018.

Individual A was a female, former pupil, [redacted]. She was due to, and did, start at university in September [redacted]. Whilst Individual A had been at the School, [redacted], of which Mr Bell was aware. [Redacted]

On 1 September 2018 Mr Bell saw Individual A and her friends in the Wetherspoons pub in [redacted]. Whilst there, Mr Bell bought Individual A and others in her group alcoholic drinks. During the period whilst at the pub Mr Bell made inappropriate comments such as *'which member of staff would you most like to sleep with.'* Mr Bell also told Individual A that he thought that she was attractive.

As the evening progressed Mr Bell attended another venue with the group, more alcohol was purchased and drunk and Mr Bell behaved in an inappropriate manner in that he touched Individual A's leg, cuddled her and told her again that she was attractive. Upon leaving the venue, at a time when Individual A was very intoxicated, Mr Bell pulled her against a wall, kissed her, touched her bottom and put his hands down her jeans.

Mr Bell then went home but in the early hours of 2 September 2018, he contacted Individual A on text and Facetime and invited her to come to his house. Individual A attended his house and she and Mr Bell then had sexual intercourse on several occasions.

As a result of a post on Snapchat of a photograph of Mr Bell having drinks with Individual A and others on 1 September 2018, the School opened an investigation. On 3 September 2018 Mr Bell was invited to a meeting with the [redacted], Individual B, during which he gave an account to the effect that he had seen the students in the pub by chance, had not bought them any drinks and had been in their company for around an hour before going home. Following this meeting, Mr Bell was issued with a letter of management advice and no further disciplinary action was taken.

On 3 September 2018 Mr Bell contacted Individual A and told her that the School was investigating events and told her to delete all their messages and what to say if she was asked by the School about what had happened.

On 3 November 2018 Mr Bell sent a series of messages to Individual A, some of which were of a sexually explicit nature. Moreover, within the dialogue he sought to persuade Individual A not to divulge what had happened between them. On 5 November 2018 Mr Bell telephoned Individual A and attempted to dissuade her from saying what had occurred.

On 5 November 2018 Individual A reported what had happened to another teacher and on 6 November 2018 Mr Bell resigned.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact were as follows:

The panel considered that the admissions made within the Statement of Agreed Facts to be unambiguous and unequivocal as well as finding that the allegations were corroborated by the evidence provided. The panel, therefore, found each of the particulars of allegations proven on the basis of the admissions.

1. Whilst employed as a Teacher at A school in the Northeast of England "the school" you engaged in inappropriate behaviour in that:

a. On or around the night of 1 September 2018, you:

- i. Bought drinks for Individual A, a female former student, and her friends and got drunk with them;**
- ii. Made sexually suggestive comments about Individual A;**
- iii. Kissed Individual A;**
- iv. Touched Individual A intimately;**
- v. Contacted Individual A via Facetime and invited her to your house.**

b. On or around 2 September 2018, you:

- i. made sexual advances towards Individual A; and**
- ii. had sexual intercourse with Individual A at your house.**

In relation to allegations 1a i to v and 1b i to ii. as well as accepting Mr Bell's admissions, the panel had regard to the email from Individual A dated 5 November 2018 at pages 61 to 62 in which the events of the evening of 1 and 2 September 2018 are described. The panel has also taken into account the messages at pages 66 and 67.

c. On or around 3 September 2018, you told Individual A what to say to the School should they investigate the matter.

In respect of allegation 1c, the panel, as well as accepting Mr Bell's admission, had regard to the aforementioned email from Individual A dated 5 November 2018 at page 61. The panel has also taken into account the messages at pages 68 and 69.

d. On or around 3 September 2018, you misled the School about the extent of the events which may be found proven at allegation 1(a), and (b) above.

With regard to allegation 1d, the panel, as well as accepting Mr Bell's admission, had regard to the evidence of Individual B at page 19.

e. On or around 3 November 2018, you sent a series of sexually explicit messages to Individual A.

In relation to allegation 1e, the panel, as well as accepting Mr Bell's admission, had regard to the aforementioned email from Individual A dated 5 November 2018 at pages 61 to 62. The panel has also taken into account the messages at pages 70 to 77. [Redacted].

f. On or around 5 November 2018, you sent messages to Individual A asking her not to tell anyone what had happened.

In relation to allegation 1f, the panel, as well as accepting Mr Bell's admission, had regard to the aforementioned email from Individual A dated 5 November 2018 at pages 61 to 62. The panel has also taken into account the messages at pages 78 to 80.

2. Your behaviour as may be found proven at allegation 1, took place in circumstances whereby you knew or ought to have known that Individual A had been a [redacted] student.

In respect of allegation 2, the panel, as well as accepting Mr Bell's admission, had regard to the evidence within Individual B's statement as to [redacted] and [redacted]. The panel also considered that Mr Bell had been Individual A's [redacted]. Therefore, Mr Bell would have been aware of her [redacted].

3. Your behaviour as may be found proven at allegation 1 (a)(i-v), (b) and (e) was conduct of a sexual nature and/or was sexually motivated.

With regard to allegation 3, the panel was satisfied that the conduct was of a sexual nature and that it was sexually motivated. The panel felt that there was no other reasonable explanation for this conduct except that it was sexually motivated.

4. Your behaviour as may be found proven at allegation 1(c), (d) and (f) demonstrated a lack of integrity and/or was dishonest.

In relation to allegation 4 insofar as it relates to allegations 1c and 1f, the panel found that this conduct was lacking in integrity. By seeking to influence what Individual A said to the School, Mr Bell's actions were highly inappropriate and did not meet the high standards required of a member of the teaching profession. However, the panel did not consider that this conduct was dishonest.

In respect of allegation 4 insofar as it relates to allegation 1d, the panel considered that Mr Bell deliberately gave the school a false account of what had occurred on the nights of 1 September 2018 and 2 September 2018. The motivation for this conduct was to seek to avoid any potential consequences for his actions of that night. The panel considered that this deception was lacking in integrity in that by not telling the truth Mr Bell did not meet the high standards required of a member of the teaching profession. The panel also considers this conduct to have been dishonest applying the standards of reasonable honest people.

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

Having found all of the particulars of the allegations proven, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proven 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 Mr Bell in relation to the facts found proven, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considered that by reference to Part Two, Mr Bell 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;
- ✓ Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Bell fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel also considered whether Mr Bell'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.

The panel noted that the Mr Bell's contact with Individual A took place outside of an education setting to the extent that she had recently left the School. However, the panel considers that, nevertheless, it was inappropriate for Mr Bell to engage in behaviour of a sexualised nature with a pupil who had left the School.

Mr Bell had previously taught Individual A [redacted] so he was aware of her [redacted]. Moreover, by engaging in this type of behaviour with Individual A, the panel considers

that Mr Bell was exploiting the influence he derived from having been her teacher. The panel considers Mr Bell's conduct to be a gross blurring of professional boundaries.

On both 3 September and 5 November 2018 Mr Bell sought to dissuade Individual A from giving a true account of what had taken place between them to the School. The motivation for this was an attempt to withhold the truth from his employer in order to protect his own position, reputation and employment. Although the panel has not found these acts to be dishonest, it has found that Mr Bell acted with a lack of integrity. Moreover, it considers that this conduct was extremely serious and was aggravated by it taking place on more than one occasion and the [redacted].

On 3 September 2018 Mr Bell, upon being questioned, gave the School a false account of the events of 1 September 2018 and 2 September 2018. The panel has found that this was a deliberate attempt to withhold the truth in order to avoid any potential consequences for his actions of that night. These actions were dishonest and must be considered a serious transgression from what is expected of a teacher.

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 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 therefore found that Mr Bell's actions constituted 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 and of other members of the public; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

Given the panel's findings against Mr Bell, which involved sexualised behaviour, having sex with a [redacted] former pupil and dishonestly misleading his employer, there was a strong public interest consideration in the protection of pupils and ex pupils.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously undermined if conduct such as that found against Mr Bell was 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 Mr Bell was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

The panel has 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 Bell. The panel has also taken into account that fact that Mr Bell is a science teacher, which is a subject where there is a shortage of teachers and the public interest in retaining science teachers within the profession. The panel has considered the references provided and relied upon by Mr Bell and the evidence from Individual B and Individual C as to his abilities as a teacher.

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 Mr Bell. The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours of a teacher have been proven. In the list of such behaviours, those that are relevant in this case are:

- ✓ serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- ✓ dishonesty especially where there have been serious consequences, and/or it has been repeated and/or covered up;
- ✓ sexual misconduct e.g. involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature and/or that use or exploit the trust, knowledge or influence derived from the individual's professional position;

Even though some of the behaviour found proven in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors. The panel considers that there are the following mitigating features:

- ✓ No previous disciplinary findings against Mr Bell;
- ✓ Admitted the allegations;

- ✓ Mr Bell's personal circumstances and health at the time of the conduct.
- ✓ The positive references provided for Mr Bell.

The panel carefully considered Mr Bell's personal circumstances and health issues that were being experienced at the time of the proven conduct. Whilst the panel is sympathetic to Mr Bell's personal circumstances it does not consider that these matters excuse or explain Mr Bell's behaviour.

Moreover, the panel notes that none of the testimonial referees have indicated that they are aware of the allegations. For this reason, the panel only gives limited weight to this evidence.

The panel first considered whether the publication of the findings made by the panel would be a sufficient sanction of itself.

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, a recommendation of no prohibition order would not be a proportionate and appropriate response. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings was sufficient in the case would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for the teacher 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 Mr Bell. The gross blurring of professional boundaries, the sexually motivated conduct with an ex pupil and the attempts to cover up his actions were 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 proven, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. These behaviours include serious dishonesty and serious sexual misconduct.

The panel has also considered carefully the degree of insight shown by Mr Bell and has concluded that despite having made admissions and engaged in medical care his insight is limited. The panel is not persuaded that Mr Bell has fully taken on board the reputational damage to the School and the profession or the potential harm to a [redacted] individual. The panel is not satisfied that Mr Bell has adequately recognised the serious nature of his dishonest conduct. The panel is concerned that Mr Bell has

sought to minimise the gravity of his behaviour by attributing his conduct to the personal and health issues he was experiencing at the time. The panel considers this to be a failure to take genuine responsibility for his actions.

Mr Bell's conduct is likely to be viewed by members of the public as reprehensible. The panel takes the view that Mr Bell's entire course of conduct renders him fundamentally incompatible with being a teacher.

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

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

I have given very careful consideration to this case and to the recommendation of the panel in respect of 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 the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. In this case, the panel has however found that in respect of allegation 4 where it refers to allegation 1c and 1 f and it has found lack of integrity and not dishonesty, but in respect of allegation 4 where it refers to allegation 1d it has found dishonesty. I have been careful to recognise that distinction in my considerations of this case.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Bell 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;
- ✓ Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of lack of integrity and dishonesty and also involve, as described by the panel, "this conduct was extremely serious and was aggravated by it taking place on more than one occasion and the [redacted]".

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 Bell, 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 panel considers that Mr Bell was exploiting the influence he derived from having been her teacher. The panel considers Mr Bell’s conduct to be a gross blurring of professional boundaries.” In addition the panel also say, “These actions were dishonest and must be considered a serious transgression from what is expected of a teacher.”

A prohibition order would therefore prevent such risks 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, “despite having made admissions and engaged in medical care his insight is limited. The panel is not persuaded that Mr Bell has fully taken on board the reputational damage to the School and the profession or the potential harm to a [redacted] individual. The panel is not satisfied that Mr Bell has adequately recognised the serious nature of his dishonest conduct. The panel is concerned that Mr Bell has sought to minimise the gravity of his behaviour by attributing his conduct to the personal and health issues he was experiencing at the time. The panel considers this to be a failure to take genuine responsibility for his actions.”

In my judgement, the lack of insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, “The findings of misconduct are serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual’s status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public perception.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of both lack of integrity and dishonesty in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

I have had to consider that the public has a high expectation of professional standards of all teachers and that 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 Mr Bell himself. The panel has noted some mitigating features:

- ✓ No previous disciplinary findings against Mr Bell;
- ✓ Admitted the allegations;
- ✓ Mr Bell's personal circumstances and health at the time of the conduct.
- ✓ The positive references provided for Mr Bell.

“The panel carefully considered Mr Bell's personal circumstances and health issues that were being experienced at the time of the proven conduct. Whilst the panel is sympathetic to Mr Bell's personal circumstances it does not consider that these matters excuse or explain Mr Bell's behaviour.

Moreover, the panel notes that none of the testimonial referees have indicated that they are aware of the allegations. For this reason, the panel only gives limited weight to this evidence.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Bell from teaching and would also clearly deprive the public of his contribution to the profession for the period that it is in force.

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel's comments concerning the lack of insight or remorse. The panel has also said, “The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Bell. The gross blurring of professional boundaries, the sexually motivated conduct with an ex pupil and the attempts to cover up his actions were a significant factor in forming that opinion.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that, “Mr Bell's entire course of conduct renders him fundamentally incompatible with being a teacher.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Bell 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 remorse or full 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 that no provision should be made for a review period.

I have considered 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 Mr Bell. The gross blurring of professional boundaries, the sexually motivated conduct with an ex pupil and the attempts to cover up his actions were a significant factor in forming that opinion."

I have considered whether allowing for no review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is proportionate to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, the following factors mean that a no review period is necessary to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are, the dishonesty found, the lack of integrity found, the lack of either insight or remorse, the gross blurring of professional boundaries and the sexually motivated conduct with an ex pupil.

I consider therefore that allowing for no review period is necessary to maintain public confidence and is proportionate and in the public interest.

This means that Mr David Bell is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. Furthermore, in view of the seriousness of the allegations found proven against him, I have decided that Mr David Bell 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 David Bell has a right of appeal to the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this order.



Decision maker: Alan Meyrick

Date: 22 August 2019

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