



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Stuart Blan: Professional conduct panel outcome**

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

**August 2022**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
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	14

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

<b>Teacher:</b>	Mr Stuart Blan
<b>Teacher ref number:</b>	9036640
<b>Teacher date of birth:</b>	7 June 1969
<b>TRA reference:</b>	17788
<b>Date of determination:</b>	17 August 2022
<b>Former employer:</b>	Clifton College, Bristol (1994-2000 and 2004), Canford College (2000-2003), British School Al Khubairat (2007-2017)

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 16 August 2022 remotely via Microsoft TEAMS to consider the case of Mr Blan.

The panel members were Ms Susan Humble (lay panellist – in the chair), Mr Paul Hawkins (lay panellist) and Mr Ian Hylan (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Sarah Price of Blake Morgan solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Ben Bentley of Browne Jacobson solicitors.

Mr Blan was not 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 16 May 2022.

It was alleged that Mr Blan was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that between 2004-2007:

1. Whilst employed as a teacher at Clifton College he failed to maintain a proper boundary appropriate to a teacher's professional position in that in the academic year 2004/2005 he had sexual relations with Pupil E.
2. Whilst employed as a teacher at Canford College he failed to treat pupils with dignity in that he used intimidatory behaviour and language in his role as a teacher.
3. In or before April 2007, he did not disclose to the British School Al Khubairat ('BSAK') that he had been a teacher at Clifton College in 2004.
4. His conduct as may be found proven in relation to Allegation 1 was sexually motivated.
5. His conduct as may be found proven in relation to Allegation 3 lacked integrity.

The panel was provided with a statement of agreed and disputed facts, within which Mr Blan admitted allegations 2, 3 and 5. Mr Blan did not accept allegations 1 and 4. In respect of the admitted facts, Mr Blan accepted these amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

## Preliminary applications

The panel first considered an application by the presenting officer to proceed in the absence of Mr Blan. The panel accepted the legal advice provided in relation to this application and took account of the various factors referred to it, as derived from the guidance set down in the case of *R v Jones* [2003] 1 AC 1 (as considered and applied in subsequent cases including *GMC v Adeogba* [2016] EWCA Civ 162). The panel was satisfied that the Notice of Proceedings ("the Notice") had been sent in accordance with the *Teacher Misconduct: Disciplinary Procedures for the Teaching Profession 2018*. The panel went on to consider whether to proceed in Mr Blan's absence. Mr Blan had been represented in respect of the preparation of his response to the allegations, including a statement of agreed and disputed facts that had been provided to the panel. There was written confirmation that Mr Blan was aware of the hearing and was content for it to

proceed in his absence. The panel determined that it should proceed in the absence of Mr Blan, for the following reasons:

- Mr Blan had not sought an adjournment on medical or any other grounds.
- The panel was satisfied that given Mr Blan's response to the Notice, his absence was voluntary, and he had waived his right to attend.
- There was no indication that Mr Blan might attend at a future date and an adjournment would be unlikely to result in his attendance at a later date.
- The panel was conscious that the witness had made arrangements and was ready to attend the hearing to provide their oral evidence.
- There is a strong public interest in hearings taking place within a reasonable timeframe.

The panel heard an application for additional documents to be admitted. These comprised of Mr Blan's witness statement with exhibits, a medical letter and a signed statement of agreed and disputed facts. This application was not opposed. The panel heard and accepted legal advice on this application. The panel determined that the documents were relevant to the issues it had to determine, and it was in the interests of a fair hearing for the documents to be admitted.

Finally, the panel also considered an application on behalf of Mr Blan for certain aspects to be heard in private. The TRA took a neutral stance. The panel considered and accepted legal advice on this matter. In the panel's view, there is a public interest in disciplinary proceedings being transparent but agreed that any aspects relating to Mr Blan's health would be heard in private and that should the press request any documents in relation to this matter, those aspects relating to health and details of any family names should be redacted. The panel also directed that any references to Pupil E's identity in the papers should be redacted.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section 1: Chronology – pages 2 to 3

Section 2: Notice of proceedings – pages 5 to 8

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 10 to 16

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 18 to 81

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 83 to 93

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

- Witness statement of Stuart Blan with exhibits, 10 August 2022 [pages 94 to 136]
- Medical letter, 11 January 2022 [page 137]
- Statement of agreed and disputed facts, 15 August 2022 [pages 138 to 143]

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**

The panel heard oral evidence from Pupil E, who was called by the TRA.

## **Decision and reasons**

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

Insofar as is relevant to the allegations; Mr Stuart Blan began teaching in 1994. He was employed at Clifton College ("the School") between 1994 to 2000 as a Science Teacher and thereafter an Assistant Housemaster. Mr Blan thereafter was employed at Canford College between 2000 and 2003 as a Physics Teacher and Hockey Coach. Mr Blan was re-employed at the School between September and November 2004. He was employed as a Physics Teacher and Head of Year from 1 September 2007 to 13 December 2017 at the British School Al Khubairat ('BSAK').

Whilst Mr Blan was employed at Canford College, allegations came to light that he had behaved inappropriately towards pupils and used intimidatory language. An investigation was conducted, and Mr Blan admitted to these allegations. Mr Blan resigned from his position as part of a mutual agreement with Canford College.

Whilst Mr Blan was employed at BSAK, in or around November 2017, allegations came to light that Mr Blan had formed a relationship with a former pupil (Pupil E) at the School in or around 2004 to 2005. BSAK were unaware that Mr. Blan had been re-employed by the School during 2004. A formal investigation was triggered whereby the allegations of an inappropriate relationship with Pupil E and Mr Blan's dishonesty in his employment chronology were considered. BSAK determined that Mr Blan had been dishonest about his employment chronology when applying for his position. Mr Blan resigned from his role at BSAK in 2017.

As part of BSAK's investigation, they contacted the School to confirm Mr Blan's dates of employment and investigate the allegations of an inappropriate relationship. This triggered a formal investigation by the School into the historical allegations of an inappropriate relationship with Pupil E during the academic year 2004 to 2005. The School determined that there was insufficient evidence to pursue the allegations against Mr Blan further.

## 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. Whilst employed as a teacher at Clifton College you failed to maintain a proper boundary appropriate to a teacher's professional position in that in the academic year 2004/2005 you had sexual relations with Pupil E.**

The panel heard evidence from Pupil E. The panel considered her evidence to be measured and candid. The panel was mindful that the events occurred many years ago, which may have impacted her memory and she readily accepted when her memory was not precise. The panel considered that Pupil E did not embellish matters and was able to describe how the relationship with Mr Blan had developed.

Pupil E explained how she first met Mr Blan in September 2004, when he became a House Parent at Oakley House (at the School), where she was a [redacted]. She explained that extra [redacted] training sessions were offered by Mr Blan during the first term and these quickly turned in to one to one session, on at least a weekly basis. She explained that during these sessions there was "flirtation", which she said included touching during training that she had not experienced with other coaches previously. Pupil E explained that Mr Blan had offered her driving practice.

On one occasion during that first term at the School, she explained that during a drive, Mr Blan stopped near a woodland, and they kissed in the car. During her evidence, Pupil E stated that this was the first kiss between them and described it as "snogging". Pupil E recalled further occasions at the School when she and Mr Blan kissed. One of these was in the [redacted] department, in a room used by staff not pupils. Pupil E described that Mr Blan guided her into the room and kissed her, before they returned to their respective lessons. The panel found as a fact that the kissing as described by Pupil E constituted sexual relations.

During her evidence Pupil E stated that the relationship developed quickly, and they had sexual intercourse shortly after the occasion when they kissed in the car. The panel found that at this point, Mr Blan was still teaching lessons at the School, until told not to

do so by the School from 18 November 2004. It was accepted by both Mr Blan and Pupil E that after this the relationship continued into the summer of 2005.

Mr Blan did not give live evidence. In his statement, he admitted that he had sexual relations with Pupil E in the academic year 2004/05 from December 2004 onwards but denied that he developed an inappropriate relationship with Pupil E during his employment at the School. The panel did not accept that evidence, it preferred the evidence of Pupil E.

Mr Blan stated that in early December, he spoke to Pupil E's parents to ask if he could date their daughter. The panel found that a relationship between Mr Blan and Pupil E had already formed by this stage.

The panel considered that Mr Blan had failed to maintain appropriate boundaries. In particular, Mr Blan stated in his witness statement that Pupil E had "*made a flirtatious comment*" when he first started coaching her. Pupil E stated in her oral evidence that they had both been flirtatious and that Mr Blan had made comments about being distracted. However, the flirtation had started, the panel considered that the responsibility was on Mr Blan, the responsible adult, to discourage any inappropriate behaviour and report it to the appropriate senior leader.

The panel assessed the weight and reliability of the evidence, and on the balance of probabilities, it found that a sexual relationship had developed whilst Mr Blan was a teacher at the school. Therefore, this allegation is found proved.

**2. Whilst employed as a teacher at Canford College you failed to treat pupils with dignity in that you used intimidatory behaviour and language in your role as a teacher.**

This allegation was admitted by Mr Blan and was supported by the evidence available to the panel. In particular, the panel noted that when Mr Blan was presented with these allegations on or around 29 November 2002, he admitted that he had been "extremely unprofessional both in his teaching and in the way he spoke to and sometimes treated pupils."

Therefore, this allegation was found proved.

**3. In or before April 2007, you did not disclose to the British School Al Khubairat ('BSAK') that you had been a teacher at Clifton College in 2004.**

This allegation was admitted by Mr Blan and was supported by the evidence available to the panel. It was therefore found proved.



#### **4. Your conduct as may be found proven in relation to Allegation 1 was sexually motivated.**

For the reasons set out above in respect of Allegation 1, the panel found that a sexual relationship had developed between Mr Blan and Pupil E prior to him leaving employment at the School. The panel noted that on both the accounts of Pupil E and Mr Blan, a sexual relationship did form between them and lasted until summer 2005.

The panel considered the definition of sexual motivation as set out in Section 8 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003, namely

- "A sexual motivation means that the conduct was done either:
  - in pursuit of sexual gratification or
  - In pursuit of a sexual relationship"

The panel found that Mr Blan's conduct as proven at allegation 1 was sexually motivated in that it was in pursuit of a sexual relationship.

The panel assessed the weight and reliability of the evidence, and on the balance of probabilities, it found this allegation proved.

#### **5. Your conduct as may be found proven in relation to Allegation 3 lacked integrity.**

This allegation was admitted by Mr Blan and was supported by the evidence available to the panel. It was therefore found proved.

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

Having found all 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 Mr Blan in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Blan was in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by

- treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
- having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Blan amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession. Mr Blan had breached boundaries by engaging in a sexual relationship with a pupil, failed to treat pupils with dignity by using intimidatory behaviour and language, and been found to be lacking integrity in that he failed to disclose his full employment history.

The panel also considered whether Mr Blan's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice. The panel found that the offence of sexual activity and sexual communication with a child was relevant. The Advice indicates that where behaviours associated with such an offence exist, a panel is likely to conclude that an individual's conduct would amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mr Blan 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 proven allegations relate to Mr Blan's conduct across three different schools.

The panel was provided with evidence that there were rumours, at the time, relating to an inappropriate relationship between a teacher and pupil during Mr Blan's employment at the School. There was also evidence that this had resulted in a notice being placed in the School advising people not to speak to the press.

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

Having found the facts proved, the panel further found that Mr Blan'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/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, protection of pupils, the protection of other members of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession, declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Blan there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils, given the serious findings of an inappropriate sexual relationship with a pupil and the failure to treat pupils with dignity by using intimidatory behaviour and language.

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

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 Mr Blan.

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 Blan.

The panel considered the medical evidence submitted on behalf of Mr Blan and noted Mr Blan's issues in or around 2002 and indeed, those more recently. However, the panel found that the [redacted] that they related to his conduct. Further the panel was not provided with any contemporaneous [redacted] in relation to the allegations that took place in 2004. Therefore, the panel did not find that these outweighed the public interest considerations.

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 safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving vulnerable pupils);
- an abuse of any trust, knowledge, or influence gained through their professional position in order to advance a romantic or sexual relationship with a pupil or former pupil;
- 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;
- failure to act on evidence that indicated a child's welfare may have been at risk e.g. failed to notify the designated safeguarding lead and/or make a referral to children's social care, the police or other relevant agencies when abuse, neglect and/or harmful cultural practices were identified;
- failure in their duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to a risk or failing to promote the safety and welfare of the children (as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE);
- sustained or serious bullying, or other deliberate behaviour that undermines pupils, the profession, the school or colleagues;
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions or purposeful destruction of evidence, especially where these behaviours have been repeated or had serious consequences, or involved the coercion of another person to act in a way contrary to their own interests;

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 evidence that Mr Blan's actions were deliberate. There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Blan was acting under duress. The panel noted the concerns were across three schools and took place over a period of time.

The TRA confirmed Mr Blan had no previous disciplinary history. The panel was provided with references on behalf of Mr Blan. The panel considered that whilst these were positive, they had been collated for another purpose in 2019 and were not up to date. The panel also noted that the references dated from a time after the date the offences occurred.

The panel determined that that there was no evidence that Mr Blan had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal or professional conduct that contributed significantly to the education sector.

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 Mr Blan 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 Blan. The seriousness of the findings against Mr Blan, which included an inappropriate sexual relationship with a pupil aged [redacted] 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. These behaviours include serious sexual misconduct, such as where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons, particularly where the individual has used his professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons and any sexual misconduct involving a child.

The panel found that Mr Blan was responsible for breaching boundaries by having a sexual relationship with a pupil. Whilst Mr Blan had made an expression of remorse, the panel did not find that he had genuine understanding and remorse for his actions. In his statement, Mr Blan had not accepted that he had a sexual relationship with a pupil whilst still teaching. The panel acknowledged Mr Blan's evidence that at the time he had been in an [redacted], but the panel considered that this did not justify engaging in a relationship with a pupil. The panel was not reassured that other pupils would not be at risk of harm if Mr Blan was allowed to continue to teach.

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 provisions for a review period.

## **Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State**

I have given very careful consideration to this case and to the recommendation of the panel in respect of 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 Mr Stuart Blan should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Blan is in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
  - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was also, “satisfied that the conduct of Mr Blan amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.”

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of both sexually motivated behaviour and lack of integrity.

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 Blan, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children and safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, “The panel found that the offence of sexual activity and sexual communication with a child was relevant.” 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, “Whilst Mr Blan had made an expression of remorse, the panel did not find that he had genuine understanding and remorse for his actions. In his statement, Mr Blan had not accepted that he had a sexual relationship with a pupil whilst still teaching.” In my judgement, the lack of full insight or 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 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.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of sexually motivated misconduct and lack of integrity 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 Blan himself. The panel comment “The panel determined that that there was no evidence that Mr Blan had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal or professional conduct that contributed significantly to the education sector.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Blan 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 seriousness of the findings against Mr Blan, which included an inappropriate sexual relationship with a pupil aged [redacted] was a significant factor in forming that opinion.”

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

I have considered the panel’s comments “In his statement, Mr Blan had not accepted that he had a sexual relationship with a pupil whilst still teaching. The panel acknowledged Mr Blan’s evidence that at the time he had been in an [redacted] but the panel considered that this did not justify engaging in a relationship with a pupil. The panel was not reassured that other pupils would not be at risk of harm if Mr Blan was allowed to continue to teach.”




I have considered whether not allowing a 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 factors which mean that a no review period is necessary are the sexual misconduct, the lack of integrity and the lack of either full insight or remorse.

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 Stuart Blan is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England.** Furthermore, in view of the seriousness of the allegations found proved against him, I have decided that Mr Stuart Blan shall not be entitled to apply for restoration of his eligibility to teach.

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

Mr Stuart Blan has a right of appeal to the King's Bench Division of the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this order.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Alan Meyrick', with a vertical line at the end.

**Decision maker: Alan Meyrick**

**Date: 19 August 2022**

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