



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr David Chidlow: Professional conduct panel meeting 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	4
Documents	4
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	13

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

Teacher:	Mr David Chidlow
Teacher ref number:	0659625
Teacher date of birth:	1 April 1963
TRA reference:	20102
Date of determination:	24 August 2022
Former employer:	Maidstone Grammar School, Kent

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ('the panel') of the Teaching Regulation Agency ('the TRA') convened on 24 August 2022 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr David Chidlow.

The panel members were Ms Penny Griffith (lay panellist – in the chair), Mr Nigel Shock (lay panellist) and Mr Ian Hylan (teacher panellist).

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

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Chidlow that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Chidlow provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, Ms Louise Ravenscroft of Capsticks solicitors LLP, Mr Chidlow or any representative for Mr Chidlow.

The meeting took place in private by way of a virtual meeting.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 25 July 2022.

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

1. On one or more occasions accessed pornographic material on an adult website:
 - a) using his school laptop; and/ or
 - b) whilst responsible for teaching a lesson to pupils via Microsoft Teams;
2. On one or more occasions engaged in 'sex chats' on an adult website:
 - a) using his school laptop; and/or
 - b) whilst responsible for teaching a lesson to pupils via Microsoft Teams;
3. On one or more occasions, he deleted the internet history on his school laptop in an attempt to conceal the material that he had accessed; and
4. His conduct at 3 above was dishonest.

Mr Chidlow admitted the facts of allegations 1 to 4 and that his behaviour amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, as set out in the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Chidlow on 9 March 2022.

Preliminary applications

There were no preliminary applications.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

- Section 1: Chronology and list of key people – pages 4 to 6
- Section 2: Notice of referral, response and notice of meeting – pages 7 to 18
- Section 3: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 19 to 25

- Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 26 to 388
- Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 389 to 399

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

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Chidlow on 9 March 2022.

Decision and reasons

The panel carefully considered the case and reached the following decision and reasons:

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

Mr Chidlow was employed as a teacher of business studies and economics at Maidstone Grammar School ('the School') since 7 September 2018. Mr Chidlow was delivering lessons for both GCSE and A-level pupils.

On 26 February 2021, [redacted] reported that the School's monitoring software had flagged up some key words "*I take my life*" from a staff members school device. These key words prompted an investigation.

As a result of the investigation, [redacted] found that Mr Chidlow was the teacher in question and that he had been accessing an adult pornographic website known as Adultwork.com on his school laptop on 26 February 2021 and 1 March 2021.

Remote monitoring of Mr Chidlow's laptop had been undertaken on 26 February 2021 and 1 March 2021 by the School, without Mr Chidlow's knowledge. [redacted] recorded and took screen shots of the websites and material that Mr Chidlow was accessing. At the time that the websites were accessed, Mr Chidlow was teaching a Year [redacted] class via MS Teams.

[redacted] monitoring further revealed that Mr Chidlow was 'flicking' back and forth between his MS Teams screen, whilst he was teaching, and the Adultwork.com website. Mr Chidlow was also recorded deleting the Adultwork.com website from his internet history on 26 February 2021 and 1 March 2021.

At the conclusion of the School's investigation, a formal disciplinary hearing took place on 19 May 2021. At the conclusion of the disciplinary hearing the panel directed that Mr Chidlow be summarily dismissed for gross misconduct.

Mr Chidlow's employment ended on 31 May 2021.

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 one or more occasions accessed pornographic material on an adult website:

a) using your school laptop; and/ or

b) whilst responsible for teaching a lesson to pupils via Microsoft Teams;

The panel noted that within a statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Chidlow on 9 March 2022, Mr Chidlow admitted the facts of allegations 1(a) and 1(b). Further, Mr Chidlow admitted that his actions amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Mr Chidlow admitted that on 26 February 2021, whilst teaching Year [redacted] pupils using MS Teams from his school laptop, he was accessing Adultwork.com on the same laptop and simultaneously browsing the profiles of females. Mr Chidlow admitted that he went in between the live school lesson and Adultwork.com on multiple occasions.

Mr Chidlow further admitted that on 1 March 2021, whilst teaching Year [redacted] pupils using MS Teams from his school laptop, he was accessing Adultwork.com simultaneously on the same laptop, browsing profiles of females. Mr Chidlow admitted that he went in between the live school lesson and Adultwork.com on multiple occasions.

Mr Chidlow accepts that he should not have been accessing Adultwork.com using the School's laptop at any time. Mr Chidlow admitted that he accessed Adultwork.com a total of 74 times during his contractual hours as a teacher. Mr Chidlow further admitted that he sought images from females on Adultwork.com for sexual gratification, which he saved onto the Schools laptop.

Notwithstanding the admissions made, the panel considered the evidence provided in the bundle and made its own determination based on the evidence available to it.

The panel noted documentation within the bundle evidencing Mr Chidlow's access to Adultwork.com. This included profiles that had been viewed and images that had been saved.

On examination of the documents before them, and the admissions in the signed statement of agreed facts, the panel was satisfied that allegations 1(a) and 1(b) were proven.

2. On one or more occasions engaged in ‘sex chats’ on an adult website:

a) using your school laptop; and/or

b) whilst responsible for teaching a lesson to pupils via Microsoft Teams;

The panel noted that within a statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Chidlow on 9 March 2022, Mr Chidlow admitted the facts of allegations 2(a) and 2(b).

Mr Chidlow admitted that he did access Adultwork.com using his school laptop on various occasions between 18 February 2021 and 1 March 2021. Mr Chidlow admitted that he was communicating with females during this time, through his Yahoo email account using his school laptop. Mr Chidlow admitted that he was actively sending emails to different females with profiles on Adultwork.com whilst he was responsible for teaching pupils. Mr Chidlow admitted that the nature of the emails exchanged with the females from Adultwork.com was for sexual gratification. During the communications, Mr Chidlow was discussing his sexual interests and this included requesting photographs from the females which were saved onto the School’s laptop.

Notwithstanding the admissions made, the panel considered the evidence provided in the bundle and made its own determination based on the evidence available to it.

The panel noted documentation within the bundle evidencing Mr Chidlow’s access to Adultwork.com. This included messages that had been sent and received between Mr Chidlow and females whilst he was teaching a class.

On examination of the documents before them, and the admissions in the signed statement of agreed facts, the panel was satisfied that allegations 2(a) and 2(b) were proven.

3. On one or more occasions, you deleted the internet history on your school laptop in an attempt to conceal the material that you had accessed;

The panel noted that within a statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Chidlow on 9 March 2022, Mr Chidlow admitted the facts of allegation 3.

Mr Chidlow admitted that on 26 February 2021 at 15:36pm he deleted his browsing history from his school laptop; he completed this action whilst also chatting to a pupil through MS Teams. Mr Chidlow admitted that he also deleted his browsing history from the schools laptop on 1 March 2021 at 1:22am. Mr Chidlow admitted that the purpose of deleting the internet history was an attempt to conceal that he had been accessing

Adultwork.com using the School's device and during the School day when he was teaching pupils.

Notwithstanding the admissions made, the panel considered the evidence provided in the bundle and made its own determination based on the evidence available to it.

On examination of the documents before them, and the admissions in the signed statement of agreed facts, the panel was satisfied that allegation 3 was proven.

4. Your conduct at 3 above was dishonest.

The panel noted that within a statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Chidlow on 9 March 2022, Mr Chidlow admitted the facts of allegation 4.

Mr Chidlow admitted that the deleting of his internet browsing history on 26 February 2021 and 1 March 2021 amounted to dishonesty.

Notwithstanding the admissions made, the panel considered the evidence provided in the bundle and made its own determination based on the evidence available to it.

The panel considered the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd t/a Crockford* [2017] UKSC 67, in which the test for dishonesty in criminal matters was set out. The panel was satisfied that the evidence in the bundle supported that Mr Chidlow had deliberately and wilfully deleted the internet history on the School laptop in an attempt to conceal the material that he had accessed. The panel noted that Mr Chidlow had deleted his internet browsing history on more than one occasion. The panel considered Mr Chidlow's actions to be both dishonest by his own standards and those of ordinary decent people.

On examination of the documents before them, and the admission in the signed statement of agreed facts, the panel was satisfied that allegation 4 was proven.

In summary the panel found allegations 1(a), 1(b), 2(a), 2(b), 3 and 4 proven.

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

Having found 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 Chidlow, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Chidlow was in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school by:
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance;
- 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 Chidlow fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel considered whether Mr Chidlow's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice. The Advice indicates that where behaviours associated with an offence such as fraud or serious dishonesty exists, a panel is more likely to conclude that an individual's conduct would amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel noted that the allegations took place within an education setting and during the teaching day. Further it was noted that Mr Chidlow used a School laptop to access pornographic material and engage in 'sex chats' on an adult website which was in clear contravention of both the School's policies, which Mr Chidlow had signed and agreed to, and the Teaching Standards.

The panel had regard to the fact that no pupils were physically present at the time Mr Chidlow was accessing pornographic material and engaging in sex chats. However, the panel noted that pupils were present remotely as Mr Chidlow was engaging in this activity whilst teaching classes online.

The panel considered Mr Chidlow's actions to be a serious safeguarding risk and a breach of the Keeping Children Safe in Education statutory guidance. By flicking between the live school lesson and Adultwork.com the panel considered that Mr Chidlow could easily have inadvertently shared pornographic material with pupils. Further, the panel noted that if material had been inadvertently shared, Mr Chidlow would not have had any control over who would have had sight of the material. In addition to the pupils there was

a risk that other family members, including children, could have seen it. The panel noted that there was no evidence before them that any material was shared by Mr Chidlow. Nevertheless, the panel considered that the risk was created by Mr Chidlow on multiple occasions.

The panel was in no doubt that Mr Chidlow's behaviour would damage the public's perception of the teaching profession and there were public interest factors to consider.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mr Chidlow was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel took into account the way the teaching profession is viewed by others and considered the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community. The panel also took account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils' lives and the fact that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way they behave.

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

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

Having found the facts of particulars 1(a), 1(b), 2(a), 2(b), 3 and 4 proved, the panel further found that Mr Chidlow's conduct amounted to both unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be made, the panel had to consider whether it would be an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it would be in the public interest to do so. Prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely: the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public.

the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct; and that prohibition strikes the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest, if they are in conflict.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Chidlow which involved accessing pornographic sites and engaging in sex chats from his school laptop whilst teaching, there was a strong public interest consideration.

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

Notwithstanding the clear public interest considerations that were present, the panel discussed thoroughly whether or not it would be proportionate to impose a prohibition order, taking into account the effect that this would have on Mr Chidlow.

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

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- failure in their duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk or failing to promote the safety and welfare of the children (as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE);
- 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.

The panel regarded Mr Chidlow's actions as deliberate and noted that there was not any evidence to suggest that he was acting under extreme duress.

The panel was not presented with any mitigation evidence by Mr Chidlow nor any current references or testimonials to attest to his previous history as a teacher.

The panel was not presented with any evidence which demonstrates that Mr Chidlow has exceptionally high standards in both personal and professional conduct. The panel noted the contents of a reference provided to the School in 2018 when Mr Chidlow applied for his teaching position. In the absence of more recent evidence the panel did not consider that Mr Chidlow had contributed significantly to the education sector.

The panel acknowledged that at the time of his behaviour Mr Chidlow stated that he was experiencing difficult family circumstances. The panel noted that this was uncorroborated. Having balanced the comprehensive evidence provided by the School and risk of harm to pupils' the panel attributed little weight to Mr Chidlow's comments about his family circumstances.

The panel considered that Mr Chidlow had demonstrated some insight in to his actions. The panel however did not find any evidence that Mr Chidlow expressed remorse in respect of either the pupils, the School or the teaching profession. On the information before it, the panel was not satisfied that the risk of repetition of behaviour had been reduced.

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 Chidlow 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 Chidlow. The safeguarding risk posed, the seriousness of his actions including dishonesty and lack of evidence before the panel that there was a reduced risk of repetition, were significant factors 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 two years.

The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. The panel found that Mr Chidlow was not responsible for any such behaviours.

The Advice also indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer review period. One of these behaviours includes fraud or serious dishonesty. The panel found that Mr Chidlow was dishonest when he tried to clear his internet history on the School's laptop.

The panel considered Mr Chidlow's behaviour to be extremely serious, a significant breach of the Teachers' Standards and a safeguarding risk. He simultaneously accessed Adultwork.com and live school lessons on multiple occasions then dishonestly attempted to conceal his actions by deleting his internet browser history. The lack of mitigation presented led the panel to conclude that they did not have confidence that there was not a risk of repetition of behaviour.

The panel therefore 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 David Chidlow should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school by:
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance;
- 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 Chidlow, involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE).

The panel finds that the conduct of Mr Chidlow fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they involved accessing pornographic sites and engaging in sex chats from his school laptop whilst teaching and behaviour found to be dishonest.

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 Chidlow, 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 considered, "Mr Chidlow's behaviour to be extremely serious, a significant breach of the Teachers' Standards and a safeguarding risk. He simultaneously accessed Adultwork.com and live school lessons on multiple occasions then dishonestly attempted to conceal his actions by deleting his internet

browser history. The lack of mitigation presented led the panel to conclude that they did not have confidence that there was not a risk of repetition of behaviour.” A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel’s comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows, “The panel considered that Mr Chidlow had demonstrated some insight in to his actions. The panel however did not find any evidence that Mr Chidlow expressed remorse in respect of either the pupils, the School or the teaching profession. On the information before it, the panel was not satisfied that the risk of repetition of behaviour had been reduced.” In my judgement, the lack of 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 was in no doubt that Mr Chidlow’s behaviour would damage the public’s perception of the teaching profession and there were public interest factors to consider.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of 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 Chidlow and the panel comment “The panel was not presented with any evidence which demonstrates that Mr Chidlow has exceptionally high standards in both personal and professional conduct. The panel noted the contents of a reference provided to the School in 2018 when Mr Chidlow applied for his teaching position. In the absence of more recent evidence the panel did not consider that Mr Chidlow had contributed significantly to the education sector.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Chidlow from teaching. A prohibition order 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 following comments, “The panel noted that the allegations took place within an education setting and during the teaching

day. Further it was noted that Mr Chidlow used a School laptop to access pornographic material and engage in 'sex chats' on an adult website which was in clear contravention of both the School's policies, which Mr Chidlow had signed and agreed to, and the Teaching Standards."

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel that "The panel considered Mr Chidlow's actions to be a serious safeguarding risk and a breach of the Keeping Children Safe in Education statutory guidance. By flicking between the live school lesson and Adultwork.com the panel considered that Mr Chidlow could easily have inadvertently shared pornographic material with pupils. Further, the panel noted that if material had been inadvertently shared, Mr Chidlow would not have had any control over who would have had sight of the material. In addition to the pupils there was a risk that other family members, including children, could have seen it."

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Chidlow 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, 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 Advice also indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer review period. One of these behaviours includes fraud or serious dishonesty. The panel found that Mr Chidlow was dishonest when he tried to clear his internet history on the School's laptop."

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 allowing for no review period is necessary are the seriousness of the case, resulting in a safeguarding risk, the dishonesty found and lack of 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 David Chidlow 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 Chidlow 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 Chidlow 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 black ink, appearing to read 'S Buxcey', with a horizontal line underneath.

Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey

Date: 31 August 2022

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