



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr John Dadds: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

October 2022

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Witnesses	6
Decision and reasons	6
Findings of fact	6
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

Teacher:	Mr John Dadds
Teacher ref number:	9740799
Teacher date of birth:	12 October 1958
TRA reference:	18587
Date of determination:	10 October 2022
Former employer:	The Compass Learning Centre (PRU), Weymouth

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ('the panel') of the Teaching Regulation Agency ('the TRA') convened on 27 and 28 June and on 4, 6 and 10 October 2022 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr John Dadds.

The panel members were Mr Diarmuid Bunting (lay panellist – in the chair), Mr Peter Ward (lay panellist) and Ms Fiona Angel (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Josie Beal of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Andrew Cullen of Browne Jacobson LLP solicitors.

Mr Dadds was present and was represented by Ms Denise Robinson of NASUWT.

The hearing took place by way of a virtual hearing in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 6 April 2022.

It was alleged that Mr Dadds was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst employed as a teacher of ICT and geography at the Compass Learning Centre on or around 2 May 2019, he:

1. Inappropriately handled Pupil A during an ICT lesson; and
2. His behaviour as may be found proven at allegation 1 above was despite previous advice given to him by senior staff members regarding appropriate contact with pupils.

Mr Dadds denied the allegations.

Preliminary applications

The panel noted that since the date of the referral to the TRA in this case, new 'Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession' were published in May 2020 (the "May 2020 Procedures"). The panel understands that the earlier provisions contained within the 'Teacher misconduct: disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession' updated in April 2018 (the "April 2018 Procedures") apply to this case, given that those provisions applied when the referral was made. Although the panel has the power to direct that the May 2020 Procedures should apply in the interests of justice or the public interest, the panel had received no representations that this should be the case. For the avoidance of doubt, therefore, the panel confirms that it has applied the April 2018 Procedures in this case.

Application to admit additional documents

At the outset of the hearing, the panel considered a preliminary application for the admission of additional documents.

The documents were:

- A table prepared by Mr Dadds setting out a list of discrepancies between the version of the disciplinary meeting minutes included in the TRA's section of the bundle and the version included in the teacher's section of the bundle.
- An un-redacted copy of page 261 of the hearing bundle. Mr Dadds objected to this page being redacted and wanted the panel to consider the page without redactions.

The panel heard representations from the presenting officer and teacher's representative in respect of the application. The presenting officer did not object to the documents being admitted.

The documents subject to the application had not been served in accordance with the requirements of April 2018 Procedures. Therefore, the panel was required to decide whether the documents should be admitted under paragraph 4.25 of the April 2018 Procedures.

The panel considered the additional documents were relevant. Accordingly, the documents were added to the bundle at pages 402 to 403 and 404.

The hearing was adjourned on 28 June 2022 and reconvened on 4 October 2022. During the adjournment Mr Dadds provided an updated version of the table he had prepared setting out a list of discrepancies in respect of the disciplinary meeting minutes. The presenting officer did not object to this document. The panel considered this in place of the table previously provided.

At the point of the adjournment on 28 June 2022, the TRA had concluded its evidence in respect of this matter. Mr Dadds was to begin his evidence on 4 October 2022. Although Mr Dadds was represented by Ms Robinson, he requested that he be permitted to read out a statement he had prepared and to show CCTV footage of the incident to which this matter relates. The presenting officer did not object to this proposal. Mr Dadds provided the panel and presenting officer with a copy of the statement he had prepared.

The panel noted that this was not in accordance with normal procedure and acknowledged that a statement prepared during an adjournment and not served in accordance with the April 2018 Procedures could result in unfairness and/or prejudice. However, the panel decided to exercise its discretion on this occasion to allow Mr Dadds to give evidence in this manner. The panel did not consider that, in the context of this matter and given the content of the statement, Mr Dadds' proposal would result in unfairness or prejudice to the TRA. Mr Dadds' written statement was adduced as evidence as part of these proceedings.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

- Section 1: Notice of proceedings – pages 6 to 16
- Section 2: Witness statements – pages 18 to 48

- Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 50 to 257
- Section 4: Teacher documents – pages 259 to 401
- CCTV evidence – provided separately

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

- A table prepared by Mr Dadds setting out a list of discrepancies between the version of the disciplinary meeting minutes included in the TRA's section of the bundle and the version included in the Teacher's section of the bundle (and an updated version of this table).
- An un-redacted copy of page 261 of the hearing bundle.

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 the following witnesses called by the TRA:

- Individual A

Mr Dadds gave oral evidence at the hearing.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

Mr Dadds was employed by The Compass Learning Centre (a pupil referral unit) ('the School'), as a teacher of ICT and geography from 1 September 2013.

On 2 May 2019, whilst Mr Dadds was teaching an ICT lesson an incident occurred with Pupil A, which resulted in Mr Dadds seeking to physically restrain Pupil A.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

1. Inappropriately handled Pupil A during an ICT lesson;

The panel heard oral evidence from Mr Dadds and from Individual A. The panel also viewed CCTV footage of the incident.

Individual A explained that Pupil A had joined the School in [redacted] from his previous school. At the time of the incident the School was in the early stages of creating an individual student education, behaviour, care and health plan for Pupil A (“the Plan”). Individual A’s evidence was that such plans are implemented after three serious behavioural incidents.

Mr Dadds was teaching an ICT lesson to a [redacted] class (which included Pupil A) on 2 May 2019. He was experiencing some issues with his IT equipment and allowed the pupils to play on computer games until he was ready to start the planned lesson. When Mr Dadds was ready to commence the lesson, he used some software to block the computer games, causing Pupil A to react in a negative manner.

As a result of this, Pupil A was going to leave the classroom. Before he left the classroom Mr Dadds warned him about the loss of rewards and sanctions as a result of his behaviour. Individual A’s evidence was that this warning was inappropriate and triggered the events that then unfolded. The Plan stated that staff members should avoid reminding Pupil A of consequences. Mr Dadds accepted that he was aware of this but explained that he taught this class four times a week and was familiar with the pupils. He said that the pupils in the class had a strong sense of injustice and he felt that, if Pupil A were allowed to leave the classroom and work elsewhere without consequences, the other pupils would perceive Pupil A as having been rewarded for his bad behaviour.

Following this exchange, Pupil A became visibly angry and frustrated. Mr Dadds told the panel that Pupil A said he was going to “smash up” Mr Dadds’ laptop, or words to that effect. The CCTV footage clearly showed Pupil A approaching Mr Dadds in an angry and aggressive manner.

Mr Dadds was initially standing in front of the laptop trying to protect it, with an open stance. The CCTV footage showed Pupil A pushing Mr Dadds’ laptop along a desk. Mr Dadds told the panel that he conducted a dynamic risk assessment and was concerned that Pupil A would attempt to damage or throw his laptop thus injuring another pupil or staff member. Following his risk assessment, Mr Dadds attempted to use a “Team Teach” hold on Pupil A, known as a “T Wrap”. Mr Dadds’ evidence was that unfortunately and unintentionally it did not work; the hold was far more difficult than he had anticipated due to Pupil A’s strength (which Mr Dadds did not expect from a [redacted] pupil). Mr Dadds fell against a desk and Pupil A kicked Mr Dadds whilst he was on the ground.

In an undated letter to the TRA Mr Dadds submitted that he had been trained in Team Teach and used those skills during the incident to the best of his ability. Mr Dadds

explained that the physical contact which occurred was in order to fulfil his duty of care to pupils and staff that were present; Mr Dadds believed Pupil A was an immediate risk to others in the room and valuable equipment.

Individual A was called to deal with the incident (after it had taken place) and subsequently viewed the CCTV footage. Individual A was concerned by what she saw on the footage. She said she could not see any legal or ethical conditions for the attempted use of restraint being used on Pupil A. She did not believe that the technique applied was a Team Teach "T Wrap". In addition, she was concerned that the attempt seemed too long in duration and without any positive outcome in mind.

The panel noted that, in accordance with s93(1) of the Education and Inspections Act 2006, teachers are permitted to use "*such force as is reasonable in the circumstances*" for the purposes of preventing a pupil from causing personal injury to or damage to the property of any person.

The panel also took into account the guidance set out in the Department for Education's use of reasonable force: advice for headteachers, staff and governing bodies July 2013. The panel noted that the guidance states that reasonable force can be used to prevent pupils from hurting themselves or others, from damaging property or from causing disorder. The guidance further states: "*Reasonable in the circumstances means using no more force than is needed*" and "*The use of force is reasonable if it is proportionate to the consequences it is intended to prevent. This means the degree of force used should be no more than is needed to achieve the desired result*".

The panel accepted Mr Dadds' evidence that he was concerned that Pupil A may damage the laptop and/or cause injury himself or others. The panel also accepted that, although the CCTV footage did not have sound, based on the evidence before the panel, it was more likely than not that Pupil A threatened to damage the laptop.

The panel did not believe that Mr Dadds acted with anger or malice; he appeared to be calm in the CCTV footage. However, the panel did not consider that the physical contact with Pupil A was proportionate to the consequences it was intended to protect. The panel was of the view that Mr Dadds used more force than was needed. In the circumstances, Mr Dadds should have given Pupil A a verbal warning and/or sought assistance from Individual B present in the room, or the senior leadership team, in order to seek to de-escalate the situation before resorting to the use of force. The panel considered that the use of force ought to be a last resort and it believed that Mr Dadds had lost control of the situation and made a poor decision.

The panel concluded that Mr Dadds had not used reasonable force in accordance with s93(1) of the Education and Inspections Act 2006 and the Department for Education's

guidance. As such, the panel concluded that Mr Dadds had handled Pupil A inappropriately during an ICT lesson on 2 May 2019.

The panel found allegation 1 proven.

2. Your behaviour as may be found proven at allegation 1 above was despite previous advice given to you by senior staff members regarding appropriate contact with pupils.

The bundle of documents before the panel contained evidence of informal discussions within which Mr Dadds was given advice regarding appropriate contact with pupils, on/around: 12 May 2016, 2 February 2017, 4 October 2017 and 12 October 2017.

In his oral evidence, Mr Dadds accepted that he had received this advice from senior staff members regarding contact with pupils. He told the panel that this advice was not given formally, it was not placed on his record, and he was not subject to any disciplinary action or warnings before the incident occurred on 2 May 2019. Mr Dadds submitted that this advice was given to protect him, rather than to protect pupils.

Individual A stated that she had spoken to Mr Dadds informally about positive handling, physical handling and managing situations to prevent the need to resort to physically handling pupils. Individual A said that other senior colleagues had also spoken to Mr Dadds regarding these matters.

On examination of the evidence before it, it was clear to the panel that Mr Dadds had received advice from senior staff members regarding appropriate contact with pupils. The panel was not compelled by Mr Dadds' explanation that the advice was not formal and was given to protect him. In the panel's view, the key point was that Mr Dadds had received this advice.

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions

The panel considered whether Mr Dadds' conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice but did not find any of these offences to be relevant.

The panel understood that Mr Dadds was in a pressurised situation and that he made a split second decision to attempt a "T Wrap" on Pupil A. However, the panel considered that this was a poor decision in the circumstances; Mr Dadds knew Pupil A and was familiar with his behaviour and possible reaction. There were other actions Mr Dadds could and should have explored to seek to de-escalate the situation before resorting to physical contact. Furthermore, the panel considered that Mr Dadds' actions caused the situation to escalate, and he ought to have realised this and sought to employ further de-escalation techniques instead. The panel was also mindful that Mr Dadds' actions on 2 May 2019 were despite previous advice given on a number of occasions. This was a cause for concern for the panel.

Therefore, on balance, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Dadds amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mr Dadds 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 Mr Dadds' status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public perception.

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

Having found the facts of allegations 1 and 2 proved, the panel further found that Mr Dadds' 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.

The panel were aware that 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 Dadds which involved inappropriately handling a pupil despite previous advice from senior staff members regarding appropriate contact with pupils, there was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Dadds was not treated seriously 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 Dadds 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 Dadds.

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

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk

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 took into account evidence from Mr Dadds relating to [redacted]. Mr Dadds had been [redacted]. The incident on 2 May 2019 occurred approximately three weeks after Mr Dadds had [redacted].

However, there was no evidence to suggest that Mr Dadds was acting under extreme duress. The panel found that his actions were deliberate in that he made a decision to physically intervene.

Whilst the panel took into account character references he had provided and agreed that Mr Dadds had contributed to the education sector, there was no evidence he had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in personal and professional conduct.

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 Dadds of prohibition.

The panel was particularly concerned about pupil safety and the potential future risk of harm to pupils. Whilst the panel accepted that Mr Dadds' actions on 2 May 2019 were the result of a split second decision, it was mindful that he had previously received informal advice from senior members of staff regarding appropriate contact with pupils. The panel was concerned that Mr Dadds had not taken on board or followed this advice, particularly given that physical contact with pupils is a potentially serious matter.

The panel considered that Mr Dadds demonstrated a lack of insight into his actions, and it was not satisfied by the evidence he gave in respect of the way in which he would approach a similar situation in future. The panel was concerned that Mr Dadds had not been able to properly reflect on, or take responsibility for, his own behaviour; he did not seem to appreciate that he should have behaved differently on 2 May 2019, for example by using other de-escalation methods before resorting to physical contact. Furthermore, he did not seem to understand why he ought to have followed the informal advice he was given in respect of contact with pupils, i.e., to safeguard himself and pupils.

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 Dadds for the reasons given above. 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 panel considered paragraphs 50 and 51 of the Advice which set out behaviours that might weigh in favour of a prohibition order without a review period or a longer review period. The panel did not find any of the behaviours at paragraphs 50 or 51 to be relevant in this case.

Whilst Mr Dadds' conduct was serious, the panel accepted that it was at the lower end of the spectrum of serious misconduct. The panel considered that there was scope for Mr Dadds to reflect on his actions of 2 May 2019, to accept that he ought to have behaved in a different way and satisfy a future panel that there is not a continuing risk in respect of pupil wellbeing and/or safeguarding. The panel also considered that Mr Dadds should be able to reflect on the value of management guidance and accept that he should have heeded the advice from senior members of staff and, had he done so, the events on 2 May 2019 may not have escalated in the manner they did.

The panel therefore decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for the minimum review period, i.e 2 years. In the panel's view this was a sufficient amount of time to safeguard the public interest and to allow Mr Dadds to properly reflect on his conduct.

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 John Dadds should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of 2 years.

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include findings that Mr Dadds inappropriately handled Pupil A during an IT lesson despite previously being given advice regarding appropriate contact with pupils.

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 Dadds, 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/safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, "The panel was particularly concerned about pupil safety and the potential future risk of harm to pupils. Whilst the panel accepted that Mr Dadds' actions on 2 May 2019 were the result of a split second

decision, it was mindful that he had previously received informal advice from senior members of staff regarding appropriate contact with pupils. The panel was concerned that Mr Dadds had not taken on board or followed this advice, particularly given that physical contact with pupils is a potentially serious matter.” 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 Dadds demonstrated a lack of insight into his actions, and it was not satisfied by the evidence he gave in respect of the way in which he would approach a similar situation in future.” In my judgement, the lack of insight 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, “public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Dadds was not treated seriously when regulating the conduct of the profession.” I am particularly mindful of the finding that Mr Dadds inappropriately handled a pupil 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 Mr Dadds himself, the panel comment “Whilst the panel took into account character references he had provided and agreed that Mr Dadds had contributed to the education sector, there was no evidence he had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in personal and professional conduct.” A prohibition order would prevent Mr Dadds from teaching and clearly deprive the public of his contribution to the profession for the period that it is in force. I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Dadds 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 insight, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

For these reasons, I have concluded that a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest in order to achieve the intended aims of a prohibition order.

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended a 2 year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments "Whilst Mr Dadds' conduct was serious, the panel accepted that it was at the lower end of the spectrum of serious misconduct. The panel considered that there was scope for Mr Dadds to reflect on his actions of 2 May 2019, to accept that he ought to have behaved in a different way and satisfy a future panel that there is not a continuing risk in respect of pupil wellbeing and/or safeguarding. The panel also considered that Mr Dadds should be able to reflect on the value of management guidance and accept that he should have heeded the advice from senior members of staff and, had he done so, the events on 2 May 2019 may not have escalated in the manner they did."

The panel has also said that a 2 year review period was "a sufficient amount of time to safeguard the public interest and to allow Mr Dadds to properly reflect on his conduct."

I have considered whether a longer review period or no review period is proportionate to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a 2 year review period is sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are that the panel deemed the misconduct to be at the lower end of the spectrum of serious misconduct together with the lack of insight demonstrated by Mr Dadds.

I consider therefore that a 2 year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

This means that Mr John Dadds is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. He may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 21 October 2024, 2 years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If he does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Mr Dadds remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr Dadds 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.



Decision maker: John Knowles

Date: 18 October 2022

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