



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Alexander Fox: Professional conduct panel outcome**

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

**March 2021**

## Contents

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

<b>Teacher:</b>	Mr Alexander Fox
<b>Teacher ref number:</b>	0332380
<b>Teacher date of birth:</b>	26 April 1979
<b>TRA reference:</b>	19094
<b>Date of determination:</b>	8 March 2021
<b>Former employer:</b>	St Edward's Roman Catholic & Church of England VA School, Poole, Dorset.

### Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 8 March 2021 by virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Alexander Fox.

The panel members were Dr Angela Brown (lay panellist – in the chair), Miss Juliet Berry (lay panellist) and Mr Edward MacIntyre (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Rob Kellaway of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Sherelle Appleby of Browne Jacobson LLP solicitors.

Mr Fox was present and was represented by Ms Lizzy Bowman 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 4 January 2021.

It was alleged that Mr Fox was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst employed at the St Edward's Roman Catholic & Church of England VA School:

1. He engaged in inappropriate and/or unprofessional behaviour on one or more occasions towards Individual A by conducting one-to-one role-plays of pupil behaviour scenarios with her in which he made comments to the effect of:
  - a. "miss I have a big black cock and I know you want it...do you want it up the front or the back...I am going to stick it in your mouth and come, do you gag miss?"
  - b. "you're a filthy bitch and I know you've wanted it since the day I met you"
  - c. "I'm going to rape you miss"
  - d. "there is nothing worse than when you find out that daddy is raping his little girl"
2. His behaviour towards Individual A as may be found proven at allegation 1 above was sexually motivated;
3. His conduct towards Individual A as may be found proven at allegation 1 above was intended to intimidate her.

Mr Fox admitted allegation 1. in that he admits he made comments to the effect of those listed at allegation 1.a. to d. Moreover, Mr Fox admits that his comments amounted to unprofessional and inappropriate behaviour towards Individual A.

Mr Fox did not admit allegations 2. or 3.

## Preliminary applications

The panel considered an application from Mr Fox for the admission of an additional document: a letter from [Redacted]. There was no objection to the admission of this additional document by the presenting officer. The panel determined that the letter from the [Redacted] was a relevant document and it would be in the interests of justice for that document to be considered at the hearing and should therefore form part of the bundle.

## Summary of evidence

## Documents

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

- Section 1: Preliminary documents – pages 2 to 3
- Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response and statement of agreed and disputed facts – pages 5 to 18
- Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 20 to 111
- Section 4: Teacher documents – pages 113 to 115.

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following document to the bundle:

- a letter from the [Redacted] to Mr Fox dated 3 December 2020. This document was added to the bundle at page 116 to 117.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle in advance of the hearing and read the additional document before reaching its decision.

## Witnesses

The presenting officer did not call any witnesses to give oral evidence at the hearing.

The panel heard oral evidence from Mr Fox who did not call any other witnesses.

## 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 Fox had been employed as a technology teacher at St Edward's Roman Catholic & Church of England VA School ("the School") from 1 January 2016 until he resigned on 16 January 2020.

Individual A was a [Redacted] at the School who had started her placement at the School in [Redacted]. Mr Fox was [Redacted] to Individual A.

On 22 November 2019, the School's headteacher was informed of an allegation against Mr Fox about his conduct towards Individual A. Mr Fox was suspended immediately and a disciplinary investigation commenced. The School also contacted the Local Authority Designated Officer.

It was alleged that on more than one occasion Mr Fox had conducted one-to-one role-play scenarios with Individual A of examples of extreme sexualised language by pupils. It is alleged that Mr Fox's behaviour in relation to those role-play scenarios was sexually motivated and that his conduct was intended to intimidate Individual A.

During the School's investigation, the School took a signed statement from Individual A on 25 November 2019 and 10 December 2019 in relation to the incident.

A disciplinary hearing with Mr Fox was scheduled for 20 January 2020. However, Mr Fox submitted his resignation on 16 January 2020. A referral was made to the TRA on 6 February 2020.

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of facts on each of the allegations are set out below.

**1. You engaged in inappropriate and/or unprofessional behaviour on one or more occasions towards Individual A by conducting one-to-one role plays of pupil behaviour scenarios with her in which you made comments to the effect of:**

**a. "miss I have a big black cock and I know you want it...do you want it up the front or the back...I am going to stick it in your mouth and come, do you gag miss?"**

**b. "you're a filthy bitch and I know you've wanted it since the day I met you"**

**c. "I'm going to rape you miss"**

**d. "there is nothing worse than when you find out that daddy is raping his little girl".**

The panel considered the statement of agreed and disputed facts within the bundle in which Mr Fox stated that he admitted this allegation. The panel considered that Mr Fox's admission was consistent with the admissions he had made during his investigation interviews with the School. In his oral evidence at the hearing, Mr Fox also admitted that he had made comments to this effect to Individual A.

Mr Fox said that the allegation comments set out at allegation 1.a. to d. were not verbatim of what he had said to Individual A during the role-play exercises. Mr Fox said that in terms of allegation d. he believed the statement had been words to the effect of "there is nothing worse than when you find out a father is molesting his little girl". The panel noted that the handwritten statement of Individual A on 22 November 2019, the day she had reported the role playing to the School, included a note "daddy raping little girl"

which suggested that those exact words may have been used rather than “father” and “molesting” as advanced by Mr Fox. When asked what the verbatim comments had been in relation to allegations 1.a. to c. Mr Fox stated he could not recollect what he had said exactly but accepted that it had been words to the effect of those set out in allegation 1.

The panel noted that in his evidence Mr Fox had stated he had initiated the one-on-one training scenarios with Individual A as he had concerns about Individual A’s instincts and safeguarding knowledge. The panel noted that Mr Fox did not report these concerns to the School’s safeguarding team or any delegated staff responsible for [Redacted], but instead chose to undertake training, which included the role-playing scenarios, on his own accord without approval from the School’s safeguarding team or senior leadership team. Mr Fox admitted this had been an error on his part not to report his safeguarding concerns. Mr Fox had not been trained to provide training in relation extreme sexual language by students.

At the hearing, the panel noted Mr Fox’s explanation for conducting the role-play exercises in that he wanted to prepare Individual A for situations that he considered may arise in the classroom or in a school environment. Mr Fox submitted that these were based on events that he had directly experienced or witnessed. The panel also noted Mr Fox’s evidence that aside from pupils using sexually explicit language, other issues such as bullying, and racism had been discussed and role-played during his meetings with Individual A.

The panel found that the role-play scenarios had taken place on more than one occasion. The panel noted that in his interview with the School on 27 November 2019, Mr Fox had stated he, “couldn’t recall but it was nothing like 5 or 6; maybe 3 or 4”. Mr Fox’s evidence at the hearing was also that the role-playing meetings had taken place over 3 or 4 meetings during Individual A’s [Redacted] with the School.

The panel considered that the role-play scenario and the comments made by Mr Fox during those scenarios which had taken place on multiple occasions to be wholly inappropriate and unprofessional.

In reaching its decision on these facts, the panel noted the evidence within the bundle of the negative impact that the role-play scenarios had had on the wellbeing of Individual A.

On examination of all the documents before the panel and on consideration of the oral evidence, the panel was satisfied that the facts of this allegation are proved.

## **2. Your behaviour towards Individual A as may be found proven at allegation 1 above was sexually motivated.**

When considering this allegation, the panel again considered Mr Fox’s explanation for conducting the role-play scenarios in order to prepare Individual A for real life teaching.

Mr Fox explained he had previously worked at a school in London in which sexually explicit statements had been said to a teacher such as: “I bet you like large cocks”, “we are going to rape you”, “do you prefer it up front or the back”, “I am going to put it in your mouth” and that he had overheard year 7 girls describing what “cum tasted like”.

Mr Fox informed the panel that Individual A had not requested that they undertake role-playing scenarios relating to sexually explicit comments by pupils but that the issue had come up when discussing other training topics.

The panel found that Mr Fox had on occasions, been inconsistent in the evidence he had given. For example, on the one hand Mr Fox had referred to the School as a “dream school” whilst on the other he had a long list of issues with how the School operated. The panel was not wholly convinced by Mr Fox’s explanation of these inconsistencies. However, the panel considered that Mr Fox’s evidence that his intentions had not been sexually motivated were consistent and the inconsistencies in other parts of his evidence were not enough to persuade the panel that Mr Fox’s evidence in relation to this allegation was unreliable.

The panel carefully considered the words and actions found proved at allegation 1. and whilst they concluded that the allegations contained sexually explicit language, the panel found that there was not enough evidence to conclude, on the balance of probabilities, that Mr Fox’s conduct was sexually motivated.

The panel was not satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that the facts of this allegation were proved on all the evidence before it.

### **3. Your conduct towards Individual A as may be found proven at allegation 1 above was intended to intimidate her.**

The panel was not satisfied that the facts of this allegation were proved.

The panel considered that there had been an imbalance of power between Mr Fox and Individual A, a [Redacted], in that Mr Fox was a qualified teacher and Individual A’s [Redacted]. However, the panel was not presented with persuasive evidence that, on the balance of probabilities, Mr Fox’s intentions had been to intimidate Individual A.

The panel noted the signed statements of Individual A dated 25 November 2019 and 10 December 2019. In particular, the panel noted the minutes of the meeting with Individual A on 10 December 2019 which included, “she is constantly fearful for her safety and the safety of her children” and “the scenarios used in the “meetings” with Individual A have also meant that discussions about this type of scenario in training events has brought back feelings of anxiety and fear for Individual A.”



Whilst the panel considered that Individual A may well have felt intimidated by the role-playing scenarios found proven at allegation 1, the panel was not satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that Mr Fox had intended to intimidate Individual A.

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

Having found allegation 1. proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of that allegation 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 Fox, in relation to the facts found proved involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 1 and Part 2, Mr Fox was in breach of the following standards:

### Part 1

- Develop effective personal relationships with colleagues, knowing how and when to draw on advice and specialist support.

### Part 2

- 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
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach...

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Fox in respect of allegation 1. amounted to misconduct of a serious nature that fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel considered that Mr Fox’s comments he had made in the role-playing sessions was a clear breach of the Teachers’ Standards.

The panel considered that it was wholly inappropriate for Mr Fox to have unilaterally and informally decided to undertake the role-play scenarios with Individual A using the language found at allegation 1.

The panel also considered whether Mr Fox’s conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 10 and 11 of the Advice. The panel considered the offence of sexual activity but did not consider this to be relevant given its finding in

relation to allegation 2. Accordingly, the panel found that none of the offences were relevant.

The panel went on to consider whether Mr Fox's actions in respect of each allegation amounted to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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 panel considered that it was clear that the actions of Mr Fox fell significantly short of what the public would expect or tolerate of an individual, and especially a teacher. The panel found the fact that Mr Fox's conduct had been towards [Redacted], and who sought appropriate guidance from a teacher with 17 years' experience was totally unacceptable.

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. Accordingly, the panel considered that Mr Fox's proven actions may bring the profession into disrepute.

In summary, having found the facts of the allegation proved in respect of allegation 1., the panel found that Mr Fox's conduct amounted to 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 noted 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 protection of pupils and other members of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

The panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Fox was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession. The conduct found against Mr Fox was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated by a teacher.

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 Fox was far outside that which could reasonably be tolerated. The panel considered that Mr Fox with his 17 years of experience should have been fully aware that his conduct and decision making had been wholly inappropriate and unprofessional.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Fox, the panel also considered there was a public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils and members of the public. The panel noted that Individual A had been a [Redacted] at the material time and therefore [Redacted]. The panel considered Mr Fox had abused a position of trust and responsibility in which there was a power imbalance. Given the extent of inappropriateness of Mr Fox's conduct to an [Redacted] which had been found to be proven, the panel did have some ongoing concerns that Mr Fox posed a potential ongoing risk to members of the public and to pupils.

The panel did not consider there to be a strong public interest consideration in retaining Mr Fox in the profession. The panel did note that Mr Fox had not previously been subject to any professional disciplinary sanctions. The panel did note the positive references from Mr Fox's previous schools, which he had worked at between October 2011 and August 2013 and between 1 January 2014 and 31 August 2015. Amongst others, the panel noted the comments set out below within those two references.

"He [Mr Fox] was a big favourite with the students (and staff) who were very sad to see him leave".

"Alex has consistently been graded as delivering good or better lessons" and "Alex has regularly given up his time to help students at break and lunchtime and has volunteered to help out with lesson preparation when colleagues have been absent. Alex has a calm manner within the classroom and experiences little or no classroom management issues. Consequently, he has formed good relationships with many of our students".

However, the panel considered that given Mr Fox had been a teacher for 17 years, only limited information had been provided as to his ability as a teacher. The panel noted that no further character references had been provided by Mr Fox, in particular by former colleagues over his teaching career, aside from thank you cards from 2 pupils that Mr Fox had recently taught.

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 Fox.

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 Fox. 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
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving vulnerable pupils) or violation of the rights of pupils.

Even though the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors. The panel noted that mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

The panel considered that Mr Fox's actions were deliberate. Mr Fox had deliberately chosen to undertake the role-playing scenarios with Individual A on multiple occasions.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Fox was acting under duress. There was no evidence put forward that he was placed under any undue or extraordinary pressure or that some other event had impacted upon him so as to affect his behaviour at that time.

Mr Fox did express remorse for his actions in his personal statement in the bundle and in his oral evidence. Mr Fox also commented on the impact his decisions had had on him, "I have learnt from the moment I heard that I had hurt Individual A, that I carry deep, often debilitating guilt."

The panel noted Mr Fox stated he had undertaken counselling since leaving the School, and that in his statement of 6 February 2021, he commented that "my past negative experiences in teaching are beginning to heal." Mr Fox also said that he had not been employed as a teacher since his resignation "out of respect for the profession".

### Recommendation

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 Fox 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 Fox. The serious nature of the misconduct 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. However, the panel did not find any of those behaviours to be proved in this case.

The panel decided that its 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 a review period of 2 years. The panel considered that this would allow Mr Fox a further period of time to reflect on his actions and to continue with the counselling which he had said he had undertaken and in particular to fully address his “past negative experiences in teaching”.

## **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 some of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. In this case, the panel has found some of the allegations not proven, and/or found that some allegations do not amount to unacceptable professional conduct or conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute. I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Alexander Fox should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of 2 years.

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

- Develop effective personal relationships with colleagues, knowing how and when to draw on advice and specialist support.
- 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
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach...

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of inappropriate and/or unprofessional behaviour on one or more occasions towards Individual A, behaviours that were an abuse of position or trust.

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 Fox, and the impact that will have on him, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children. The panel has observed, "Given the extent of inappropriateness of Mr Fox's conduct to an [Redacted] which had been found to be proven, the panel did have some ongoing concerns that Mr Fox posed a potential ongoing risk to members of the public and to pupils". 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, "Mr Fox did express remorse for his actions in his personal statement in the bundle and in his oral evidence. Mr Fox also commented on the impact his decisions had had on him, "I have learnt from the moment I heard that I had hurt Individual A, that I carry deep, often debilitating guilt" and "The panel noted Mr Fox stated

he had undertaken counselling since leaving the School, and that in his statement of 6 February 2021, he commented that “my past negative experiences in teaching are beginning to heal.” Mr Fox also said that he had not been employed as a teacher since his resignation “out of respect for the profession”.

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 considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Fox was not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession”. I am particularly mindful of the finding of serious misconduct found proven in this case and the position of Individual A 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 Fox himself and the panel comment “The panel considered that given Mr Fox had been a teacher for 17 years, only limited information had been provided as to his ability as a teacher. The panel noted that no further character references had been provided by Mr Fox, in particular by former colleagues over his teaching career, aside from thank you cards from 2 pupils that Mr Fox had recently taught”.

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Fox 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 found the fact that Mr Fox’s conduct had been towards [Redacted], and who sought appropriate guidance from a teacher with 17 years’ experience was totally unacceptable” and also “The panel considered that it was wholly inappropriate for Mr Fox to have unilaterally and informally decided to undertake the role-play scenarios with Individual A using the language found at allegation 1”.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Fox 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, 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 "It would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a review period of 2 years. The panel considered that this would allow Mr Fox a further period of time to reflect on his actions and to continue with the counselling which he had said he had undertaken and in particular to fully address his "past negative experiences in teaching".

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 Alexander Fox 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 13 March 2023, 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 Fox remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

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



**Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey**

**Date: 10 March 2021**

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



