



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Christopher Terry: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

November 2018

Contents

A. Introduction	3
B. Allegations	4
C. Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Statement of agreed facts	5
D. Decision and reasons	5
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 Christopher Terry
Teacher ref number:	9552251
Teacher date of birth:	15 December 1971
TRA reference:	17051
Date of determination:	15 November 2018
Former employer:	Witchford Village College, Cambridgeshire

A. Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the Agency”) convened on 15 November 2018 at Cheylesmore House, 5 Quinton Road, Coventry, CV1 2WT to consider the case of Mr Terry.

The panel members were Ms Ann Walker (former teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Geoffrey Penzer (lay panellist) and Mr Anthony Bald (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mrs Luisa Gibbons of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP solicitors.

In advance of the meeting, the Agency agreed to a request from Mr Terry that the allegations be considered without a hearing after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice. Mr Terry 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, Mr Terry or his representative.

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

B. Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Meeting dated 21 September 2018.

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

Whilst working as Principal at Witchford Village College between June 2013 – December 2017 he:

1. Failed to adequately respond to a complaint made by Pupil A's mother in September 2015 relating to Pupil A's exam results.
2. Acted with a lack of professional integrity and/ or dishonestly in that he:
 - a. continually reassured Pupil A and /or her mother that he was seeking to resolve the problems with Pupil A's examination results when he was not.
 - b. informed Pupil A and/ or her mother that Pupil A's GCSE English language grade had been amended when he knew or ought to have known that it had not;
 - c. informed Pupil A and/ or her mother that an updated GCSE English language certificate was expected when he knew or ought to have known that this was not the case;
 - d. produced a letter for Pupil A to provide to higher educational establishments to prove she had achieved a grade C in GCSE English language when he had no evidence that she had;
 - e. reassured Pupil B's parents that he was seeking to resolve the problems with Pupil B's examination results when he was not;
 - f. informed Pupil B and/or his parents that Pupil B's GCSE English language grade had been amended when he knew or ought to have known that it had not;
 - g. informed Pupil B and/or his parents that an updated GCSE English language certificate was expected when he knew or ought to have known that this was not the case; and
 - h. produced a fraudulent print out for Pupil B and his family to rely on as evidence that he had achieved a grade C in GCSE English Language when he had no evidence that he had.

Mr Terry has admitted the alleged facts and that they constitute unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

C. Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology and anonymised pupil list – pages 1 to 3

Section 2: Notice of Referral, response and Notice of Meeting – pages 4 to 13c

Section 3: Statement of Agreed Facts and Presenting Officer Representations – pages 13 to 19

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 20 to 145

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 146 to 150

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

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a Statement of Agreed Facts which was signed by Mr Terry on 25 July 2018.

D. Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

The panel has carefully considered the case and reached a decision.

The panel confirms that it has read all the documents provided in the bundle in advance of the hearing.

In advance of the meeting, the Agency agreed to a request from Mr Terry that the allegations be considered without a hearing. The panel has 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 is necessary or appropriate in this case. In Mr Terry's letter to the Agency of 19 April 2018, he has stated that he "had been trying to find evidence" that he could present and stated that he was no longer working in schools and as such could not access any materials. He then stated that he was "not able to offer any evidence to refute the statements", and he admitted to the matters set out in the Agency's letter of 23 March, and stated that he would agree a

statement of facts. The panel was concerned as to whether Mr Terry had admitted the facts alleged as a result of the difficulty he had in obtaining documentation, and in order to avoid the public nature of a hearing. However, the panel considered that had Mr Terry had any explanation that would have afforded him a defence to the allegations, he would have put this forward, even in the absence of documentary evidence. The panel considered the interests of justice and given that the facts of the allegations have been admitted, Mr Terry has requested a meeting and the panel has the benefit of Mr Terry's representations, the panel was of the view that justice would be adequately served by considering this matter at a meeting.

Mr Terry was employed at Witchford Village College ("the College") as Principal from September 2013. He resigned in December 2017 for personal reasons. A formal complaint was subsequently made to the College by Pupil A's mother which led to a formal investigation. During the course of the investigation into the allegations surrounding Pupil A, similar concerns arose in relation to Pupil B. On 6 March 2018, Pupil A's mother referred Mr Terry to the Agency.

Findings of fact

Our findings of fact are as follows:

The panel has found the following particulars of the allegations against you proven, for these reasons:

Whilst working as Principal at Witchford Village College between June 2013 – December 2017 you:

1. Failed to adequately respond to a complaint made by Pupil A's mother in September 2015 relating to Pupil A's exam results.

In the Statement of Agreed Facts, Mr Terry has admitted this allegation; and stated that he should have conducted a formal investigation in line with the policy of the College rather than informing Pupil A's mother that he would deal with the matter personally. He admitted that he subsequently failed to make any proper enquiries or investigations into the incident that would be expected of any teacher. The panel has seen Pupil A's mother's communications with Mr Terry commencing with her email to him dated 23 August 2015 regarding her concerns relating to Pupil A's exam results, her email of complaint of 20 September 2015 concerning another employee's failure to submit a medical appeal, and subsequent exchanges. The panel understands from Pupil A's mother's letter of complaint of 27 January 2018 that this culminated in her contacting the examinations officer at the College on 25 January 2018, following which she received a telephone call the next day stating that the examination board had no knowledge of Mr Terry's involvement. In light of Mr Terry's admission, and the correspondence reviewed by the panel, the panel was satisfied that Mr Terry failed to adequately respond to the complaint in September 2015 and this allegation is found proven.

2. Acted with a lack of professional integrity and/ or dishonestly in that you:

- a. continually reassured Pupil A and /or her mother that you were seeking to resolve the problems with Pupil A's examination results when you were not.**

The panel has considered each of the sub paragraphs to paragraph 2 in the first instance before turning its mind to whether Mr Terry has lacked professional integrity or acted dishonestly in respect of any of the sub paragraphs found proven.

In the statement of agreed facts, Mr Terry has admitted that he maintained communication with Pupil A and her mother over the months that followed her initial complaint, assuring them in the first instance that he would be able to sort the problem out. He has admitted that he was not in communication with the examination board. The panel has seen the communications from Mr Terry reassuring Pupil A's mother that he was in contact with the examination board, but has seen no evidence of Mr Terry actually having that contact. The examination board has provided details of correspondence with the College regarding Pupil A's examination results and had no evidence of any correspondence or communication from Mr Terry. In light of Mr Terry's admission, and in the absence of any evidence as to contact with the examination board, the panel was satisfied that sub paragraph 2.a. is found proven.

- b. informed Pupil A and/ or her mother that Pupil A's GCSE English language grade had been amended when you knew or ought to have known that it had not;**

In the Statement of Agreed Facts, Mr Terry has admitted that he informed Pupil A and her mother that Pupil A's grade had been changed from a D to a C when this was not the case. He also admitted that he was never informed whilst working for the College that Pupil A had her grade amended. The panel has seen an email from Mr Terry to Pupil A's mother of November 2015 referring to his expectation that a decision would shortly be taken regarding Pupil A's exam results. The next communications that the panel has seen dates from March 2016 when the topic of the exchanges turned to when Pupil A's certificate would be received. From this the panel considered that it is implicit that Pupil A's mother had been told that Pupil A's grade had been amended. In light of Mr Terry's admission, and in the absence of any communication from the exam board stating that Pupil A's grade had been amended, the panel was satisfied that sub paragraph 2.b. is found proven.

- c. informed Pupil A and/ or her mother that an updated GCSE English language certificate was expected when you knew or ought to have known that this was not the case;**

In the Statement of Agreed Facts, Mr Terry has admitted that he informed Pupil A and her mother than an updated examination certificate would be issued, when he knew this

was untrue. The panel has seen emails from Mr Terry to Pupil A's mother stating that he had expected "the certificate should be dispatched shortly"; that "it will be with us very soon"; that he "expected this to arrive by now"; and that he was "fully expecting it if not by the end of the week then Monday". In light of Mr Terry's admission, and in the absence of any communication from the exam board stating that it was dispatching an updated certificate, the panel was satisfied that sub paragraph 2.c. is found proven.

d. produced a letter for Pupil A to provide to higher educational establishments to prove she has achieved a grade C in GCSE English language when you had no evidence that she had;

In the Statement of Agreed Facts, Mr Terry has admitted that for the purposes of Pupil A providing it in support of her university application, he produced his own document, on the College's headed paper stating that Pupil A had achieved/ been awarded a grade C in her English Language GCSE when that was not the case. The panel has seen a copy of that letter, signed by Mr Terry. In light of Mr Terry's admission, and in the absence of any communication from the exam board stating that Pupil A had achieved a grade C in GCSE English Language, the panel was satisfied that sub paragraph 2.d. is found proven.

e. reassured Pupil B's parents that you were seeking to resolve the problems with Pupil B's examination results when you were not;

In the Statement of Agreed Facts, Mr Terry has admitted that he communicated with Pupil B's parents, reassuring them that he was seeking to rectify problems with the examination results when he was not. The panel has seen an email from Mr Terry of November 2014 referring to him chasing Pupil B's certificate. This was some time after Pupil B left the College, having been awarded a grade D in English language. This would have been outside the time frame for an appeal to be lodged. The panel has seen evidence of the examination board having stated that they could not find any application to review the decision as to Pupil B's grade. In light of Mr Terry's admission, the evidence of Mr Terry's communication to Pupil B's parents, and the absence of any evidence that Mr Terry had contacted the examination board to review the decision, the panel was satisfied that sub paragraph 2.e. is found proven.

f. informed Pupil B and/or his parents that Pupil B's GCSE English language grade had been amended when you knew or ought to have known that it had not;

In the Statement of Agreed Facts, Mr Terry has admitted that he informed Pupil B and his parents that Pupil B's GCSE English Language grade had been amended from a D to a C when he knew this was not true. Pupil B's parent has provided a copy of an email of 5 November 2014 from Mr Terry stating that he had been chasing the certificate and would be providing an update later that day as to when Pupil B would receive it. Had Mr Terry not told Pupil B's parents that Pupil B's grade had been amended, then the parents

would not have been anticipating receipt of an updated certificate. Pupil B's parent has provided a certificate from the examination board that he received in February 2018 which confirmed that Pupil B's grade had not been amended. In light of Mr Terry's admission and in light of this email, the panel considered it more probable than not that Mr Terry had informed Pupil B's parent that Pupil B's grade had been amended, when it is apparent that it had not been. The panel was satisfied that sub paragraph 2.f. is found proven.

g. informed Pupil B and/or his parents that an updated GCSE English language certificate was expected when you knew or ought to have known that this was not the case; and

In the Statement of Agreed Facts, Mr Terry has admitted telling Pupil B and his parents that an updated GCSE certificate was expected in relation to his GCSE English Language grade, when he knew this was not the case. The panel has referred to the relevant correspondence in its findings in respect of allegation 2.f. The panel was satisfied that sub paragraph 2.g. is found proven.

h. produced a fraudulent print out for Pupil B and his family to rely on as evidence that he had achieved a grade C in GCSE English language when you had no evidence that he had.

In the Statement of Agreed Facts, Mr Terry has admitted amending school records to reflect a grade C for Pupil B, when this was not the case, and providing a copy of the report for Pupil B and his family to rely on to evidence a grade which Pupil B had not achieved. The panel has seen a print out that Pupil B's parent provided to another education institution in August 2015 that he referred to as documentary proof of Pupil B having received a grade C for GCSE English language. That institution referred to the scanned copy containing a discrepancy. The panel has also seen evidence that the examination board continued to record Pupil B as having received a grade D in February 2018. The panel concluded that Pupil B's parent must have received the print out from Mr Terry since it was he that they were in communication with. In light of Mr Terry's admission, his communications with Pupil B's parent and the discrepancy between the print out Pupil B's parent had, and the examination board's record, the panel was satisfied that sub paragraph 2.h. is found proven.

In relation to the allegation that Mr Terry acted with a lack of professional integrity in respect of the sub paragraphs of allegation 2 that have been found proven, Mr Terry has admitted in the Statement of Agreed Facts that he acted with a lack of professional integrity. The panel considered that the ethical standards of the profession requires that the veracity of examination results should be beyond doubt. The panel concluded that Mr Terry's actions in misleading pupils and their parents regarding the true examination results demonstrated a clear lack of professional integrity.

In relation to the allegation that Mr Terry acted dishonestly in respect of the sub paragraphs of allegation 2 that have been found proven, Mr Terry has admitted in the Statement of Agreed Facts that he acted dishonestly in that he accepts that his conduct would be regarded as dishonest by the ordinary standards of reasonable and honest people. Mr Terry could not have reasonably believed that he had been in communication with the examination board and that the pupils results had been amended when he knew that not to be the case. Ordinary decent people would consider that conduct to be dishonest.

The panel therefore found allegation 2 proven that Mr Terry both lacked professional integrity and acted dishonestly in respect of all the sub-paragraphs of allegation 2.

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

Having found the allegations to have been proven, the panel has gone on to consider whether the facts of those proven allegations amount to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In doing so, the panel has had regard to the document Teacher Misconduct: The Prohibition of Teachers, which the panel refers to as “the Advice”.

The panel is satisfied that the conduct of Mr Terry in relation to the facts found proven, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considers that by reference to Part Two, Mr Terry 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;
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils’ well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions;
 - showing ... respect for the rights of others;
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach;
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel is satisfied that the conduct of Mr Terry fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel has also considered whether Mr Terry’s conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 8 and 9 of the Advice. The panel has found that the offence of fraud or serious dishonesty is relevant. The Advice indicates

that where behaviours associated with such an offence exist, a panel is likely to conclude that an individual's conduct would amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

Accordingly, the panel is satisfied that Mr Terry is guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel has taken into account how 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 has taken account of the uniquely influential role that teachers can hold in pupils' lives and that pupils must be able to view teachers as role models in the way they behave.

The panel therefore finds that Mr Terry's actions constitute conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Having found the facts of particulars 1 and 2 proved, we further find that Mr Terry's conduct amounts 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 is 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 has to consider whether it is an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it is 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 has considered the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and having done so has found all of them to be relevant in this case, namely the protection of pupils; the protection of other members of the public; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

The panel has found allegations proven that Mr Terry acted dishonestly and without integrity in his communications with pupils and/ or parents in respect of examination results. In light of these findings, there is a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils given the serious impact that Mr Terry's actions have had on the ability of the pupils concerned to re-take their examinations at the appropriate time and the serious subsequent effect on their educational progression and future careers. In July 2016, Pupil A's mother had highlighted the importance of Pupil A's GCSE results to

her potential degree application. Despite this Mr Terry continued on the course of action on which he had embarked.

Similarly, the panel considers that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Terry were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

The panel considered that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Mr Terry was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

Mr Terry has stated that he had an “excellent record” in his teaching career and that he had changed the lives of many students, albeit has not offered any independent evidence to attest to this. The panel considered whether there was any public interest in retaining the teacher in the profession. However, the panel considered that the potential risk to pupils and the reputation of teachers in retaining Mr Terry in the profession, given his actions, outweighed any public interest in retaining him.

Notwithstanding 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 Terry.

In carrying out the balancing exercise the panel has considered the public interest considerations and the interests of Mr Terry. The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours of a teacher have been proven. In the list of such behaviours, those that are relevant in this case are:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers’ Standards;
- 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 vulnerable pupils) or violation of the rights of pupils;
- dishonesty especially where there have been serious consequences, and/or it has been repeated and/or covered up;
- ...other deliberate behaviour that undermines pupils, the profession, the school or colleagues.

Even though there were behaviours that would point to a prohibition order being appropriate, the panel went on to consider whether or not there were sufficient mitigating factors to militate against a prohibition order being an appropriate and proportionate measure to impose, particularly taking into account the nature and severity of the behaviour in this case. The panel was satisfied that the teacher’s actions were deliberate.

However, the panel noted that Mr Terry has provided an explanation that he was under strain at the time of his conduct [redacted], but that he provided no independent evidence of this. Whilst the panel accepts that Mr Terry has previously good history, it had no evidence before it as to his history. The panel has noted that no references have been provided from any colleagues that can attest to his abilities as a teacher, nor have any character references been provided.

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 is sufficient.

The panel is of the view that applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen recommending no prohibition order is not a proportionate and appropriate response. Recommending that publication of adverse findings is sufficient in the case would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of consequences for the teacher of prohibition.

The panel is of the view that prohibition is both proportionate and appropriate. The panel has decided that the public interest considerations outweigh the interests of Mr Terry. The persistent and sustained course of conduct that Mr Terry repeated in respect of two different pupils was a significant factor in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel makes 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 advises that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances in any given case that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 2 years.

The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proven, would militate against a review period being recommended. These behaviours include fraud or serious dishonesty. The panel has found that Mr Terry has been responsible for acts of dishonesty and acting without integrity when communicating with pupils and/or parents in respect of examination results. Those pupils and their parents had placed their trust in Mr Terry, and he abused that trust, fundamentally undermining the confidence that pupils, parents, future educators and employers place in examination results. The panel's decision has been influenced by compelling evidence of the significant consequences experienced by the pupils and the years of enquiries that their parents have had to pursue. Mr Terry has expressed regret for the trouble his actions have caused and the upset to the families but his brief and superficial response failed to demonstrate any insight as to the serious impact of his actions affecting the lives and careers of Pupil A, Pupil B and their parents, and the wider College community.

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

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

I have given very careful consideration to this case and to the recommendation of the panel in respect of (both) sanction and no 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 Terry should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a no review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Terry 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;
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions;
 - showing ... respect for the rights of others;
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach;
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of dishonesty and lack of integrity on the part of a headteacher.

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

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children. The panel has observed, "The panel has found allegations proven that Mr Terry acted dishonestly and without integrity in his communications with pupils and/ or parents in respect of examination results. In light of these findings, there is a strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils given the serious impact that Mr Terry's actions have had on the ability of the pupils concerned to re-take their examinations at the appropriate time and the serious subsequent effect on their educational progression and future careers." 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 Terry has expressed regret for the trouble his actions have caused and the upset to the families but his brief and superficial response failed to demonstrate any insight as to the serious impact of his actions affecting the lives and careers of Pupil A, Pupil B and their parents, and the wider College community." In my judgement, the lack of insight means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk pupils educational progression and career choices. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, "the panel considers that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Terry were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession." I am particularly mindful of the finding of dishonesty and lack of integrity in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

I have had to consider that the public has a high expectation of professional standards of all teachers and that the public might regard a failure to impose a prohibition order as a failure to uphold those high standards. In weighing these considerations, I have had to consider the matter from the point of view of an "ordinary intelligent and well-informed citizen."

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of unacceptable professional conduct, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mr Terry himself. The panel observe, "Mr Terry has stated that he had an "excellent record" in his teaching career and that he had changed the lives of many students, albeit has not offered any independent evidence to attest to this."

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Terry 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 panel's comments when considering whether there was any public interest in retaining the teacher in the profession, where the panel say, "the potential risk to pupils and the reputation of teachers in retaining Mr Terry in the profession, given his actions, outweighed any public interest in retaining him."

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Terry 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 that is not backed up by full insight, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended that no provision should be made for a review period.

I have considered the panel's comments, "The panel felt the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate and as such decided that it would be proportionate in all the circumstances for the prohibition order to be recommended without provision for a review period."

The panel also said it, "has found that Mr Terry has been responsible for acts of dishonesty and acting without integrity when communicating with pupils and/or parents in respect of examination results. Those pupils and their parents had placed their trust in Mr Terry, and he abused that trust, fundamentally undermining the confidence that pupils, parents, future educators and employers place in examination results."

The panel went on to say its decision has been influenced, "by compelling evidence of the significant consequences experienced by the pupils and the years of enquiries that their parents have had to pursue."

I have considered whether a no review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession and am in agreement with the panel.

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 Christopher Terry 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 Terry 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 Terry 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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Dawn Dandy', written in a cursive style.

Decision maker: Dawn Dandy

Date: 21 November 2018

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