



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Richard Newman: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

May 2023

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Statement of agreed facts	6
Decision and reasons	6
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	10
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 Richard Newman
Teacher ref number:	0261316
Teacher date of birth:	29 July 1969
TRA reference:	19282
Date of determination:	2 May 2023
Former employer:	John Ferneley College, Melton Mowbray

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ('the panel') of the Teaching Regulation Agency ('the TRA') convened on 2 May 2023 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Richard Newman.

The panel members were Mr Ian McKim (lay panellist – in the chair), Mr Neil Hillman (teacher panellist) and Miss Asma Majid (lay panellist).

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

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Newman that the allegations be considered without a hearing. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, Ms Alicia Wade of Capsticks LLP, Mr Newman or any representative for Mr Newman.

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

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 20 February 2023.

It was alleged that Mr Newman was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that, whilst employed as a teacher at John Ferneley College, he:

1. On one or more occasions between 17 August 2013 and 9 January 2020:
 - a) touched student A's back and/or shoulders and/or arms;
 - b) touched student B's back and/or shoulders and/or arms;
 - c) touched Student D's hair and/or ears and/or shoulders and/or spoke to Student D by whispering in her ears;
 - d) touched Student E's hair and/or spoke to Student E by whispering in her ears; and
 - e) touched and/or stroked Student F's hair.
2. By his conduct in paragraph 1 above, he failed to observe proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position.
3. By his conduct in paragraph 1 above, he failed to have proper professional regard for the Safeguarding and Child Protection Policy of the School in which he was teaching.

In his response to the notice of referral dated 17 March 2021 and in the statement of agreed facts signed on 14 November 2022, Mr Newman admitted allegations 1 to 3. He also admitted that his behaviour amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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 relating to admissibility of evidence

In February 2023, the panel was provided with a bundle of documents for use at the professional conduct panel meeting.

On 27 April 2023, the panel was provided with an updated bundle of documents. On 28 April 2023, the presenting officer submitted a written application in which she invited the panel to put from their minds the previous bundle of documents and admit and consider the updated bundle of documents.

The presenting officer explained that the original bundle provided to the panel: (a) did not contain redactions which had been applied to information that was irrelevant to the allegations or related to the outcome of local disciplinary proceedings; and (b) had redactions applied to information that was relevant to the proceedings, including mitigation advanced by Mr Newman. The presenting officer provided an additional bundle to the panel which highlighted the changes that had been made.

The presenting officer sent a copy of the application to Mr Newman on 28 April 2023. Mr Newman replied to explain that [REDACTED]. He said that he was in no position to respond to amendments or deadlines as he needed to focus on [REDACTED], but also asked the presenting officer to submit the new document.

The updated bundle had not been served in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 4.20 of the April 2018 Procedures. Therefore, the panel first considered whether it should be admitted under paragraph 4.25 of the April 2018 Procedures. The panel was satisfied that the updated bundle was relevant to the issues it had to determine and that it should be admitted.

Next, the panel considered whether it could put the original bundle from its mind and proceed with the professional conduct panel meeting. The panel members had all had sight of the original hearing bundle. However, they were satisfied that they could put this bundle out of their mind and continue to hear the matter fairly. The new redactions did not appear to be significant and the panel was aware of the way in which outcomes of local investigations should be considered, in accordance with *Enemuwe v Nursing and Midwifery Council [2015] EWHC 2081*.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

- Section 1: Chronology, anonymised pupil list and list of key people – pages 4 to 7
- Section 2: Notice of referral, response and notice of meeting – pages 8 to 13

- Section 3: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 14 to 19
- Section 4: TRA documents – pages 20 to 154
- Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 155 to 189

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the updated bundle of documents.

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

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Newman on 14 November 2022 and signed by the presenting officer on 18 November 2022.

Decision and reasons

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

In advance of the meeting, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Newman for the allegations to be considered without a hearing. The panel had the ability to direct that the case be considered at a hearing if required in the interests of justice or in the public interest. The panel did not determine that such a direction was necessary or appropriate in this case.

Mr Newman commenced employment at John Ferneley College ('the School') as a business studies teacher on 27 August 2013.

On 9 January 2020, Staff Member A and Staff Member B overheard a conversation amongst a group of [REDACTED] as they were getting changed at the end of their PE lesson. During the conversation, Student A mentioned that Mr Newman had massaged her shoulders and other students indicated that Mr Newman had done the same thing to them. Staff Members A and B reported the conversation. The School conducted an internal investigation and the matter was reported to the LADO. On 6 February 2020, a referral was made to the TRA.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

1. On one or more occasions between 17 August 2013 and 9 January 2020:

- a) touched student A's back and/or shoulders and/or arms;
- b) touched student B's back and/or shoulders and/or arms;
- c) touched Student D's hair and/or ears and/or shoulders and/or spoke to Student D by whispering in her ears;
- d) touched Student E's hair and/or spoke to student E by whispering in her ears; and
- e) touched and/or stroked Student F's hair.

The panel noted that Mr Newman admitted allegations 1(a)-(e), as set out in the response to the notice of referral dated 17 March 2021 and the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Newman on 14 November 2022. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the facts available to it.

The panel noted a letter from Mr Newman's solicitors, Richard Nelson LLP, dated 14 September 2020 within which Mr Newman accepted allegations 1(a)-(e) and accepted that he had, on occasion:

- patted or tapped students on the back, shoulder or arm as a way of reassuring and encouraging students;
- patted students on the head or shoulder or ruffled their hair; and
- spoken quietly to students whilst standing next to or behind them to discuss their work.

Mr Newman explained that he did this in order to reassure and encourage students or reinforce positive feedback; he did not intend to make students feel uncomfortable.

The panel was provided with a copy of the School's investigation report which contained typed notes of meetings conducted with various students. The notes indicated that:

- Student A stated Mr Newman would touch and massage her back during lessons. Student A had witnessed Mr Newman touch Student F's arms and hair.
- Student B stated Mr Newman would stand behind her and massage her shoulders most lessons. Student B had witnessed Mr Newman do the same to Student A.
- Student C had witnessed Mr Newman go behind Student D and massage her shoulders and touch her ears.
- Student D stated Mr Newman "*fiddled*" with her hair and ears, massaged her shoulders and whispered the answers to questions in her ear.

- Student E stated Mr Newman would put his hand on her shoulder.
- Student F stated Mr Newman touched the ends of her hair.

The panel was satisfied that the evidence contained in the bundle was consistent with Mr Newman's admissions.

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

2. By your conduct in paragraph 1 above, you failed to observe proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position.

The panel noted that Mr Newman admitted allegation 2, as set out in the response to the notice of referral dated 17 March 2021 and the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Newman on 14 November 2022. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the facts available to it.

The panel noted a letter from Mr Newman's solicitors, Richard Nelson LLP, dated 14 September 2020 within which Mr Newman accepted allegation 2. The letter indicated that Mr Newman had allowed his enthusiasm to get the better of him and, in doing so, had failed to observe proper boundaries appropriate to the teaching profession, although this was not his intention.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct described in allegation 1 constituted a failure to observe proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position. It was clearly inappropriate for a teacher to touch pupils in this manner or whisper in their ears.

On examination of the documents before the panel, and the admissions in the signed statement of agreed facts, the panel was satisfied that allegation 2 was proven.

3. By your conduct in paragraph 1 above, you failed to have proper professional regard for the Safeguarding and Child Protection Policy of the School in which you were teaching.

The panel noted that Mr Newman admitted allegation 3, as set out in the response to the notice of referral dated 17 March 2021 and the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Newman on 14 November 2022. Notwithstanding this, the panel made a determination based on the facts available to it.

In the statement of agreed facts, Mr Newman admitted that his physical contact with pupils was not minimal, limited in duration, age appropriate or justified and was therefore in breach of the School's safeguarding and child protection policy.

The panel was provided with a copy of the School's safeguarding and child protection policy. The panel was satisfied that Mr Newman's conduct was not consistent with the spirit of the School's safeguarding and child protection policy.

On examination of the documents before the panel, and the admissions in the signed statement of agreed facts, the panel was satisfied that allegation 3 was 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 Newman, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Newman was in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
- 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 Mr Newman's conduct fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The panel understood that teachers may engage in physical contact with pupils in limited circumstances and in accordance with relevant internal and external guidance. However, Mr Newman engaged in physical contact with pupils without good reason and, in doing so, he failed to observe proper boundaries and he failed to act in accordance with the spirit of the School's safeguarding and child protection policy. It was not acceptable for Mr Newman to touch pupils' backs, shoulders, arms, ears and hair in the way in which he did, nor was it acceptable for him to whisper in their ears.

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

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

The findings of misconduct were serious and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public perception. The public would expect teachers to observe proper boundaries appropriate to their role.

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

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

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

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

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

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found the following to be relevant in this case: 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.

The panel's findings against Mr Newman involved: inappropriate physical contact; a failure to observe proper boundaries; and a failure to act in accordance with the spirit of the School's safeguarding and child protection policy. There was therefore 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 Newman were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

The panel decided that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Mr Newman 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 Newman. The panel was mindful of the need to strike the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest.

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

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk; and
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils).

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 concluded that Mr Newman's actions were deliberate; he deliberately engaged in physical contact with pupils.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Newman was acting under extreme duress.

The panel had regard to whether Mr Newman demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both personal and professional conduct and whether he has contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel noted that demonstrating "exceptionally high standards" and a "significant contribution" was a high bar to reach. However, it appeared that Mr Newman was a good teacher, and the panel noted that he previously had an unblemished record.

Mr Newman submitted a number of character witnesses and pupil testimonials which commented positively on his ability as a teacher. The panel noted the following comments in particular:

- Individual A, [REDACTED]: *“As a colleague, Rick has been one of the most if not, the most supportive teacher I have worked beside... This has been evident in his and the departments exam results over the past three years, Rick was instrumental in pushing our results to the highest level of 95% A*-C in 2016 where we jointly managed the department on a maternity cover.”*
- Individual B, [REDACTED]: *“My observations of him as a teacher over the years has always seen him as being professional and has an easy going demeanour where the students feel at ease in his lessons and seemed to genuinely enjoy being in his lessons as there was always a joyful atmosphere in his classrooms which is down to his personality and teaching style... My observations over the years of him interacting with students has always been professional and his commitment to safeguarding has been unquestionable.”*
- Individual C, [REDACTED]: *“He was unquestionably professional with the students and fellow staff during [a School] trip, as well as consistently demonstrating a very positive attitude. He developed an excellent and respectful rapport with the students... Not at any time did I feel that Richard demonstrated unsuitable behaviour with staff or students. Above all Richard was highly competent, organised, and professional.”*
- Individual D, [REDACTED]: *“During his time at John Ferneley Rick became a corner stone of the school community.”*
- Individual E, [REDACTED] alongside Mr Newman at the School: *“It has been a privilege and a pleasure to work with Rick, he has a relaxed and friendly manner of teacher. He is very good at talking to the students encouraging to come up with various ideas and helping them to work things out for themselves.”*

The panel noted an undated written statement from Mr Newman, in which he expressed remorse and accepted his wrongdoing. He referred to his desire to create relationships and inspire pupils and stated that his actions were done with the best of intentions, but accepted that, on reflection, his actions were inappropriate. The panel noted the following extracts in particular:

- *“Since the allegations were presented to me I have spent a lot of time reflecting. Having considered how I have conducted myself in a classroom, I have been particularly devastated [sic] that I have made any young person feel uncomfortable. In my mind this is unforgivable. The thought that I have, in any way, upset a young person makes me feel ashamed. I would never do this again”*

- *“If I ever went back into the teaching professions I would change my actions completely and adopt a much more professional approach.”*

The panel first considered whether it would be proportionate to conclude this case with no recommendation of prohibition, considering whether the publication of the findings made by the panel would be sufficient.

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings was sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Newman 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 Newman. The fact that Mr Newman had failed to observe appropriate professional boundaries 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 to recommend that a review period of the order should be considered. The panel was mindful that the Advice states that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances, in any given case, that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 2 years.

The panel considered the list of behaviours at paragraph 50 of the Advice. The Advice states that where a case involves such behaviours, it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period. The panel did not find that any of these behaviours were relevant.

The panel also considered the list of behaviours at paragraph 51 of the Advice. The Advice states that where a case involves such behaviours it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate. The panel did not find that any of these behaviours were relevant.

The panel 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 a 2 year review period. The panel considered that a review period of 2 years reflected the fact that the conduct, whilst serious, was towards the lower end of the spectrum of seriousness.

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 Richard Newman should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of two years.

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
- 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 Newman fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of failing to observe proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position.

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 Newman, 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 understood that teachers may engage in physical contact with pupils in limited circumstances and in accordance with relevant internal and external guidance. However, Mr Newman engaged in physical contact with pupils without good reason and, in doing so, he failed to observe proper boundaries and he failed to act in accordance with the spirit of the School’s safeguarding and child protection policy. It was not acceptable for Mr Newman to touch pupils’ backs, shoulders, arms, ears and hair in the way in which he did, nor was it acceptable for him to whisper in their ears.” 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 noted an undated written statement from Mr Newman, in which he expressed remorse and accepted his wrongdoing. He referred to his desire to create relationships and inspire pupils and stated that his actions were done with the best of intentions, but accepted that, on reflection, his actions were inappropriate.” 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, “the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Newman were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct 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 Newman himself, the panel comment “The panel had regard to whether Mr Newman demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both personal and professional conduct and whether he has contributed significantly to the education sector. The panel noted that demonstrating “exceptionally high standards” and a “significant contribution” was a high bar to reach. However, it appeared that Mr Newman was a good teacher, and the panel noted that he previously had an unblemished record. Mr Newman submitted a number of character witnesses and

pupil testimonials which commented positively on his ability as a teacher.” A prohibition order would prevent Mr Newman from teaching and clearly deprive the public of his contribution to the profession for the period that it is in force.

I have however, given less weight in my consideration of sanction to the contribution that Mr Newman 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 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 two year review period.

I have considered the panel’s comments “The panel considered that a review period of 2 years reflected the fact that the conduct, whilst serious, was towards the lower end of the spectrum of seriousness.”

I have considered whether a two year review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a two year review period is sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the lack of insight and the conduct, whilst serious, being towards the lower end of the spectrum of seriousness.

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

This means that Mr Richard Newman 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 11 May 2025, two 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 Newman remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr Newman 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.

John Knowles

Decision maker: John Knowles

Date: 3 May 2023

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