



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Julius Edwards: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

May 2023

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	5
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Witnesses	6
Decision and reasons	6
Findings of fact	7
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	11
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	13

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

Teacher:	Mr Julius Edwards
Teacher ref number:	0317729
Teacher date of birth:	27 September 1971
TRA reference:	19507
Date of determination:	10 May 2023
Former employer:	Dove House School, Basingstoke

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ('the panel') of the Teaching Regulation Agency ('the TRA') convened on 9 to 10 May 2023 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Julius Edwards.

The panel members were Ms Joanna Hurren (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Clive Ruddle (lay panellist) and Ms Susan Ridge (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Sam Haldane of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Stephen Ferson of Kingsley Napley solicitors.

Mr Edwards was present and was not represented.

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 23 February 2023.

It was alleged that Mr Edwards was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:

1. On 17 January 1989, he was convicted of burglary, contrary to Section 9(1)(b) of the Theft Act 1968.
2. On 27 August 2003, he was convicted of driving a motor vehicle after consuming so much alcohol that his alcohol concentration level was above the prescribed limit, contrary to Section 5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988.
3. On 6 May 2004, he was convicted of driving whilst disqualified, contrary to Section 103(1)(b) of the Road Traffic Act 1988.
4. On the 6 May 2004, he was convicted of using a vehicle while uninsured, contrary to Section 143(2) of the Road Traffic Act 1988.
5. On 12 April 2021, he was convicted of 12 counts of sexual activity with a child, contrary to Section 9(1) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003.
6. On 12 April 2021, he was convicted of assault by penetration, contrary to Section 2 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003.
7. On 12 April 2021, he was convicted of 3 counts of attempted penetrative sexual activity with a child, contract to Section 1(1) of the Criminal Attempts Act 1981.
8. On 12 April 2021, he was convicted of attempted sexual communication with a child, contrary to Section 1(1) of the Criminal Attempts Act 1981.
9. On 12 April 2021, he was convicted of 2 counts of failure to comply with a notice to provide a key, contrary to Sections 49 and 53(1) of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000.

Mr Edwards admitted the facts of allegations 1 and 2 but denied that those admitted facts amounted to a relevant conviction. Mr Edwards accepted allegations 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 amounted to relevant offences.

Preliminary applications

Application to admit additional documents

The panel considered a preliminary application from the presenting officer for the admission of additional documents.

The presenting officer's documents were a late papers bundle, correspondence bundle and disputed bundle.

The documents subject to the application had not been served in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 5.37 of the Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession May 2020 (the 'Procedures'). Therefore, the panel was required to decide whether the documents should be admitted under paragraph 5.34 of the 2020 Procedures.

The panel heard representations from the presenting officer and teacher in respect of the application. The teacher objected to the application on the basis he wanted the full trial transcript admitted.

The panel considered the additional documents were relevant. Accordingly, the documents were added to the bundle.

Application to determine status of teacher

The panel considered a preliminary application from Mr Edwards to find that he was not in fact a teacher or undertook teaching roles. He submitted that during the Covid 19 pandemic he was a carer rather than teacher.

The panel heard representations from the presenting officer and noted that Mr Edwards was [REDACTED] they also saw a job description provided by Dove House from 2019 to 2020 which detailed his role as a "Science Teacher".

The panel also noted the letter of [REDACTED] at page 27 of correspondence bundle confirming the role of Mr Edwards.

The panel considered Mr Edwards to be a teacher and undertaking teaching work at the time of the allegations.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

- Section 1: Chronology, anonymised pupil list and list of key people – pages 3 to 5
- Section 2: Notice of hearing and response – pages 6 to 12
- Section 3: TRA documents – pages 13 to 41
- Section 4: Teacher documents – pages 42 to 55

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following:

- Section 5A Late papers bundle – pages 56 to 62
- Section 5B Correspondence – pages 63 to 91
- Section 5C Disputed bundle – pages 92 to 99

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the hearing and the additional documents that the panel decided to admit.

Witnesses

Mr Edwards was present and therefore provided an opening statement and mitigation statement. The facts of the case were not contested.

No witnesses were called to provide oral evidence at the hearing.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

Mr Edwards was convicted of burglary on 17 January 1989. Mr Edwards was later convicted of driving a motor vehicle with excess alcohol on 27 August 2003, and driving whilst disqualified and using a vehicle while uninsured on 6 May 2004.

Mr Edwards commenced teaching at Dove House School ('the School') as a science teacher on 3 June 2019.

Mr Edwards was suspended from the School on 7 May 2020. Mr Edwards was convicted of 12 counts of sexual activity with a child, assault by penetration; 3 counts of attempted penetrative sexual activity with a child; and 2 counts of failure to comply with a notice to provide a key.

Mr Edwards was sentenced at Kingston Crown Court on 4 June 2021.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

The panel found the following particulars of the allegations against you proved but not relevant, for these reasons:

- 1. On 17 January 1989, you were convicted of burglary, contrary to Section 9(1)(b) of the Theft Act 1968.**
- 2. On 27 August 2003, you were convicted of driving a motor vehicle after consuming so much alcohol that your alcohol concentration level was above the prescribed limit, contrary to Section 5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988.**

The panel noted that, within the response to the notice of proceedings dated 2 March 2023, Mr Edwards admitted allegation 1 and 2. However, Mr Edwards denied that allegations 1 and 2 amounted to relevant convictions. Mr Edwards submitted that, if such convictions were relevant, he would not have been allowed to continue teaching.

The panel noted page 8 of the Teacher misconduct: The prohibition of teachers ('the Advice') which states that where there has been a conviction at any time, of a criminal offence, the panel will accept the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction, unless exceptional circumstances apply. The panel did not find that any exceptional circumstances applied in this case.

The panel had been provided with a copy of the print of PNC identification details document, which detailed that Mr Edwards was convicted of burglary and theft – non-dwelling contrary to s9(1)(b) of the Theft Act 1968 and driving a motor vehicle with excess alcohol contrary to s5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988. The panel was also provided with a memorandum of conviction from the North Hampshire Magistrates Court in relation to driving a motor vehicle with excess alcohol. The panel specifically noted the memorandum of conviction stated that Mr Edwards had been convicted upon a guilty plea.

In respect of the allegations, Mr Edwards was ordered to pay CPS costs of £55; a fine of £400; and was disqualified from driving for 15 months – to be reduced by 3 months 21 days if a rehabilitation course was completed by 5 June 2004. The memorandum confirmed that the rehabilitation course was not completed.

The panel found allegation 1 and 2 proven as the convictions were not disputed.

When considering the relevance of the offences the panel considered the age of Mr Edwards at the time of allegation 1 and took into account that he was a youth at the time

and had showed a lack of maturity in regard to this offence. The panel felt it was not relevant to his role as a teacher as Mr Edwards was a youth at the time of this offence.

The panel considered allegation 2 to be a serious offence and did note the age of the conviction. The panel noted that Mr Edwards had still been employed as a teacher despite having this conviction. The panel looked at this matter in isolation and felt that it was not a relevant offence given its age and the fact Mr Edwards continued to be employed as a teacher.

The panel did not find allegations 1 and 2 to be relevant offences.

- 3. On 6 May 2004, you were convicted of driving whilst disqualified, contrary to Section 103(1)(b) of the Road Traffic Act 1988.**
- 4. On the 6 May 2004, you were convicted of using a vehicle while uninsured, contrary to Section 143(2) of the Road Traffic Act 1988.**
- 5. On 12 April 2021, you were convicted of 12 counts of sexual activity with a child, contrary to Section 9(1) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003.**
- 6. On 12 April 2021, you were convicted of assault by penetration, contrary to Section 2 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003.**
- 7. On 12 April 2021, you were convicted of 3 counts of attempted penetrative sexual activity with a child, contract to Section 1(1) of the Criminal Attempts Act 1981.**
- 8. On 12 April 2021, you were convicted of attempted sexual communication with a child, contrary to Section 1(1) of the Criminal Attempts Act 1981.**
- 9. On 12 April 2021, you were convicted of 2 counts of failure to comply with a notice to provide a key, contrary to Sections 49 and 53(1) of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000.**

The panel noted that Mr Edwards denied allegations 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9.

The panel again noted page 8 of the Advice, which states that where there has been a conviction at any time, of a criminal offence, the panel will accept the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction, unless exceptional circumstances apply, and did not find that any exceptional circumstances applied in this case.

In respect of allegations 3 and 4, the panel had been provided with a copy of the print of PNC identification details document. Mr Edwards was convicted of driving whilst disqualified contrary to s103(1)(b) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and was made subject to a community punishment order – 60 hours; ordered to pay costs of £70; and his driving

licence was endorsed with 6 points. Mr Edwards was convicted of using a vehicle while uninsured contrary to s143(2) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and was ordered to pay a fine of £170 and his driving licence was endorsed.

The panel found allegations 3 and 4 to be serious and considered driving whilst disqualified to be a flagrant disregard for a court order and a conscious choice made by Mr Edwards. The panel considered that his attempt to explain his actions was not justifiable. The panel felt it showed a disregard for the law which is unacceptable in any walk of life.

In respect of allegations 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9, the panel had been provided with a copy of the certificate of conviction from Kingston Crown Court, which outlined that Mr Edwards was convicted of 12 counts of sexual activity with a child contrary to section 9(1) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003; assault by penetration contrary to s2 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003; 3 counts of attempted penetrative sexual activity with a child contrary to section 1(1) of the Criminal Attempts Act 1982; attempted sexual communication with a child contrary to section 1(1) of the Criminal Attempts Act 1981; and 2 counts of failure to comply with a notice to provide a key contrary to sections 49 and 53(1) of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000.

The panel also had sight of the sentencing remarks from [REDACTED] who described Mr Edwards as a “predatory paedophile”. They took regard to the victims’ comments on these offences which were affecting their trust with teachers at the school.

The panel felt that there was a significant element of grooming surrounding these offences and that Mr Edwards immersed himself into the child’s family life. It was even more concerning that some of the victims had additional vulnerabilities.

Of further concern was the attempts by Mr Edwards to frustrate the investigation and not co-operate with the police which ultimately led to the conviction forming the basis of allegation 9.

Mr Edwards was sentenced to a total of 14 years imprisonment with an extended license period of 4 years totalling an 18 year period. Mr Edwards was placed on the sex offenders register indefinitely. In addition, the judge ordered that Mr Edwards be placed on the barring list by the disclosure and barring service; made the subject of a sexual harm prevention order until further order; and was ordered to pay a victim surcharge of £181.

The panel found allegations 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 proven and relevant.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

Having found a number of the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to conviction of a relevant offence.

In doing so, the panel had regard to the Advice.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Edwards, in relation to the facts it found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that by reference to Part 2, Mr Edwards 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
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was made aware that the incidents did not involve pupils at the school. However, given that Mr Edwards was convicted for sexual offences against children, the panel noted that his actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety and/or security of pupils and/or members of the public.

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Edwards' behaviour in committing these offences would undoubtedly affect public confidence in the teaching profession, particularly given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community.

The panel noted that Mr Edwards' behaviour ultimately led to a sentence of imprisonment, which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed. The child protection and public protection issues engaged by Mr Edwards' actions were demonstrated by the Court's sentence.

This was a case concerning an offence involving sexual activity and sexual communication with a child, which the Advice states is more likely to be considered a relevant offence.

The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Edwards ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a

finding that these convictions were for relevant offences was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

The panel therefore determined that the convictions at allegations 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 amounted to convictions of relevant offences.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of a conviction of a relevant offence, it was necessary for the panel to go on to consider whether it would be appropriate to recommend the imposition of a prohibition order by the Secretary of State.

In considering whether to recommend to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be made, the panel had to consider whether it would be an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it would be in the public interest to do so.

The panel were aware that prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely: the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other members of the public; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct; and that prohibition strikes the right balance between the rights of the teacher and the public interest, if they are in conflict.

In light of the nature of the offences for which Mr Edwards was convicted, there was an extremely strong public interest consideration in respect of the protection of pupils and other members of the public. His actions raised obvious and significant public and child protection concerns, as was clearly recognised by the court when imposing sentence.

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

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Mr Edwards 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 Edwards. 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 Edwards. 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;
- the commission of a serious criminal offence, including those that resulted in a conviction or caution, paying particular attention to offences that are 'relevant matters' for the purposes of The Police Act 1997 and criminal record disclosures;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- sexual misconduct, for example, involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature and/or that use or exploit the trust, knowledge or influence derived from the individual's professional position;
- sustained or serious bullying, or other deliberate behaviour that undermines pupils, the profession, the school or colleagues;
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions or purposeful destruction of evidence, especially where these behaviours have been repeated or had serious consequences, or involved the coercion of another person to act in a way contrary to their own interests.

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors.

Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate. It was noted that Mr Edwards stated he had [REDACTED] however no other mitigation was advanced.

There was no evidence that Mr Edwards actions were not deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Edwards was acting under extreme duress, and, in fact, the panel found Mr Edwards actions to be calculated and motivated.

No evidence was submitted to attest to Mr Edwards history or ability as a teacher. Nor was any evidence submitted which demonstrates exceptionally high standards in both personal and professional conduct or that he contributed significantly to the education sector.

No significant mitigation evidence was submitted and Mr Edwards showed no insight or remorse for his actions.

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 Edwards.

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 Edwards. The seriousness of the offences 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. These behaviours include serious sexual misconduct, such as where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons, particularly where the individual has used his/her professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons; and any sexual misconduct involving a child. The panel found that Mr Edwards was responsible for having been convicted of 12 counts of sexual activity with a child involving different children, amongst other offences.

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

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

I have given very careful consideration to this case and to the recommendation of the panel in respect of both sanction and review period.

In considering this case, I have also given very careful attention to the Advice that the Secretary of State has published concerning the prohibition of teachers.

In this case, the panel has found all of the allegations proven and found that apart from allegations 1 and 2, that those proven facts amount to relevant convictions. In regard to the 2 allegations that were not deemed to be relevant convictions, I can confirm that I have put those matters entirely from my mind.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Julius Edwards should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Edwards 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
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
 - not undermining fundamental British values, including democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty and mutual respect, and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards in their own attendance and punctuality.
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel also set out that it, “was made aware that the incidents did not involve pupils at the school. However, given that Mr Edwards was convicted for sexual offences against children, the panel noted that his actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting.”

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of “12 counts of sexual activity with a child, contrary to Section 9(1) of the Sexual Offences Act 2003.”

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 a relevant conviction, 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 Edwards, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children and safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, “that Mr Edwards was convicted

for sexual offences against children, the panel noted that his actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and/or working in an education setting.”

The panel also, “noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence could have had an impact on the safety and/or security of pupils and/or members of the public.”

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 Edwards showed no insight or remorse for his actions.” In my judgement, the lack of insight and remorse means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils and children. 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 also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Edwards’ behaviour in committing these offences would undoubtedly affect public confidence in the teaching profession, particularly given the influence that teachers may have on pupils, parents and others in the community.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of serious sexual offences against children 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 a relevant conviction, 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 Edwards himself. The panel comment “No evidence was submitted to attest to Mr Edwards history or ability as a teacher. Nor was any evidence submitted which demonstrates exceptionally high standards in both personal and professional conduct or that he contributed significantly to the education sector.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Edwards from teaching and 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, "The panel found that Mr Edwards was responsible for having been convicted of 12 counts of sexual activity with a child involving different children, amongst other offences."

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Edwards has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, that is not backed up by full remorse or insight, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

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

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

I have considered the panel's comments "The Advice indicates that there are behaviours that, if proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period. These behaviours include serious sexual misconduct, such as where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons, particularly where the individual has used his/her professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons; and any sexual misconduct involving a child. The panel found that Mr Edwards was responsible for having been convicted of 12 counts of sexual activity with a child involving different children, amongst other offences."

I have considered whether not allowing for a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is proportionate to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, the factors which mean that not allowing for a review period is necessary and in the public interest are the nature of the convictions and the lack of any insight or remorse.

I consider therefore that allowing for no review period is necessary to maintain public confidence and is proportionate and in the public interest.

This means that Mr Julius Edwards 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 Julius Edwards 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 Julius Edwards 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.

Alan Meyrick

Decision maker: Alan Meyrick

Date: 12 May 2023

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