



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr William Nuttycombe: Professional conduct panel outcome**

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

**June 2023**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	7
Documents	7
Witnesses	8
Decision and reasons	8
Findings of fact	8
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 William Nuttycombe

**Teacher ref number:** 8363754

**Teacher date of birth:** 10 March 1959

**TRA reference:** 20044

**Date of determination:** 20 June 2023

**Former employer:** Aylesbury High School

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 19 – 20 June 2023 by virtual means to consider the case of Mr William Nuttycombe.

The panel members were Mr Ronan Tyrer (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Melissa West (teacher panellist) and Mrs Gemma Hutchinson (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Priyesh Dave of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Shaun Moran of Capsticks LLP solicitors.

Mr Nuttycombe was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

## Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 6 April 2023.

It was alleged that Mr Nuttycombe was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that while employed as a teacher at Aylesbury High School:

1. Mr Nuttycombe uploaded inappropriate photographs and/or videos to one or more of the social media profiles or websites set out at Schedule 1:
2. One or more of those photographs and/or videos referred to at allegation 1 showed Mr Nuttycombe performing sexual acts on himself and/or others;
3. Mr Nuttycombe failed to ensure that any or all of those photographs and/or videos referred to in allegations 1 and/or 2 were not visible to pupils and/or parents.

Schedule 1:

- Instagram – in name of [REDACTED]
- Instagram – using pseudonym [REDACTED] - [REDACTED]
- Twitter – in name of [REDACTED] - [REDACTED]
- ‘onlyfans.com’ – in name of [REDACTED]
- ‘4myfans.com’ – in name of [REDACTED]
- ‘justforfans.com’ – in name of [REDACTED]

Mr Nuttycombe has not admitted either the alleged facts or that he is guilty of unacceptable professional conduct or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

## Preliminary applications

### Application to amend allegations

1. An application has been made by the presenting officer to amend the Notice of Proceedings by amending allegation 3 to include the word “in”. The panel has the power to, in the interests of justice, amend an allegation or the particulars of an allegation, at any stage before making its decision about whether the facts of the case have been proved.
2. Before making an amendment, the panel is required to consider any representations by the presenting officer and by the teacher, if present.

3. The panel considered that the amendment proposed being a correction of a typographical error does not change the nature, scope or seriousness of the allegations. Despite the fact that the teacher was not present, there is no prospect of the teacher's case being presented differently had the amendment been made at an earlier stage, and therefore no unfairness or prejudice caused to the teacher. The panel therefore decided to amend the allegation as proposed.

### **Application to admit late documents**

1. The presenting officer has applied to admit a bundle of correspondence documents. Those documents were not served in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 5.35 of the Procedures, and as such the panel is required to decide whether those documents should be admitted under paragraph 5.34 of the Procedures at the discretion of the panel. The panel took into account the representations from the presenting officer to the admission of the documents. This application was heard prior to hearing any application on proceeding in the absence of the teacher.
2. Under paragraph 5.33 of the Procedures, the panel may admit any evidence, where it is fair to do so, which may reasonably be considered to be relevant to the case.
3. The panel is satisfied that the documents are relevant to the case in so far as they set out the correspondence between the TRA's representatives and the teacher.
4. With regard to the overall question of fairness, the panel's attention was drawn to the fact that the correspondence bundle contained documents to which the teacher was party. Given the absence of the teacher at this stage, the panel considered whether he had received the documents. The panel noted that one document showed the teacher responding to the TRA's representatives.
5. By reason of the above, the panel has decided to admit each of the documents and these should be paginated as set out in the correspondence bundle. Any express reference to documents in the correspondence bundle shall be referred to as the "Correspondence Bundle".

### **Proceeding in Absence**

The panel has considered whether this hearing should continue in the absence of the teacher.

The panel is satisfied that the TRA has complied with the service requirements of paragraph 19 a to c of the Teachers' Disciplinary (England) Regulations 2012, (the "Regulations").

The panel is also satisfied that the Notice of Proceedings complied with paragraphs 5.23 and 5.24 of the Teacher Misconduct: Disciplinary Procedures for the Teaching Profession, (the "Procedures").

The panel has determined to exercise its discretion under paragraph 5.47 of the Procedures to proceed with the hearing in the absence of the teacher.

The panel has taken as its starting point the principle from *R v Jones* that its discretion to commence a hearing in the absence of the teacher has to be exercised with the utmost care and caution, and that its discretion is a severely constrained one. In considering the question of fairness, the panel has recognised that fairness to the professional is of prime importance but that it also encompasses the fair, economic, expeditious and efficient disposal of allegations against the professional, as was explained in *GMC v Adeogba & Visvardis*.

In making its decision, the panel has noted that the teacher may waive his right to participate in the hearing. The panel has firstly taken account of the various factors drawn to its attention from the case of *R v Jones* [2003] 1 AC1.

- i) On the last occasion that contact was established with Mr Nuttycombe on 26 January 2023, he stated that he had not been teaching since 2020 and he did not have a hearing to deal with. He asked the TRA representatives to stop contacting him. The panel therefore believe that Mr Nuttycombe has decided not to engage with the TRA hearing.
- ii) The panel has noted that Mr Nuttycombe was later contacted by the TRA's representative regarding his lack of response to the notice of proceedings. The panel therefore considers that the teacher had knowledge of when and where the hearing is taking place and has waived his right to be present at the hearing.
- iii) On the basis of the correspondence Mr Nuttycombe had sent to the TRA representatives, it was considered unlikely that an adjournment might result in the teacher attending voluntarily, and
- iv) At the stage of panel's considerations, it was unclear how long any such adjournment would be required to obtain Mr Nuttycombe's engagement with the hearing.

- v) The panel noted that Mr Nuttycombe was not represented and the panel had not received any correspondence or application from Mr Nuttycombe to adjourn the hearing to obtain legal representation.
- vi) The panel has recognised that the allegations against the teacher are serious and that there is a real risk that if proven, the panel will be required to consider whether to recommend that the teacher ought to be prohibited from teaching.
- vii) The panel recognises that the efficient disposal of allegations against teachers is required to ensure the protection of pupils and to maintain confidence in the profession.
- viii) The panel also notes that there are two witnesses present at the hearing, who are prepared to give evidence, and that it would be inconvenient for them to return again.

The panel has decided to proceed with the hearing in the absence of the teacher. The panel considers that in light of the teacher's waiver of his right to appear; by taking such measures referred to above to address that unfairness insofar as is possible; and taking account of the inconvenience an adjournment would cause to the witnesses; that on balance, these are serious allegations and the public interest in this hearing proceeding within a reasonable time is in favour of this hearing continuing today.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section 1: Chronology and list of key people – pages 2 to 3

Section 2: Notice of Referral, Notice of Proceedings – pages 4 to 19

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 20 to 23

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 24 to 153

The panel also received two videos:

Appendix 13; and

Appendix 14.

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the Correspondence Bundle consisting of 23 pages.

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. Appendices 13 and 14 were viewed by the panel before the hearing.

## **Witnesses**

The panel heard oral evidence from:

1. Witness A, [REDACTED]; and
2. Witness B, [REDACTED].

All witnesses were called by the presenting officer.

## **Decision and reasons**

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

In September 2014, Mr Nuttycombe was employed by Aylesbury High School ("the School"). In July 2020, following an investigation by the School of Mr Nuttycombe's social media posts, a disciplinary meeting was held in July 2020. Prior to the outcome of the disciplinary meeting Mr Nuttycombe retired in August 2020.

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

The panel found the following particulars of the allegation(s) against you proved, for these reasons:

Whilst employed as a teacher at Aylesbury High School:

- 1. you uploaded inappropriate photographs and/or videos to one or more of the following social media profiles or websites set out at Schedule 1:**

**Schedule 1:**

**Instagram – in name of [REDACTED]**

**Instagram – using pseudonym [REDACTED] - [REDACTED]**

**Twitter – in name of [REDACTED] - [REDACTED]**

**'onlyfans.com' – in name of [REDACTED]**

**'4myfans.com' – in name of [REDACTED]**



## **‘justforfans.com’ – in name of [REDACTED]**

Witness A gave evidence that as part of his investigation, on behalf of the School, Mr Nuttycombe in interview admitted that:

- he had Twitter and Instagram accounts;
- he used the pseudonym of ‘[REDACTED]’; and
- the video evidence, known to the panel as appendices 13 and 14, were of him.

The panel placed substantial reliance on the evidence of Mr Nuttycombe’s admissions in the investigation interview.

Having reviewed the images that had been posted on Instagram which had been seen by the panel within the bundle, the panel determined that examples of the photos within the bundle were inappropriate due to the content of the images and their captions were sexually suggestive and of a provocative nature.

The content of appendix 13 was a solo sex act and appendix 14 was sexual activity with another person. Both appendices were pornographic in their nature and had the watermark for ‘JustForFans’.

Although the panel has not seen Mr Nuttycombe’s content on the pay-per-view sites, these websites were clearly linked in his Twitter page. The panel concluded that the inclusion of the watermark in both appendices was a desire from Mr Nuttycombe to drive traffic from his Twitter page to his OnlyFans, JustForFans, and 4MyFans pages (“Pay-Per-View Sites”).

The panel found this allegation proven.

### **2. one or more of those photographs and/or videos referred to at allegation 1 showed you performing sexual acts on yourself and/or others;**

As stated above, the panel had seen the content of appendix 13, a solo sex act, and appendix 14, sexual activity with another person. These videos were admitted by Mr Nuttycombe as being uploaded by and featuring him in his investigation meeting with Witness A.

The panel found this allegation proven.

### **3. you failed to ensure that any or all of those photographs and/or videos referred to in allegations 1 and/or 2 were not visible to pupils and/or parents.**

The panel had seen evidence that the public were able to access the content of Mr Nuttycombe’s social media pages and members of the public had reported the matter to the School. The School received some screenshots of images and videos from Instagram and Twitter. The videos from the public are those named appendices 13 and 14.

Witness A provided evidence that at the time of his investigation Mr Nuttycombe's Twitter and Instagram pages, although now private, clearly showed links to his Pay-Per-View Sites. Witness A was able to use Google to search Mr Nuttycombe's details and was able to find links to his pseudonym [REDACTED]. Witness A's evidence was that the link between Mr Nuttycombe's name and his pseudonym was correlated quickly.

The panel found this allegation proven.

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

Having found a number of 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 Nuttycombe, in relation to the facts found proved at allegation 1, 2 and 3, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Nuttycombe was in breach of the following standards:

Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by

- having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions

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 was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Nuttycombe fell significantly short of the standard of behaviour expected of a teacher.

The panel noted that the allegations 1, 2, and 3 took place outside the education setting. The sexually explicit videos uploaded to Mr Nuttycombe's social media accounts which were widely accessible to the public had the potential to expose pupils to harmful content. Even once private, Mr Nuttycombe's Twitter account still linked to Pay-Per-View Sites. This could result in pupils and/or parents being exposed to images and videos of Mr Nuttycombe if they purchased access.

The panel then considered the issue of disrepute.

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

The panel also considered whether Mr Nuttycombe conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice.

The panel found that the offence of sexual activity was 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 conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel noted that the advice is not intended to be exhaustive and there may be other behaviours that panels consider to be "conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute". The panel decided that Mr Nuttycombe's conduct was not that of a low level concern. The panel considered that the role of a teacher is a uniquely influential role. In that context, the images and videos that were posted by Mr Nuttycombe were inappropriate and those of an explicit nature were extremely inappropriate. Mr Nuttycombe in his Twitter profile included links to Pay-Per-View Sites which are understood by the panel to be typically pornographic. Mr Nuttycombe also identified himself as a teacher on his Instagram account, whilst in the same section having a link to his Twitter profile which in turn had links to his Pay-Per-View Sites. Mr Nuttycombe was easily searchable on Google to show his pseudonym of '[REDACTED]'. Although the panel saw evidence that Mr Nuttycombe took steps to make his social media accounts private, this does not correlate with the nature of the Pay-Per-View Sites which the panel understand are commercial in their nature.

The findings of misconduct are serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher.

The panel considered that Mr Nuttycombe's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher.

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

Having found the facts of particulars 1, 2, and 3 proved, the panel further found that Mr Nuttycombe'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/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 is appropriate, the panel had to consider the public interest, the seriousness of the behaviour and any mitigation offered by Mr Nuttycombe and whether a prohibition order is necessary and proportionate. Prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

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

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Nuttycombe, as stated above, the panel notes that Mr Nuttycombe had been previously warned about his inappropriate use of social media. The panel notes that Mr Nuttycombe had again uploaded inappropriate content less than six months after the earlier warning.

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of 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.

Similarly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Nuttycombe were 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 Nuttycombe was outside that which could reasonably be tolerated.

In this case, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Nuttycombe in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the behaviour, noting that the Advice states that the expectation of both the public and pupils, is that members of the teaching profession maintain an exemplary level of integrity and ethical standards at all times.

The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a panel will likely consider a teacher's behaviour to be incompatible with being a teacher if there is evidence of one or more of the factors that begin on page 15. In the list of such factors, those that were relevant in this case were:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk; and
- sexual misconduct, for example, involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature.

The panel has taken into account Mr Nuttycombe's online behaviours, in particular how easily he was found on social media, the content being posted on social media, the public nature of the Twitter and Instagram accounts, his Instagram profile stated that he was a teacher, he posted sexually explicit content on Twitter, and the links to his Pay-Per-View Sites.

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, taking account of the public interest and the seriousness of the behaviour and the likely harm to the public interest were the teacher be allowed to continue to teach, the panel went on to consider whether there were mitigating circumstances.

The panel considered:

Mr Nuttycombe, in evidence from the investigation documentation, stated that he was suffering from [REDACTED], however no medical evidence was presented to the panel.

Mr Nuttycombe during the investigation stated that he was supporting a pupil with a mental health issue. No evidence on this was provided and the School did not provide the panel with any comments on this.

The panel saw evidence that showed Mr Nuttycombe was previously subject to a recent warning in relation to his use of social media.

The panel notes that no references were provided from any colleagues that could attest to his abilities as a teacher.

Mr Nuttycombe had been teaching at the School for six years, but there is no evidence of exceptional contribution to teaching.

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 Nuttycombe 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 Nuttycombe. The absence of any insight or genuine remorse 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 cases involving certain conduct where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period. One of these cases includes serious sexual misconduct, e.g. 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 professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons. The panel found that Mr Nuttycombe was responsible for uploading sexually explicit photos and videos of himself and with other people, on social media whilst his social media accounts were open to the public. The panel has concluded that these actions amount to serious sexual misconduct.

Taking into account the issue of mitigation, although, no mitigation was provided for the panel to consider, the lack of insight and genuine remorse shown by Mr Nuttycombe, the panel could not be satisfied that there would not be repeated inappropriate use of social media or sharing of explicit sexual content in the public domain. Therefore, 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 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 William Nuttycombe should be the subject of a prohibition order, with no provision for a review period.

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

Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by

- having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions

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 Nuttycombe fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of uploading sexually explicit videos and images to social media accounts, which were widely accessible to the public had the potential to expose pupils to harmful content.

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 Nuttycombe 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, "There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and the protection of other 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, "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 Nuttycombe. The absence of any insight or genuine remorse was a significant factor in forming that opinion." 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. 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 Nuttycombe were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession." I am particularly mindful of the finding of potentially exposing pupils to sexual and harmful social media content 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 Nuttycombe himself and the panel comment "The panel notes that no references were provided from any colleagues that could attest to his abilities as a teacher."

"Mr Nuttycombe had been teaching at the School for six years, but there is no evidence of exceptional contribution to teaching." A prohibition order would prevent Mr Nuttycombe 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 concerning sexual misconduct. The panel has said, "The panel found that Mr Nuttycombe was responsible for uploading sexually explicit photos and videos of himself and with other people, on social media whilst his social media accounts were open to the public. The panel has concluded that these actions amount to serious sexual misconduct."

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding of the panel "In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Nuttycombe, as stated above, the panel notes that Mr



Nuttycombe had been previously warned about his inappropriate use of social media. The panel notes that Mr Nuttycombe had again uploaded inappropriate content less than six months after the earlier warning.”

In making my decision I have also placed considerable weight on the following “The panel decided that Mr Nuttycombe’s conduct was not that of a low level concern. The panel considered that the role of a teacher is a uniquely influential role. In that context, the images and videos that were posted by Mr Nuttycombe were inappropriate and those of an explicit nature were extremely inappropriate.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Nuttycombe 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 “Taking into account the issue of mitigation, although, no mitigation was provided for the panel to consider, the lack of insight and genuine remorse shown by Mr Nuttycombe, the panel could not be satisfied that there would not be repeated inappropriate use of social media or sharing of explicit sexual content in the public domain. Therefore, 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.”

In this case, factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the seriousness of the findings and the lack of either 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 William Nuttycombe 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 Nuttycombe 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 Nuttycombe 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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'SABuxcey', with a stylized, cursive script.

**Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey**

**Date: 23 June 2023**

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