



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Douglas Speight Professional conduct panel outcome**

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

**August 2023**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	6
Documents	6
Witnesses	7
Decision and reasons	7
Findings of fact	7
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	10
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	13

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

<b>Teacher:</b>	Mr Douglas Speight
<b>Teacher ref number:</b>	9842676
<b>Teacher date of birth:</b>	20 June 1977
<b>TRA reference:</b>	19969
<b>Date of determination:</b>	16 August 2023
<b>Former employer:</b>	[REDACTED] (“the School”)

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened by virtual means, to consider the case of Mr Douglas Speight.

The panel members were Mrs Joanna Hurren (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mr Peter Whitelock (lay panellist) and Ms Charlotte Kelly (lay panellist).

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

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Matilda Heselton of Browne Jacobson LLP solicitors.

Mr Speight was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in private and was recorded.

## Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 5 June 2023.

It was alleged that Mr Speight was guilty of having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that he was convicted at the Bradford Crown Court on or around 9 September 2021 of:

1. one or more counts of sexual activity (penetration) with a male child;
2. sexual activity (no penetration) with a male child;
3. one or more counts of inciting a male child to engage in sexual activity (penetration);
4. inciting a male child to engage in sexual activity (no penetration);
5. one or more counts of voyeurism; and
6. one or more counts of making an indecent photograph of a child.

Mr Speight has not admitted either the allegations or that he has been convicted of a relevant offence.

## Preliminary applications

The panel considered the preliminary applications from the presenting officer set out below.

### Proceeding in absence

The panel was satisfied that the TRA has complied with the service requirements of paragraph 19 (1) (a) to (c) of the Teachers' Disciplinary (England) Regulations 2012.

The panel was 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 May 2020.

The panel took as its starting point the principle from *R v Jones* [2003] 1 AC 1 that its discretion to commence a hearing in the absence of the teacher had 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 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* [2016] EWCA Civ 162.

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

- The panel determined that it was plain from the documents available to the panel that the notice of proceedings had been delivered to the prison that held Mr Speight and [REDACTED] confirmed that they had spoken with Mr Speight on 11 August 2023.
- Mr Speight confirmed that he did not wish to attend the hearing and requested it was dealt with in his absence having taken a “pragmatic view on the inevitable outcome” as communicated to the presenting officer by [REDACTED] who had spoken with Mr Speight. The panel therefore considered that Mr Speight had waived his right to be present at the hearing.
- There was no evidence to suggest that an adjournment might result in Mr Speight attending voluntarily. Mr Speight expressed no wish to adjourn to obtain legal representation or otherwise.
- The panel had the benefit of Mr Speight’s police interview in which he was questioned about the alleged offences. The panel was able to exercise vigilance in making its decision, taking into account the degree of risk of the panel reaching the wrong decision as a result of not having heard Mr Speight’s account.
- The panel considered that there was minimal risk of reaching an improper conclusion about the absence of Mr Speight. As referred to above, Mr Speight had communicated via [REDACTED] the reason for his non-attendance.
- The panel recognised that the allegations against the teacher were serious and that there was a real risk that if proven, the panel would be required to consider whether to recommend that the teacher ought to be prohibited from teaching.
- The panel recognised that the efficient disposal of allegations against teachers was required to ensure the protection of pupils and to maintain confidence in the profession. The conduct alleged was said to have taken place whilst the teacher was headteacher of the School. The School would likely have an interest in this hearing taking place in order to move forwards.
- The panel noted that there were no witnesses to be called, and therefore the effect of delay on the memories of witnesses was not a factor to be taken into consideration in this case.

The panel decided to proceed with the hearing in the absence of Mr Speight. The panel considered that in light of:

- Mr Speight’s waiver of his right to appear;
- the seriousness of the allegations; and
- the public interest in this hearing proceeding within a reasonable time,

that by taking such measures referred to above to address any unfairness insofar as possible, the balance was in favour of this hearing continuing today.

## **Application to exclude public from the hearing**

The panel has considered whether to exercise its discretion under paragraph 11 of the Teachers' Disciplinary (England) Regulations 2012 (the "Regulations") and paragraph 5.85 of the Procedures to exclude the public from all or part of the hearing.

The panel has determined to exercise its discretion under the Regulations and paragraph 5.85 (i) and (iii) of the Procedures that the public should be excluded from the hearing.

The panel has taken into account the general rule that hearings should be held in public and that this is generally desirable to maintain public confidence in the administration of these proceedings and also to maintain confidence in the teaching profession. On this occasion, however, the panel considers that the request for the hearing to be heard in private is a reasonable one. The panel is conscious of a court order in place providing third parties with anonymity, and is concerned that hearing details of this case in public could result in those third parties being identified in breach of the court order. The panel has considered whether there are any steps short of excluding the public that would serve the purpose of protecting the anonymity of those third parties but would not be able to easily separate identifying features of those third parties. The panel also considered that, on the evidence before it, hearing this matter in private was necessary to protect the interests of a third party.

The panel is required to announce its decisions in public as to whether the facts have been proven and whether those facts amount to conviction of a relevant offence. In the event that the case continues any decision of the Secretary of State will also be in public. The panel considers that in the circumstances of this case the public interest will be satisfied by these public announcements. Those public announcements will ensure that public confidence in these proceedings and in the standards of the profession are maintained.

## **Application to anonymise the name of the School**

The panel accepted an application by the presenting officer and directed that the name and identity of the School will not be disclosed during the professional conduct panel hearing or at all. The panel considered that it was in the interests of justice to direct this, since to do otherwise could lead to the identification of third parties in this case and contravene the court order referred to above. The panel did not consider that its direction was contrary to the public interest, since it was not necessary for the School to be named in order to ensure that public confidence in these proceedings and in the standards of the profession are maintained.

## **Summary of evidence**

### **Documents**

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

Section 1: Chronology and anonymised child list – pages 4 to 6

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and notice of proceedings response form – pages 8 to 19

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 21 to 142

Section 4: Teacher documents cover page – page 143

In addition, the panel agreed to accept a bundle of documents associated with the preliminary applications made by the presenting officer. This document became:

Section 5: Presenting officer applications – pages 144 to 183

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**

The panel heard no oral evidence.

## **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 Speight was employed as a headteacher of the School [REDACTED]. Mr Speight was arrested on 20 April 2021. He was suspended from his role [REDACTED].

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

**He was convicted at the Bradford Crown Court on or around 9 September 2021 of:**

- 1. one or more counts of sexual activity (penetration) with a male child;**
- 2. sexual activity (no penetration) with a male child;**
- 3. one or more counts of inciting a male child to engage in sexual activity (penetration);**
- 4. inciting a male child to engage in sexual activity (no penetration);**
- 5. one or more counts of voyeurism; and**
- 6. one or more counts of making an indecent photograph of a child.**

The panel has seen the certificate of conviction confirming Mr Speight's conviction of the alleged offences. The panel accepted the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of both the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction. Mr Speight was sentenced to 20 years' imprisonment (12 years custodial term and 8 years extended licence). It was ordered that he be subject to notification requirements for life and an indefinite sexual harm prevention order. He was also prohibited from contacting various individuals. His phones and tablet were confiscated.

The panel noted the circumstances of the conviction as set out in the Judge's sentencing remarks. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

The panel found the allegations proven in their entirety.

### **Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence**

Having found 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 document Teacher Misconduct: The Prohibition of Teachers, which is referred to as "the Advice".

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Speight, in relation to the facts it found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that by reference to Part 2, Mr Speight 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
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
  - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
  - not undermining... the rule of law
- 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 noted that the individual's actions were relevant to teaching, working with children and working in an education setting given that it involved sexual abuse of a child [REDACTED]. A sexual harm prevention order has been ordered on an indefinite basis and he is subject to notification requirements for life.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence had an impact on the safety and security of the victim, [REDACTED]. The offences of voyeurism committed by Mr Speight had a potential impact on members of the public who would likely be alarmed and distressed if they became aware of the recordings of them. The panel noted that the Judge described Mr Speight as a "dangerous, predatory, manipulative paedophile with a sexual interest in young boys". Later in the sentencing remarks, the Judge stated that he found Mr Speight to be a "highly dangerous man presenting a very real and serious risk of serious harm, physical and psychological to young [REDACTED]".

The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Speight's behaviour in committing the offence would undermine public confidence in the teaching profession, if Mr Speight was allowed to continue teaching.

The panel noted that Mr Speight's behaviour ultimately led to a substantial sentence of imprisonment, which was indicative of the seriousness of the offences committed, and which the Advice states is likely to be considered "a relevant offence".

This was a case concerning offences involving sexual activity; voyeurism; and any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or indecent pseudo photograph or image of a child, or permitting any such activity, including one off incidents. The Advice indicates that a conviction for any offence that relates to or involves such offences is likely to be considered "a relevant offence".

The panel's view was that the offences committed by Mr Speight were at the most serious end of the potential spectrum as reflected by the lengthy term of imprisonment ordered.

The panel considered whether there was any mitigation or any mitigating circumstances. The panel noted that Mr Speight was afforded a 25% discount for his pleas. The Judge stated he was not entitled to a one third discount because he showed no remorse in interview and tried to get away with his offences, but the finding of his phones and tablet left him no alternative but to admit his offending. The Judge stated that even then Mr Speight tried to limit the sentence by lying about the penetrative intercourse, and about the dates it had taken place, before belatedly admitting those offences on the day of trial. [REDACTED].

The panel has itself seen a transcript of Mr Speight's police interviews and that it was consistent with the Sentencing Remarks.

For this hearing, Mr Speight advanced no evidence of any mitigating circumstances or of his character before or after committing these offences. Mr Speight has not replied to the allegations or engaged in the process of the current proceedings. There is no indication of any remorse or insight in the evidence seen by the panel.

The panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Speight's fitness to be a teacher. The panel considered that 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.

## **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 is appropriate, the panel had to consider the public interest, the seriousness of the behaviour and any mitigation offered by Mr Speight 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; the protection of other members of the public; the maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given the serious convictions involving the repeated sexual abuse of a child over period of approximately a year. Similarly, there was a public interest consideration in respect of the protection of other members of the public given the offences of voyeurism committed by Mr Speight.

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

The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Speight in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and he sought to exploit his position of trust.

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 noted that a teacher's behaviour that seeks to exploit their position of trust should be viewed very seriously in terms of its potential influence on pupils and be seen as a possible threat to the public interest.

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;
- 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 disclosure;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving vulnerable pupils);
- an abuse of any trust, knowledge, or influence gained through their professional position in order to advance a romantic or sexual relationship with a pupil or former pupil;
- 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;
- any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or indecent pseudo photograph or image of a child, or permitting such activity, including one-off incidents;
- failure to act on evidence that indicated a child's welfare may have been at risk e.g. failed to notify the designated safeguarding lead and/or make a referral to children's social care, the police or other relevant agencies when abuse, neglect and/or harmful cultural practices were identified;

- failure in their duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk or failing to promote the safety and welfare of the children (as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE);
- violation of the rights of pupils;
- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour; and
- ... 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.

With regard to the last factor, the panel had in mind the concealment of devices to record others.

Even though 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 was any mitigation offered by the teacher and whether there were mitigating circumstances.

Mr Speight's actions were deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Speight was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation and, in fact, the panel found Mr Speight actions to be calculated and motivated.

Whilst Mr Speight had been a headteacher, there was no evidence that he demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both his personal and professional conduct and having contributed significantly to the education sector.

There is no evidence of any previous disciplinary findings against Mr Speight. However, there is hearsay evidence that Mr Speight had previously been given advice by social services and the Chair of Governors advising him against being alone with a child. This was consistent with Mr Speight having confirmed in his police interview that issues had been raised previously and that he had received a letter thereafter. The sentencing remarks also stated that Mr Speight had previously been spoken with. The panel therefore considered the evidence to be admissible. [REDACTED].

No evidence has been adduced by Mr Speight attesting to his character or of any other mitigation.

Mr Speight has expressed no remorse. [REDACTED] who spoke with him provided an email stating that Mr Speight "takes a pragmatic view on the inevitable outcome and understands that he will not be permitted to teach again in England. Due to the nature of his offending, Mr Speight is [REDACTED]. He is also subject to other indefinite

restrictions that will prevent unsupervised contact with children which would also make it very difficult for him to teach again in the future.”

The panel first considered whether it would be proportionate to conclude this case with no recommendation of prohibition and 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 Speight 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 Speight. The safeguarding risk posed by Mr Speight was significant. 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. These cases include 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; any sexual misconduct involving a child; any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or indecent pseudo photograph or image of a child. The panel found that Mr Speight was responsible for relevant offences involving these types of conduct.

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 provision for a review period.

## **Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State**

I have given very careful consideration to this case and to the recommendation of the panel in respect of both sanction and 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 the allegation proven and found that those proven facts amount to a relevant conviction.

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

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Speight 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
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
  - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
  - not undermining... the rule of law
- 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 finding of misconduct is particularly serious as it concerns convictions for sexual misconduct including one or more counts of sexual activity (penetration) with a male child and one or more counts of making an indecent photograph of a child resulting in Mr Speight being handed a significant custodial sentence.

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 Speight, 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 noted that the Judge

described Mr Speight as a “dangerous, predatory, manipulative paedophile with a sexual interest in young [REDACTED]”. Later in the sentencing remarks, the Judge stated that he found Mr Speight to be a “highly dangerous man presenting a very real and serious risk of serious harm, physical and psychological to young [REDACTED]”. 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, “There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Speight was acting under extreme duress, e.g. a physical threat or significant intimidation and, in fact, the panel found Mr Speight actions to be calculated and motivated.” The panel also notes that, “There is no indication of any remorse or insight in the evidence seen by the panel.” In my judgement, the lack of evidence of insight or remorse means that there is a significant 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 that “The panel considered that Mr Speight’s behaviour in committing the offence would undermine public confidence in the teaching profession, if Mr Speight was allowed to continue teaching.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of conviction for multiple relevant offences 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 Speight himself and the panel’s comment that, “Whilst Mr Speight had been a headteacher, there was no evidence that he demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both his personal and professional conduct and having contributed significantly to the education sector.” The panel goes on to note that, “There is no evidence of any previous disciplinary findings against Mr Speight. However, there is hearsay evidence that Mr Speight had previously been given advice by social services and the Chair of Governors advising him against being alone with a child. This was consistent with Mr Speight having confirmed in his police interview that issues had been raised previously and that he had received a letter thereafter.” The panel also observed that “No evidence has been adduced by Mr Speight attesting to his character or of any other mitigation.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Speight 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 seriousness of the offences committed by Mr Speight and the panel's comments concerning the lack of insight and remorse that he has demonstrated. I have also noted and placed weight on the significant breaches of trust committed by Mr Speight and the way that he sought to exploit his position as a head teacher as well as the panel's comment that "...a teacher's behaviour that seeks to exploit their position of trust should be viewed very seriously in terms of its potential influence on pupils and be seen as a possible threat to the public interest."

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Speight 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 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. It records that, "In doing so it has noted that 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. These cases include 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; any sexual misconduct involving a child; any activity involving viewing, taking, making, possessing, distributing or publishing any indecent photograph or image or indecent pseudo photograph or image of a child. The panel found that Mr Speight was responsible for relevant offences involving these types of conduct."

I have considered whether not allowing 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, factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. This element is the seriousness of the finding of convictions for sexual activity with a child and for one or more counts of making an indecent photograph of a child.

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 Douglas Speight 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 allegation found proved against him, I have decided that Mr Speight 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 Speight 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 'M. Cavey', enclosed within a thin black rectangular border.

**Decision maker: Marc Cavey**

**Date: 22 August 2023**

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