



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Peter Hill: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome**

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

**April 2024**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Statement of agreed facts	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	6
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**

<b>Teacher:</b>	Mr Peter Hill
<b>TRA reference:</b>	20994
<b>Date of determination:</b>	23 April 2024
<b>Former employer:</b>	Belgrave St Peter's CofE Primary School

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel ('the panel') of the Teaching Regulation Agency ('the TRA') convened on 23 April 2024 by way of a virtual meeting, to consider the case of Mr Peter Hill.

The panel members were Alan Wells (former teacher panellist – in the chair), Jo Palmer-Tweed (teacher panellist) and Helen Knee (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Abigail Reynolds of Birketts LLP solicitors.

In advance of the meeting, after taking into consideration the public interest and the interests of justice, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Peter Hill that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Hill provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, Louise Ravenscroft of Capsticks LLP, Mr Hill or any representative for Mr Hill.

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

## Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting 9 April 2024.

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

1. Prior to the English SATs tests held on or around 9 May 2022, he informed one or more year 6 pupils listed in Schedule 1, that he or someone else would “point to incorrect answers” or words to that effect;
2. On or around 9 May 2022, during the English SATs tests:
  - a. He gestured to one or more pupils, as listed within Schedule 2, that they had given incorrect answer(s);
  - b. When Pupil B asked for a rubber, he said “if I was you I would leave it” or words to that effect.
3. His conduct at any, or all of allegations 1 and/or 2, as may be found proven, was dishonest and/or lacked integrity.

Mr Hill admitted allegations 1, 2(a), 2(b) and 3 as set out in the statement of agreed facts, signed by Mr Hill on the 22 December 2023, and subsequently signed by the presenting officer on the 11 January 2024. Mr Hill further admitted that his behaviour amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

## Preliminary applications

There were no preliminary applications.

## Summary of evidence

### Documents

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

- Section 1: Chronology, anonymised pupil list and list of key people – pages 5 to 8
- Section 2: Notice of referral, response and notice of meeting – pages 9 to 30
- Section 3: Statement of agreed facts and presenting officer representations – pages 31 to 40

- Section 4: TRA documents – pages 41 to 290
- Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 291 to 304

The panel was also provided with a statement from Mr Hill dated 11 April 2024, along with a letter setting out Mr Hill's representations dated 17 April 2024.

## Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Hill on 22 December 2023, and subsequently signed by the presenting officer on 11 January 2024.

## Decision and reasons

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

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

On 28 August 2018, Mr Hill commenced employment at Belgrave St Peter's CofE Primary School ('the School'), as Deputy Headteacher. The School is part of RISE Multi-Academy Trust ('the Trust').

On 10 May 2022, Individual A made an unannounced visit to the School as an independent observer. Individual A arrived prior to the administration of a Key Stage 2 reading test. Prior to the commencement of the assessment, the pupils were asked by Mr Hill whether they had any queries. Individual A heard one pupil ask "*will we be doing that thing where there's pointing at the wrong answers?*" to which Mr Hill allegedly replied "*No, we aren't going to do that, we didn't do that yesterday, did we? Did we?*".

In light of this, Individual A selected a group of pupils at random to clarify what was meant by the 'pointing thing' and sought Standards and Testing Agency ('STA') Maladministration Guidance and guidance from the CEO of the School.

The pupils informed Individual A that they were told if they had answered a question incorrectly during their assessment, and if their teacher thought their answer was incorrect, an adult would point to the incorrect answer to prompt the pupils to check their answer. 4 out of 16 Pupils informed that Mr Hill had told them the same.

On 31 May 2022, Mr Hill resigned from his post as Deputy Headteacher.

The matter was referred to the TRA on 27 July 2022.

## Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

- 1. Prior to the English SATs tests held on or around 9 May 2022, you informed one or more year 6 pupils listed in Schedule 1, that you or someone else would “point to incorrect answers” or words to that effect;**

The panel noted that Mr Hill admitted allegation 1 in the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Hill on 22 December 2023, however it considered the evidence presented to it and made a determination.

The panel considered the disciplinary investigation notes from an interview with Individual A which took place on 12 May 2022 in which Individual A confirmed that, on 10 May 2022, he visited the School. Individual A recalled that, as the pupils were about to start the test, Mr Hill asked if the pupils had any questions for him, to which one pupil asked something like *“Will we be doing that thing where there’s pointing at the wrong answers?”*. Individual A stated that Mr Hill responded *“No, we aren’t going to do that, we didn’t do that yesterday did we? Did we?”*.

Individual A stated that he sought further guidance about the possibility of maladministration and was advised to speak to pupils at the end of the test. Individual A further stated that, after the test, he spoke to a group of pupils who stated that a teacher would point at an answer that they had got wrong, if they thought that they knew the answer and could have got it right. Individual A asked the group of children if it had happened yesterday, and more than one said that it had.

Individual A stated that he then spoke to a further group of pupils, and that this group informed him that they were told on the previous Friday, which the panel understood to be 6 May 2022, that if they got an answer wrong, the teachers would point to it so that they could rethink the answer.

Individual A understood the children to be referring to Mr Hill and another class teacher.

The panel also considered the notes of an interview with Mr Hill which took place on 25 May 2022. In the interview, Mr Hill confirmed that, in previous SATs practice tests, he had pointed to incorrect answers. However, during the interview, Mr Hill denied that he had informed pupils that a teacher would point to an incorrect answer.

Mr Hill could not recall whether it was made clear to the pupils that the practice of pointing to incorrect answers would not be possible in the formal tests.

The panel considered the notes of an interview with Individual B, a [REDCATED] teacher at the School, which took place on 27 May 2022. In the interview, Individual B confirmed that she had pointed to wrong answers both during practice tests and real tests. Individual B stated that they would point to incorrect answers even when a pupil had already responded to a question. Individual B stated that, in previous years, other teachers, including the headteacher and deputy headteacher, would also point at incorrect answers.

Individual B confirmed that both herself and Mr Hill had pointed to incorrect answers during that years' tests, but accepted that, on reflection, this was wrong.

However, Individual B stated that, on the Friday in question, no one had told pupils that adults would point to incorrect answers but acknowledged that she was not in the class for the whole day.

The panel also considered the notes of interviews with pupils which took place on 11 May 2022.

Pupil B confirmed that they were informed that "*sometimes an adult would point if the answer was wrong*". Pupil B identified that Mr Hill and another class teacher said that they would point to incorrect answers.

Pupil C confirmed that, on the Friday prior to the tests, Pupil C was told by Mr Hill and another class teacher that they would point to wrong answers. Pupil C stated that Mr Hill said "*don't worry, if we know it's a wrong answer we will point it out to you*".

Pupil N stated that Mr Hill said he would point, which would mean to "*relook at the question*". Pupil N stated that Mr Hill said this when he came to cover the class.

Pupil O identified Mr Hill, along with another class teacher, as telling the class that they would point out if the pupils had made a mistake.

Pupil P stated that it was Mr Hill who told them that, if you made a "*silly mistake*", a teacher would point it out.

The panel considered the evidence presented to it and found, on the balance of probabilities, it was more likely than not that Mr Hill informed one or more pupils that he or someone else would "point to incorrect answers" during the SATs examination.. The panel therefore found allegation 1 proven.

## **2. On or around 9 May 2022, during the English SATs tests:**

- a. You gestured to one or more pupils, as listed within Schedule 2, that they had given incorrect answer(s);**

The panel noted that Mr Hill admitted allegation 2(a) in the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Hill on 22 December 2023, however it considered the evidence presented and made a determination.

The panel further considered the notes of the interview with Individual B who, as set out above, confirmed that both herself and Mr Hill had pointed to incorrect answers during the SATs tests that took place on or around 9 May 2022.

The panel further considered the notes of the interview with Mr Hill on 25 May 2022 in which Mr Hill confirmed that, if a child was “*floundering*” and had already answered a question, he would re-read them the question so that the child fully understood it. Mr Hill stated that he would re-read a question where a child had completed the question and got it wrong.

The panel further considered the notes of the interview with Pupil A. Pupil A confirmed that, in the test, Mr Hill pointed to a wrong answer regarding a relative pronoun. The panel noted that Pupil A was not asked, and the evidence did not confirm, the test Pupil A was taking when Mr Hill made this comment. However, the panel was provided with a copy of the relevant test papers for the Key Stage 2 English grammar, punctuation and spelling test, and noted that some of the questions referred to pronouns. The panel therefore concluded that this took place on or around 9 May 2022 during the English SATs test.

Pupil C stated that Mr Hill had, in their grammar and reading SATS, said that the answer was wrong and that Pupil C needed to change it.

Pupil P confirmed that Mr Hill had pointed to an answer during their grammar test, which the panel understood was an English test which took place on or around 9 May 2022.

Having considered the evidence presented to it, the panel was satisfied that the evidence contained in the bundle was consistent with Mr Hill’s admissions.

The panel found the facts of allegation 2(a) proved.

**b. When Pupil B asked for a rubber, you said “if I was you I would leave it” or words to that effect.**

The panel noted that Mr Hill admitted allegation 2(b) in the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Hill on 22 December 2023, however considered the evidence presented to it and made a determination.

The panel further considered the notes of the interview with Pupil B. In the interview, when asked if anyone pointed to their work, Pupil B confirmed that she asked Mr Hill for a rubber to rub out an answer, and Mr Hill said, “*If I was you I would leave it*”. The panel noted that Pupil B was not asked, and the evidence did not confirm, what test Pupil B



was taking when Mr Hill made this comment. However, the panel noted that Pupil B confirmed that help was not given in maths, but in 'GAPs' and reading. Therefore, the panel considered it more likely than not that this occurred during an English SATs test on or around 9 May 2022.

In the interview on 25 May 2022, Mr Hill stated that he could not recall a pupil asking for a rubber and him telling the pupil to leave the answer.

However, in his written statement dated 11 April 2024, Mr Hill confirmed that he did tell a pupil who asked for a rubber that "*if I was you I would leave it*", indicating that the pupil's answer was correct.

The panel was satisfied that the evidence contained in the bundle was consistent with Mr Hill's admissions in his written statement and the statement of agreed facts.

The panel found the facts of allegation 2(b) proved.

### **3. Your conduct at any, or all of allegations 1 and/or 2, as may be found proven, was dishonest and/or lacked integrity.**

The panel noted that Mr Hill admitted allegation 3 in the statement of agreed facts signed by Mr Hill on 22 December 2023, however it considered the evidence presented and made a determination.

The panel firstly considered whether Mr Hill had failed to act with integrity. The panel considered the case of *Wingate & Anor v The Solicitors Regulation Authority*.

The panel was provided with a copy of the Key Stage 2 test administration guidance dated March 2022 ('the Maladministration Guidance') which stated "*You must ensure that nothing you say or do during the tests could be interpreted as giving pupils an advantage, for example, indicating that an answer is correct or incorrect, or suggesting the pupil look at an answer again.*"

The panel was provided with evidence that Mr Hill had read, and indeed provided training on, this guidance. The panel was also provided with evidence that Mr Hill was an experienced teacher who would have had a full understanding of the standards expected of him.

The panel considered the written statement of Mr Hill dated 11 April 2024 in which Mr Hill admitted that his actions prior to May 2022, and on Monday 9 May 2022, lacked integrity.

The panel was mindful that professionals are not expected to be "*paragons of virtue*". However, on examination of the documents, the panel was satisfied that Mr Hill had acted deliberately in contravention of the guidance, which in turn amounted to a clear

failure to act within the higher standards expected of a teacher. The panel was therefore satisfied that Mr Hill's conduct, as found proven, lacked integrity.

The panel then considered whether Mr Hill had acted dishonestly. In reaching its decision on this, the panel considered the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd t/a Crockford*.

The panel firstly sought to ascertain the actual state of Mr Hill's knowledge or belief as to the facts.

The panel concluded that, given Mr Hill's experience and that he had read and provided training on the Maladministration Guidance, there could be no doubt that Mr Hill knew that his actions were dishonest.

The panel further considered the written statement of Mr Hill in which he admitted that his actions prior to May 2022, and on Monday 9 May 2022, were dishonest.

The panel considered that the actions of Mr Hill had undoubtedly been dishonest according to the standards of ordinary decent people.

The panel found allegation 3 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.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Hill in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Hill 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.
- 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 satisfied that the conduct of Mr Hill fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession. When assessing pupils, members of the public, parents and pupils would expect that all teachers will act in accordance with the specification and

guidance issued in respect of assessments. Further, no pupil in any particular school should be provided with an unfair advantage over another.

The panel also considered whether Mr Hill's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the document 'Teacher misconduct: the prohibition of teachers', referred to as the 'Advice'. The panel considered the offence of serious dishonesty but did not find it relevant on the basis that, whilst Mr Hill's conduct was dishonest, it did not, in the panel's view, amount to "serious" dishonesty. This was on the basis that, whilst his actions were dishonest, Mr Hill was not giving pupils the correct answers, rather he was prompting pupils to re-check their work. Further, in respect of allegation 2(b), Mr Hill did not expressly confirm whether the answer was correct or incorrect. The panel distinguished this from, for example, a teacher who may actively inform a pupil of a correct answer, thus increasing the likelihood of inaccurate examination results and, in the panel's view, increasing the seriousness of the dishonesty.

The panel was however satisfied that Mr Hill was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

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

For the reasons set out above, the findings of misconduct were serious and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher, potentially damaging the public perception.

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

Having found the facts of particulars 1, 2(a), 2(b) and 3 proved, the panel further found that Mr Hill'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 should be made, the panel had to consider whether it would be an appropriate and proportionate measure, and whether it would be in the public interest to do so. Prohibition orders should not be given in order to be punitive, or to show that blame has been apportioned, although they are likely to have punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found the following to be relevant in this case: the 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 panel's findings against Mr Hill, which involved influencing pupils in respect of their answers during SATs examinations and acting dishonestly, the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Hill were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

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

Notwithstanding the clear public interest considerations that were present, the panel considered carefully whether or not it would be proportionate to impose a prohibition order, taking into account the effect that this would have on Mr Hill. 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 Hill. The panel took further account of the Advice, which suggests that a prohibition order may be appropriate if certain behaviours of a teacher have been proved. In the list of such behaviours, those that are relevant in this case are:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity...; and
- deliberate action in serious contravention of requirements for the conduct of an examination or assessment leading to an externally awarded qualification or national assessment (or deliberate collusion in or deliberate concealment of such action) particularly where the action had, or realistically had the potential to have, a significant impact on the outcome of the examination assessment.

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.

There was no evidence that Mr Hill's actions were not deliberate.

However, the panel considered the written evidence of Mr Hill. Mr Hill stated that, in January 2022, the School joined the Trust. At this time, the then headteacher was absent, with periods of absence in the Autumn 2021 term and again in February 2022, from which the headteacher did not return.

Mr Hill's evidence was that he was later involved in meetings with the Director of Education for the Trust, who wanted the School to raise outcomes for significant numbers of pupils who were working below the expected standard. Mr Hill described this as a difficult cohort with significant Social, Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) needs and behaviour challenges. It was Mr Hill's evidence that, as a result, there was an expectation on pupils that was excessive and unrealistic.

Mr Hill stated that, in spring 2022, he attended meetings regarding performance, where it was identified that the School's performance data was the lowest [within the Trust?]. Mr Hill's evidence was that he "*felt the underperformance acutely*" and that his work was being affected by [REDACTED].

Mr Hill submitted that, in January 2022, he was diagnosed with [REDACTED], and in May 2022 [REDACTED].

Mr Hill's evidence was that, at the same time, he was also supporting two staff who were suffering from significant [REDACTED]. The panel was not satisfied that this amounted to extreme duress, however acknowledged that the conduct occurred during a period of stress and [REDACTED].

Whilst there was no evidence to suggest that Mr Hill demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both personal and professional conduct and has contributed significantly to the education sector, the panel did acknowledge Mr Hill's long career. In particular, there was no evidence before the panel that Mr Hill was previously subject to any disciplinary proceedings or warnings, or that he was not of good character. The panel further considered Mr Hill's written statement in which he described his passion for teaching and his roles in extra-curricular activities, along with his development as a leader during his career.

The panel also considered the extent to which Mr Hill had shown insight and remorse into his actions.

The panel therefore considered that Mr Hill had recognised the seriousness of his actions and demonstrated how such conduct would be avoided in the future. The panel also concluded that Mr Hill's actions, although dishonest, were motivated by a genuine desire to further the interests of the School. In light of this, the panel considered that there was limited risk of repetition.

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, recommending no prohibition order was a proportionate and appropriate response. Given that the nature and severity of the behaviour were at the less serious end of the possible spectrum and, having considered the mitigating factors that were present, the panel determined that a recommendation for a prohibition order would not be appropriate in this case. The panel considered that the publication of the adverse findings it made would be sufficient to send an appropriate message to the teacher as to the standards of behaviour that were not acceptable and that the publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession.

## **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 sanction.

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 recommended that the findings of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, should be published and that such an action is proportionate and in the public interest.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Peter Hill 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.

- 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 finds that the conduct of Mr Hill fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a finding of influencing pupils in respect of their answers during SATs examinations and acting dishonestly.

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 likely to 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 Hill, 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. Whilst the panel has found that Mr Hill's actions were dishonest and has noted that no pupil should have an unfair advantage over another, the panel has not raised any concerns about Mr Hill's conduct in relation to the protection of children and safeguarding of pupils.

I have also taken into account the panel's comments on insight and remorse, which the panel has set out as follows, "The panel therefore considered that Mr Hill had recognised the seriousness of his actions and demonstrated how such conduct would be avoided in the future." I agree with the panel that the insight and remorse shown by Mr Hill means that there is a limited risk of the repetition of this behaviour. I have 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 has observed that "public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Hill were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession." I am particularly mindful of the finding of dishonesty in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

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

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, 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 Hill himself. The panel has commented “Whilst there was no evidence to suggest that Mr Hill demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both personal and professional conduct and has contributed significantly to the education sector, the panel did acknowledge Mr Hill’s long career. In particular, there was no evidence before the panel that Mr Hill was previously subject to any disciplinary proceedings or warnings, or that he was not of good character. The panel further considered Mr Hill’s written statement in which he described his passion for teaching and his roles in extra-curricular activities, along with his development as a leader during his career.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Hill 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 the extent to which Mr Hill had shown insight and remorse. The panel concluded that although his actions were dishonest, they were motivated by a desire to further the interests of the school. The panel also considered that there was a limited risk of repetition.

I have also noted the comments of the panel about mitigating factors and in particular that Mr Hill’s “conduct occurred during a period of stress and [REDACTED].”

For these reasons, I have concluded that a prohibition order is not proportionate or in the public interest. I consider that the publication of the findings made would be sufficient to send an appropriate message to the teacher as to the standards of behaviour that were not acceptable and that the publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession.



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D Oatley', with a large, sweeping flourish at the end.

**Decision maker: David Oatley**

**Date: 26 April 2024**

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