



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Matthew John Edgar- Andrews: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

April 2024

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	5
Summary of evidence	7
Documents	7
Witnesses	7
Decision and reasons	8
Findings of fact	10
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	15
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	17

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

Teacher: Mr Matthew John Edgar-Andrews
TRA reference: 20888
Date of determination: 24 April 2024
Former employer: Hereford Cathedral School, Hereford

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 22 April 2024 – 24 April 2024 at Cheylesmore House, 5 Quinton Road, Coventry, CV1 2WT, to consider the case of Mr Matthew John Edgar-Andrews.

The panel members were Mr Paul Hawkins (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Bev Williams (teacher panellist) and Mr Phillip Thomson (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Jermel Anderson of Blake Morgan solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Mark Millin of Kingsley Napley solicitors.

Mr Matthew John Edgar-Andrews was present and was represented by Ms Reka Hollos of Three Raymond Buildings.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded. Matters that concern private or sensitive issues are highlighted in red as below.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 12 February 2024.

It was alleged that Mr Edgar-Andrews was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that whilst working as a Teacher at Hereford Cathedral School:

- 1) Between approximately September 2021 and March 2022, you sent messages on Microsoft Teams to Student A which were inappropriate in terms of volume and/or frequency;
- 2) Between approximately September 2021 and March 2022, you sent messages on Microsoft Teams to Student A outside of school hours, including evenings and/or during school holidays;
- 3) Between approximately September 2021 and March 2022, you sent Student A messages on Microsoft Teams the content of which were inappropriate and/or over-familiar;
- 4) You did not follow colleague instructions to: a) limit contact with Student A in December 2021 and/or February 2022; b) stop one to one contact with Student A from 7 March 2022
- 5) You did not disclose to senior colleagues the level of contact you had with Student A;
- 6) By reason of your conduct at allegation 5 above you: a) Were dishonest; and/or b) Failed to act with integrity

Mr Edgar-Andrews admitted Allegation 1, Allegation 2, Allegation 3 and Allegation 5.

Mr Edgar-Andrews denied Allegations 4a, 4b, 6a and 6b. Mr Edgar-Andrews also denied unacceptable professional conduct, and that the conduct may bring the profession into disrepute.

Preliminary applications

Application to exclude hearsay evidence

The panel heard an application from Mr Edgar-Andrews' representative to exclude the hearsay evidence of [REDACTED]. The application was opposed by the TRA. The panel received legal advice in relation to this. The panel heard that, the evidence should be excluded on the basis that it would be unfair to Mr Edgar-Andrews to allow this evidence, given that these witnesses cannot be cross examined, but with respect of allegation 4(b), their evidence is sole and decisive as they are the only witnesses who are said to directly have given an instruction to Mr Edgar-Andrews in relation to the issue. The panel also heard submissions more broadly that both witnesses are directly relevant to Allegation 4 in totality, which Mr Edgar-Andrews has denied in full. The panel were mindful of the need to allow for a fair hearing. It was also careful to consider whether reasons had been provided for the non-attendance of these witnesses.

The panel considered the evidence of [REDACTED]. It noted that there were concerns emanating from his original statement which led to the production of a second statement was not then disclosed. The panel felt this raised an issue of reliability, particularly noting the fact that it was excluded by the internal appeal process. The panel felt [REDACTED] evidence was sole and decisive evidence in relation to Allegation 4b, and were concerned that they had no ability to test it. The evidence appeared to therefore be unfair, given there were no avenues to test this other than through the evidence of Mr Edgar-Andrews. It additionally did not find that any steps were taken to secure the attendance of [REDACTED].

The panel went on to consider the evidence of [REDACTED]. The panel considered that there was no issue of reliability in relation to her evidence. The panel however felt that this evidence was also *sole and decisive* within the context of Allegation 4. The panel considered that this evidence was particularly central to the matters in dispute. It was apparent that there was no other evidence that pertains to this evidence which could be tested in relation to the conversation that underpins the allegation, apart from the evidence of Mr Edgar-Andrews. The TRA had presented no explanation for the non-attendance of this witness and the panel felt, that given the significance it holds within the context of these proceedings, as the only factually contested element, it would expect to have seen some efforts made. The panel felt the risk to prejudice would be significant, as the Allegation is disputed and there is no other evidence that supports the matter.

The panel therefore determined that the hearsay evidence of both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] should be excluded.

Submission of No Case to Answer:

The panel heard a submission from Mr Edgar-Andrews' representative at the conclusion of the TRA's case, advancing that there was no case to answer in respect of Allegation 4a and Allegation 4b. The application was opposed by the TRA. The panel received legal advice in relation to this submission which had regard to the relevant case law, this was accepted by the panel. The panel considered the case as presented, bearing in mind the persuasive burden of the TRA in these proceedings. The panel first considered whether there was any evidence that would allow them to find the facts proved. In relation to Allegation 4a, the panel found that there was no evidence that could allow them to find the allegation proved. The panel then considered Allegation 4b. It considered that it had seen no evidence at all which could show that in relation to this allegation, there had been any colleague instructions.

Accordingly, the panel allowed the application.

Allegations 4a and 4b were therefore discontinued.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology and Key Person List – pages 8 to 11

Section 2: Notice of Hearings and Response – pages 12 to 18

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 19 to 32

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 33 to 829

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 830 to 958

In addition, the panel considered the following:

CCTV Footage as provided by the TRA.

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

In the consideration of this case, the panel had regard to the document Teacher Misconduct: Disciplinary Procedures for the Teaching Profession 2020, (the “Procedures”).

Witnesses

The panel heard oral evidence from [REDACTED], [REDACTED] of the School, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] at the School, and [REDACTED] who were all called by the TRA.

The panel also heard from [REDACTED].

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 Edgar-Andrews commenced employment as the Head of History at Hereford Cathedral School on 2 September 2019. He also became Head of House at the School on 1 September 2021.

An investigation was opened by the Headmaster on 7 March 2022 relating to the relationship between Mr Edgar-Andrews and Student A, following concerns being raised by both staff and pupils. The primary concern pertained to the amount of contact that Mr Edgar-Andrews was said to be having with Student A.

Mr Edgar-Andrews was suspended from the School following a fact-finding investigation which convened on 9 March 2022. There was a subsequent position of trust meeting with the police and the LADO where messages were reviewed. The police advised that the school continue its own investigation on 22 March 2022.

[REDACTED].

Following a disciplinary hearing on 8 July 2022, [REDACTED] at the School, referred the matter to the TRA on 20 June 2022. The School's investigative process concluded on 29 September 2022 and Mr Edgar-Andrews was informed of the findings.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

The panel were presented with the witness statements of [REDACTED] which were supported by their live evidence. It was also provided with a range of materials that pertained to the safeguarding investigation and the disciplinary process undertaken by the School. The exhibits provided by the TRA also showed a significant number of conversations and interactions between Mr Edgar-Andrews and Student A through Microsoft Teams. Mr Edgar-Andrews also provided his own witness statement, in addition to the witness statement of [REDACTED] who the panel also heard live evidence from. A series of emails and certificates showing work undertaken by Mr Edgar-Andrews were also provided in addition to other supporting documentation, which included nine character references.

The panel found the following particulars of the allegations against you proved:

Allegation 1, Allegation 2, Allegation 3, Allegation 5, Allegation 6b

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

Allegation 4a, Allegation 4b, Allegation 6a

It was alleged that you were guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that whilst working as a Teacher at Hereford Cathedral School:

1) Between approximately September 2021 and March 2022, you sent messages on Microsoft Teams to Student A which were inappropriate in terms of volume and/or frequency;

Mr Edgar-Andrews accepted this allegation in full. In addition, the panel had sight of the messages in question and considered them to be inappropriate due to their volume and frequency.

Accordingly, the panel found Allegation 1 proved.

2) Between approximately September 2021 and March 2022, you sent messages on Microsoft Teams to Student A outside of school hours, including evenings and/or during school holidays;

This allegation was admitted by Mr Edgar-Andrews. The panel also had sight of the messages which confirmed the times that they were sent.

Allegation 2 was therefore found proved by the panel.

3) Between approximately September 2021 and March 2022, you sent Student A messages on Microsoft Teams the content of which were inappropriate and/or over-familiar;

This Allegation was accepted by Mr Edgar-Andrews. The panel considered that, as with Allegation 1 and Allegation 2 it had also had full sight of the messages referred to within the Allegation. Having considered the messages in full, the panel was satisfied that the messages were both inappropriate and over-familiar.

Allegation 3 was therefore found proved by the panel.

4) You did not follow colleague instructions to: a) limit contact with Student A in December 2021 and/or February 2022; b) stop one to one contact with Student A from 7 March 2022

The panel did not consider this Allegation as it was discontinued in its entirety following a submission of no case to answer from Mr Edgar-Andrews' representative.

5) You did not disclose to senior colleagues the level of contact you had with Student A;

This allegation was admitted in full by Mr Edgar-Andrews in advance of the hearing through his witness statement. The panel also heard live evidence to Mr Edgar-Andrews who acknowledged that he had not disclosed to senior colleagues the level of contact that he had with Student A.

The panel therefore found Allegation 5 proved.

6) By reason of your conduct at allegation 5 above you:

a) Were dishonest; and/or

b) Failed to act with integrity

The panel heard from both the TRA's presenting officer and Mr Edgar-Andrews' representative in relation to this allegation. The panel also received legal advice as to consider both limbs of this allegation, which it accepted.

The panel noted that it had heard directly from Mr Edgar-Andrews in relation to his lack of disclosure to senior colleagues concerning his contact with Student A. It also considered that the wording of Allegation 5, included the phrase "level of contact" and were careful to maintain an appreciation of this. The panel considered that Mr Edgar-Andrews was a credible witness who had provided a consistent account in relation to this issue. The

panel were particularly mindful, that Mr Edgar-Andrews had disclosed to colleagues that there had been “a lot” of messages, and considered that this was a plausible honest reflection of the level of contact that he had with Student A. Accordingly, the panel felt that it could draw an inference as to Mr Edgar-Andrews’ state of mind at the time of the relevant disclosure, and felt that it could find that he did not seek to conceal or obscure the level of contact he had with Student A. It therefore determined that it was more likely than not that Mr Edgar-Andrews had been honest in his disclosures.

The panel went on to consider the issue of integrity. The panel were mindful of the higher standards by which teachers are expected to conduct themselves. The panel considered that whilst there was a degree of pastoral care within his role, Mr Edgar-Andrews should have been able to acknowledge the impact of his behaviour and the professional standards that were expected of him at the School. The panel did not consider that it would be an unrealistically high standard for a teacher with 8 years’ experience and in a leadership position, to take appropriate action and disclose the contact in full. The panel recognised that there may have been a lack of robust electronic reporting systems within the School at the time. However, it felt that this did not remove the obligation upon teachers to deal with safeguarding issues appropriately. The panel had seen the relevant safeguarding policy, which make specific reference to social interactions and noted that Mr Edgar-Andrews had signed to say that he had undertaken the relevant training in relation to it in September 2021.

The panel therefore found Allegation 6a not proven and found Allegation 6b 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 Edgar-Andrews in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Edgar-Andrews 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
- 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 also considered whether Mr Edgar-Andrews' conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

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 unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel found that none of these offences was relevant.

The panel was satisfied that in relation to the facts found proved, there were breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel however were mindful of the broader context of the conduct, and considered that it did fall short of the standards expected of the profession. The panel did not feel that these breaches were serious, within the meaning of unacceptable professional conduct. The panel did not, therefore, consider that Mr Edgar-Andrews' conduct fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

Accordingly, the panel was not satisfied that Mr Edgar-Andrews was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Mr Edgar-Andrews' actions amounted to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, the panel took into account the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. It 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 felt that the nature of the Allegations found proved refer directly to a situation where a teacher in a leadership position had communicated in an inappropriate and over-familiar manner with a student. It felt that Allegations of this nature speak directly to the perception that the public holds with regard to the teaching profession, and noted that Mr Edgar-Andrews had been advised to some degree by colleagues as to the appropriateness of these interactions.

The panel therefore found that Mr Edgar-Andrews' actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Having found the facts of particulars 1,2, 3, 5 and 6b proved, the panel further found that Mr Edgar-Andrews' conduct amounted to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of 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 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 the declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct .

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Edgar-Andrews which involved inappropriate and over-familiar communications with a student, the panel felt that all of the concerns as mentioned above were engaged. However, it felt that these concerns were limited due to the wider context of the conduct in question.

There was a public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, given Mr Edgar-Andrews' approach to communication with Student A.

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

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

In addition to the public interest considerations set out above, the panel went on to consider whether there was a public interest in retaining Mr Edgar-Andrews in the profession.

The panel decided that there was a significant public interest consideration in retaining Mr Edgar-Andrews in the profession. It was apparent that he continues to make a

valuable contribution to the profession through his role at the School, and he had received references from multiple colleagues endorsing his abilities as an educator.

In view of the clear public interest considerations that were present, the panel considered carefully whether or not it would be proportionate to impose a prohibition order, taking into account the effect that this would have on Mr Edgar-Andrews.

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 Edgar-Andrews. 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.

The panel found that none of the behaviours were present.

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 evidence that Mr Edgar-Andrews' individual actions were deliberate.

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Edgar-Andrews was acting under duress. The panel however did not find Mr Edgar-Andrews' actions to be calculated and motivated.

Mr Edgar-Andrews did have a previously good history and the panel accepted that the incident was out of character. The panel felt that there was no risk of repetition.

The panel had consideration for nine character references that were provided. The character reference of [REDACTED] was noted by the panel as particularly beneficial to its determination and the statement, "it is strongly my belief that Matthew's (sic) character is one of scrupulous professionalism and diligence, coupled with a strong sense of justice and boundless empathy" was of particular assistance.

[REDACTED] also stated "Matt is one of the most dedicated, hardworking and engaging teachers I've had the pleasure of working with" which further assisted the panel with its considerations. The panel also noted that recent school appraisals it had seen within the bundle, had praised Mr Edgar-Andrews' abilities as a classroom practitioner. The panel were content, having heard live evidence from Mr Edgar-Andrews that he was a contrite and remorseful teacher, who had greatly reflected upon his actions and had demonstrated significant insight and remorse.

The panel had regard for the fact that Mr Edgar-Andrews had undertaken several professional development courses, including courses that focused on safeguarding and professional boundaries. It also noted that Mr Edgar-Andrews had made significant changes to his working practices by removing Microsoft Teams from his mobile phone and not responding to emails outside of working hours. The panel felt that these changes demonstrate an appreciation of the need to set appropriate professional boundaries.

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, the recommendation of no prohibition order would be both a proportionate and an 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 had made was sufficient to send an appropriate message to the teacher as to the standards of behaviour that are not acceptable, and the publication would meet the public interest requirement of declaring proper standards of the profession.

The panel therefore make no recommendation regarding the imposition of a prohibition order.

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 some of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. In this case, the panel has found some of the allegations not proven (including 4a, 4b, 6a). I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Matthew Edgar-Andrews should not be the subject of a prohibition order. The panel has recommended that the findings of 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 Edgar-Andrews 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
- 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.

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 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 Edgar-Andrews, 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 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 the declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct" 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 were content, having heard live evidence from Mr Edgar-Andrews that he was a contrite and remorseful teacher, who had greatly reflected upon his actions and had demonstrated significant insight and remorse." 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 weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Edgar-Andrews were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.”

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

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of 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 Edgar-Andrews himself and the panel comment “Mr Edgar-Andrews did have a previously good history and the panel accepted that the incident was out of character. The panel felt that there was no risk of repetition.” The panel went on to say they “had consideration for nine character references that were provided. The character reference of [REDACTED] was noted by the panel as particularly beneficial to its determination and the statement, “it is strongly my belief that Matthew’s (sic) character is one of scrupulous professionalism and diligence, coupled with a strong sense of justice and boundless empathy” was of particular assistance.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Edgar-Andrews 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 level of insight or remorse. The panel has said, “The panel were content, having heard live evidence from Mr Edgar-Andrews that he was a contrite and remorseful teacher, who had greatly reflected upon his actions and had demonstrated significant insight and remorse.” And that “The panel had regard for the fact that Mr Edgar-Andrews had undertaken several professional development courses, including courses that focused on safeguarding and professional boundaries. It also noted that Mr Edgar-Andrews had made significant changes to his working practices by removing Microsoft Teams from his mobile phone and not responding to emails outside of working hours. The panel felt that these changes demonstrate an appreciation of the need to set appropriate professional boundaries.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding that “The panel decided that there was a significant public interest consideration in retaining Mr Edgar-Andrews in the profession. It was apparent that he continues to make a valuable contribution to the profession through his role at the School, and he had received references from multiple colleagues endorsing his abilities as an educator.”

I have given weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Edgar-Andrews has made to the profession.

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 'S Buxcey', with a horizontal line underneath.

Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey

Date: 29 April 2024

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