



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Andrew Richard Dixon: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

October 2024

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Preliminary applications	4
Summary of evidence	6
Documents	6
Witnesses	6
Decision and reasons	6
Findings of fact	7
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	9
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	13

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

Teacher: Mr Andrew Richard Dixon
Teacher ref number: 2041307
Teacher date of birth: 14 December 1997
TRA reference: 21462
Date of determination: 25 October 2024
Former employer: St Joseph's College, Ipswich

Introduction

A professional conduct panel ("the panel") of the Teaching Regulation Agency ("the TRA") convened on 25 October 2024 via virtual means, to consider the case of Mr Andrew Richard Dixon.

The panel members were Ms Susan Humble (lay panellist – in the chair), Mr Neil Hillman (teacher panellist) and Mr Francis Murphy (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Miss Shanie Probert of Eversheds Sutherland (International) LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Mr Lee Bridges of Kingsley Napley LLP solicitors.

Mr Dixon was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegation set out in the Notice of Hearing dated 23 July 2024.

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

1. On 30 March 2023, he was convicted of assault occasioning actual bodily harm on 16 December 2022.

The allegation was admitted by the teacher. The teacher admitted that his conduct amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

Preliminary applications

Proceeding in absence

The panel considered an application from the presenting officer to proceed in the absence of the teacher.

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

The panel was also satisfied that the Notice of Hearing complied with paragraphs 5.23 and 5.24 of the Teacher Misconduct: Disciplinary Procedures for the Teaching Profession dated May 2020 (the "Procedures").

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

The panel took as its starting point the principle from *R v Jones* [2003] 1 AC1 that its discretion to commence a hearing in the absence of the teacher has to be exercised with the utmost care and caution, and that its discretion is a severely constrained one. In considering the question of fairness, the panel recognised that fairness to the professional is of prime importance but that it also encompasses the fair, economic, expeditious and efficient disposal of allegations against the professional, as was explained in *GMC v Adeogba & Visvardis*.

In making its decision, the panel 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*:

- i) The panel had sight of the Notice of Hearing which was sent to the teacher on 23 July 2024. The panel had sight of the teacher's signed response to the Notice of Hearing dated 8 August 2024. Within this response, the teacher

confirmed that he did not intend to be present at the hearing, nor did he intend to be represented at the hearing. The panel also had sight of a covering letter to the TRA which was signed by the teacher, dated 8 August 2024, in which the teacher confirmed that he would not be attending the hearing [REDACTED]. The panel was satisfied that the teacher waived his right to be present at the hearing in the knowledge of when and where the hearing was taking place;

- ii) The panel did not consider that an adjournment would result in the teacher attending voluntarily;
- iii) The panel had the benefit of written representations made by the teacher, which included his evidence in mitigation, and was able to take this into account at the relevant stage. The panel had not identified any significant gaps in the documentary evidence provided to it and noted that should such gaps arise during the course of the hearing, the panel would be able to take such gaps into consideration in considering whether the hearing should be adjourned;
- iv) There was no risk of the panel reaching an improper conclusion about the absence of the teacher. The teacher's reason for his non-attendance was set out in his letter to the TRA dated 8 August 2024;
- v) The panel recognised that the allegation against the teacher was serious, and that there was a real risk that if found proven, the panel would be required to consider whether to recommend that the teacher ought to be prohibited from teaching;
- vi) The panel recognised that the efficient disposal of allegations against teachers is required to ensure the protection of pupils and to maintain confidence in the profession. The conduct alleged is said to have taken place whilst the teacher was employed at St Joseph's College ("the College"). The panel noted that the College would have an interest in the hearing taking place in order to move forwards; and
- vii) 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 the teacher. The panel considered that in light of the teacher's clear and unequivocal waiver of his right to appear, and by taking such measures referred to above to address any unfairness caused insofar as possible; that on balance, this was a serious allegation and the public interest in the hearing proceeding within a reasonable time was in favour of the hearing continuing as listed.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology, anonymised pupil list and list of key people – pages 3 to 6

Section 2: Notice of hearing and response – pages 6 to 17

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 18 to 115

The panel had sight of the anonymised pupil list, which had been provided as a separate document alongside the hearing bundle. The panel also had sight of a separate “proceeding in absence” bundle, which was relied upon by the presenting officer as part of his preliminary application to proceed with the hearing in the absence of the teacher.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle in advance of the hearing, including the additional documents referred to above.

Witnesses

The panel did not hear oral evidence at the hearing.

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

On 5 January 2022, Mr Dixon commenced employment in a new role at the College as a Temporary Residential Boarding Assistant, having first joined the College from University in 2019.

On 31 August 2022, Mr Dixon’s role at the College changed to Teacher of PE and Games, Boarding House Tutor and Head of House.

On 16 December 2022, Mr Dixon was arrested at the College.

On 17 December 2022, Mr Dixon was released from police custody on bail, pending a court appearance.

On 5 January 2023, Mr Dixon attended an investigatory meeting at the College.

On 16 January 2023, Mr Dixon attended a disciplinary hearing at the College.

On 17 January 2023, Mr Dixon was dismissed from the College.

On 26 January 2023, Mr Dixon was referred to the TRA.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

You have been convicted of a relevant offence, namely:

1. On 30 March 2023, you were convicted of assault occasioning actual bodily harm on 16 December 2022.

Mr Dixon admitted that he was convicted of assault occasioning actual bodily harm, in the response to the Notice of Hearing that he signed and returned on 8 August 2024.

The panel noted the following facts, as set out in the referral to the TRA and which were not disputed by Mr Dixon:- On 16 December 2022, after the term had finished, Mr Dixon went out for drinks after work with colleagues. He returned to campus and instead of returning to his staff accommodation at a different location on campus, he arrived at the common room of the [REDACTED] where a group of 24 Spanish students had been staying prior to their return to Spain. At approximately 10:40pm, the [REDACTED] received reports from students that Mr Dixon was fighting with a male member of staff from the holiday company who was looking after the group of students, post the end of the school term. The police were called, and Mr Dixon was arrested for assault occasioning actual bodily harm.

Mr Dixon entered a guilty plea, and on 30 March 2023, he was convicted of assault occasioning actual bodily harm on 16 December 2022, contrary to section 47 of the Offences Against the Person Act 1861, at Ipswich Magistrates' Court. Mr Dixon was ordered to pay a fine and compensation.

The panel has seen the certificate of conviction and accepted it as conclusive proof of the conviction and the facts necessarily implied by the conviction. The panel has also seen an extract of the police national computer record confirming the conviction.

The panel found this allegation proven.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

Having found the allegation proven, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of the proved allegation amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Dixon, in relation to the facts it found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that by reference to Part 2, Mr Dixon 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 noted that the individual's actions were relevant to working in an education setting. Whilst the panel noted that Mr Dixon was not teaching at the time of his conduct, and his conduct did not take place within a classroom, Mr Dixon had committed his offending within the College environment, and in the immediate vicinity of individuals who had studied at the College for a term. In particular, the panel noted that Mr Dixon had opted to go to the boarding house as opposed to his own accommodation, and engaged in confrontational behaviour whilst under the influence of alcohol. The panel noted that Mr Dixon had acted contrary to the requirements of his role at the College, as were set out in the job description, such as to: "set an excellent example to students through personal presentation and conduct". The panel considered that Mr Dixon had a duty to uphold high standards of conduct and to act as a role model whilst on the College's grounds, and amongst pupils who studied at the College, at all times but he failed to do so.

The panel noted that the behaviour involved in committing the offence would have been likely to have had an impact on the safety and/or security of pupils. In particular, the panel had sight of written statements from pupils who were present that had been provided to the police, who stated that they felt "shock" at seeing the incident.

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

The panel noted that Mr Dixon's behaviour did not lead to a sentence of imprisonment, which was indicative that the offence was at the less serious end of the possible spectrum.

This was a case concerning an offence involving violence. The Teacher Misconduct: The Prohibition of Teachers ("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 found the offence to be serious. The panel considered that the offence was a violent assault. In particular, the panel noted the written statement of the victim of the

assault which had been provided to the police on 20 December 2022, who stated that he had been left in pain in his jaw since the incident and potentially required surgery, he had broken his thumb and he had several bruises. The panel also noted from the statements of both the victim and the pupils who had witnessed the incident, that the physical altercation had been instigated by Mr Dixon who had acted aggressively towards the victim, even whilst the victim attempted to de-escalate the situation. The panel also noted that even once the police had arrived, the situation continued to escalate as Mr Dixon appeared to be “argumentative” and in a “difficult mood” according to those who witnessed the event, which resulted in the police arresting him at the scene.

There was no evidence of Mr Dixon’s teaching proficiency in the bundle.

The panel did take into account Mr Dixon’s written representations in the bundle, in which he explained that he had been drinking alcohol on the evening of the incident as part of the sports department’s end of term celebration. Mr Dixon also explained that once he had arrived back at the College grounds, he had started to walk to his flat but he had heard noises coming from the boarding house and so he decided to investigate. Mr Dixon also stated that he had become “concerned” and “suspicious” about a man that he did not recognise at the boarding house, which resulted in a verbal exchange and had escalated to a physical altercation. Mr Dixon also described the steps he had taken to address his issues since the incident, such as engaging in a series of counselling sessions to explore his relationship with alcohol and issues with anger management.

Notwithstanding this, the panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the conviction was relevant to Mr Dixon’s fitness to be a teacher. The panel considered that a finding that this conviction was for a relevant offence was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the 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 Dixon 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: safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils and 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, in light of the panel's findings that Mr Dixon had committed a violent assault whilst under the influence of alcohol, in front of a number of pupils who had studied at the College for a term. In particular, the panel noted that Mr Dixon had continued to demonstrate his aggressive behaviour in front of pupils, despite having multiple opportunities to remove himself and ensure that they did not witness the incident. As a result, the panel considered that Mr Dixon had failed in his duty to safeguard the pupils involved.

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

Whilst there is some evidence that Mr Dixon had ability as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Dixon in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.

The panel considered carefully the seriousness of the behaviour, noting that the Advice states that the expectation of both the public and pupils, is that members of the teaching profession maintain an exemplary level of integrity and ethical standards at all times. The panel found that whilst Mr Dixon's conduct did not relate to his integrity or ethical standards, the behaviour was very serious.

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; and

- 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.

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, taking account of the public interest and the seriousness of the behaviour and the likely harm to the public interest were the teacher be allowed to

continue to teach, the panel went on to consider the mitigation offered by the teacher and/or whether there were mitigating circumstances.

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

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Dixon was acting under extreme duress, eg a physical threat or significant intimidation.

There was no evidence that Mr Dixon had been previously subject to disciplinary proceedings or warnings. There was also no evidence to suggest that Mr Dixon did not have a previously good history. However, the panel did not find that there was sufficient evidence to show that Mr Dixon had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in both his personal and professional conduct or that he had contributed significantly to the education sector. However, the panel accepted that the incident was out of character.

The panel had sight of evidence in the bundle which indicated that Mr Dixon was of good character. In particular, the panel noted that the students who witnessed the incident had told the [REDACTED] at the time of the incident that they liked Mr Dixon and that they were worried that he would get into trouble. The panel also noted that the same [REDACTED] who was called to the incident had made comments to the students to the effect that this was out of character, as recorded by Pupil E in their written statement. The panel also noted that during his time at the College, Mr Dixon had been offered a role with additional responsibility which suggested that he was appreciated at the College. The panel noted from Mr Dixon's written statement provided as part of the College's investigation, that he had "been regularly praised on the quality of [his] work and for upholding the values of [the College] ..." However, the panel observed that it did not have sight of any references or statements in support of Mr Dixon's character or record as a teacher.

The panel took into account that Mr Dixon was not a very experienced teacher, although it also noted that it did not have sight of sufficient evidence to show the level of training and mentoring that he would have received. However, the panel also considered that Mr Dixon would have been familiar with the job description and would have had an understanding of the need to safeguard students and act appropriately, particularly in his role as Head of House and Boarding House Tutor.

The panel also considered Mr Dixon's level of insight and remorse. The panel found that Mr Dixon had demonstrated remorse on several occasions. Firstly, the panel noted that Mr Dixon had fully engaged in the College's disciplinary process. The panel also noted that in his written statement, Mr Dixon stated that he was "ashamed about [his] actions", he had understood that his "actions were unprofessional, shameful and incredibly regretful", and that he was "extremely sorry". Further, within his letter to the TRA on 8 August 2024 enclosing his response to the Notice of Hearing, Mr Dixon stated that he was "genuinely sorry" for his actions, the incident was "totally out of character" and he

understood that he had let the College down. The panel also noted that Mr Dixon had pleaded guilty to the offence.

The panel found that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that Mr Dixon had sufficient insight into the impact of his behaviour on the victim, the College and the public. In his written statement provided for the College's investigation, Mr Dixon did state that he had taken a number of steps to ensure his actions were not repeated, such as: (1) booking a series of counselling sessions to explore his relationship with alcohol and issues with anger management, and (2) enrolling to attend an AA meeting. Whilst the panel accepted that Mr Dixon had appeared to take immediate steps to rectify his behaviour, the panel noted that this statement was provided as part of the College's investigation in January 2023 and prior to his conviction, and it did not have sight of any recent evidence to show the outcome of these steps or any ongoing steps since Mr Dixon's conviction.

As a result, whilst the panel accepted that Mr Dixon had taken some responsibility for his actions and was intending to engage in preventative measures, the panel found there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate the effectiveness of these measures on Mr Dixon's current compatibility with teaching. Therefore, the panel found there was a current risk of repetition.

Proportionality

The panel first considered whether it would be proportionate to conclude this case with no recommendation of prohibition, considering whether the publication of the findings made by the panel would be sufficient.

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings would be sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Dixon 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 Dixon. The violent nature of the assault which occurred in front of students was a significant factor in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate for it to decide to recommend a review period of the order. The panel was mindful that the Advice states that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances, in any given case, that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 2 years.

The Advice indicates that there are cases involving certain conduct where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate. One of these cases includes violence. The panel found that Mr Dixon was convicted of assault occasioning actual bodily harm, which was violent in nature.

The panel noted that Mr Dixon did not receive a sentence of imprisonment, and instead was ordered to pay a small fine, which indicated that the seriousness of the offence was on the lower end of the spectrum. The panel was also mindful that the offence occurred in 2022, and since then, Mr Dixon had indicated a willingness to seek support and to learn from his behaviour. As a result, the panel found that whilst Mr Dixon was not currently suitable to return to the teaching profession, he should be given the opportunity to demonstrate that he has learnt from his behaviour and has rectified his issues, so that he could potentially return to teaching in the future, if he wished to do so.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a review period. The panel recommended a review period of 2 years.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

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

In this case, the panel has found all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to a relevant conviction.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Andrew Dixon should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of two years.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Dixon 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.

The panel finds that the conduct of Mr Dixon fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

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 Dixon, and the impact that will have on the teacher, is proportionate and in the public interest.

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children/safeguard pupils. The panel has observed, "There was a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, in light of the panel's findings that Mr Dixon had committed a violent assault whilst under the influence of alcohol, in front of a number of pupils who had studied at the College for a term. In particular, the panel noted that Mr Dixon had continued to demonstrate his aggressive behaviour in front of pupils, despite having multiple opportunities to remove himself and ensure that they did not witness the incident. As a result, the panel considered that Mr Dixon had failed in his duty to safeguard the pupils involved." 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 also considered Mr Dixon's level of insight and remorse. The panel found that Mr Dixon had demonstrated remorse on several occasions. Firstly, the panel noted that Mr Dixon had fully engaged in the College's disciplinary process. The panel also noted that in his written statement, Mr Dixon stated that he was "ashamed about [his] actions", he had understood that his "actions were unprofessional, shameful and incredibly regretful", and that he was "extremely sorry". Further, within his letter to the TRA on 8 August 2024 enclosing his response to the Notice of Hearing, Mr Dixon stated that he was "genuinely sorry" for his actions, the incident was "totally out of character" and he understood that he had let the College down. The panel also noted that Mr Dixon had pleaded guilty to the offence." The panel has also commented that they "found that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that Mr Dixon had sufficient insight into the impact of his behaviour on the victim, the College and the public." In my judgement, the lack of full insight means that there is some

risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, "The panel also took account of the way the teaching profession is viewed by others. The panel considered that Mr Dixon's behaviour in committing the offence would be likely to affect public confidence in the teaching profession, if Mr Dixon was allowed to continue teaching." I am particularly mindful of the finding of violence in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

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

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of a relevant conviction, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mr Dixon himself and the panel comment "The panel took into account that Mr Dixon was not a very experienced teacher, although it also noted that it did not have sight of sufficient evidence to show the level of training and mentoring that he would have received. However, the panel also considered that Mr Dixon would have been familiar with the job description and would have had an understanding of the need to safeguard students and act appropriately, particularly in his role as Head of House and Boarding House Tutor."

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Dixon 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, although the panel acknowledged there was evidence of remorse, I have also placed considerable weight on the panel's comments concerning the lack of full insight. The panel has said, "Whilst the panel accepted that Mr Dixon had appeared to take immediate steps to rectify his behaviour, the panel noted that this statement was provided as part of the College's investigation in January 2023 and prior to his conviction, and it did not have sight of any recent evidence to show the outcome of these steps or any ongoing steps since Mr Dixon's conviction."

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding that "whilst the panel accepted that Mr Dixon had taken some responsibility for his actions and was intending to engage in preventative measures, the panel found there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate

the effectiveness of these measures on Mr Dixon's current compatibility with teaching. Therefore, the panel found there was a current risk of repetition."

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Dixon has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, that is not backed up by full 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 a 2 year review period.

I have considered the panel's comments "The panel noted that Mr Dixon did not receive a sentence of imprisonment, and instead was ordered to pay a small fine, which indicated that the seriousness of the offence was on the lower end of the spectrum. The panel was also mindful that the offence occurred in 2022, and since then, Mr Dixon had indicated a willingness to seek support and to learn from his behaviour. As a result, the panel found that whilst Mr Dixon was not currently suitable to return to the teaching profession, he should be given the opportunity to demonstrate that he has learnt from his behaviour and has rectified his issues, so that he could potentially return to teaching in the future, if he wished to do so."

I agree with the panel and have decided that a two year review period is proportionate in this case, to maintain public confidence and in the public interest.

This means that Mr Andrew Dixon is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. He may apply for the prohibition order to be set aside, but not until 2026, 2 years from the date of this order at the earliest. This is not an automatic right to have the prohibition order removed. If he does apply, a panel will meet to consider whether the prohibition order should be set aside. Without a successful application, Mr Dixon remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

This order takes effect from the date on which it is served on the teacher.

Mr Dixon 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.



Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey

Date: 29 October 2024

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