



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Mark Hunt: Professional conduct panel meeting outcome

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

September 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	10
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	14

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

Teacher:	Mr Mark Hunt
Teacher ref number:	0735281
Teacher date of birth:	22 October 1982
TRA reference:	20453
Date of determination:	26 September 2024
Former employer:	Bartley Green School, Birmingham

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened remotely via Microsoft Teams on 26 September 2024, to consider the case of Mr Mark Hunt.

The panel members were Ms Nicola Hartley (lay panellist – in the chair), Mr Nick Watkiss (teacher panellist) and Ms Megan Gomm (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Delme Griffiths of Blake Morgan 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 Hunt that the allegations be considered without a hearing. Mr Hunt provided a signed statement of agreed facts and admitted unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel considered the case at a meeting without the attendance of the presenting officer, Mr Hunt or any representative.

The meeting took place in private.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of meeting dated 12 September 2024.

It was alleged that Mr Hunt was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute, in that whilst working as a Lead Practitioner of Geography/Teacher at Bartley Green School:

1. On or around 9 June 2021, he sent communications of an inappropriate and/or sexual nature to Pupil A, a pupil at his former school, who was [REDACTED] at the time;
2. On or around 17 March 2023, he accepted a police caution in relation to attempting to cause a female aged 13 or over to engage in sexual activity – no penetration;
3. Between 7 February 2021 and 9 February 2021, he sent communications of an inappropriate and/or sexual nature to Pupil J, a pupil at his former school;
4. His conduct at allegation 1 and/or allegation 3 was sexually motivated.

Mr Hunt admitted the facts of all the allegations.

Mr Hunt also admitted that his actions 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 and list of key people – pages 4 to 6

Section 2: Notice of referral and response – pages 7 to 26

Section 3: Statement of agreed facts – pages 27 to 29

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 32 to 291

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 292 to 295

Section 6: Notice of meeting – pages 296 to 297

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, in advance of the meeting.

Statement of agreed facts

The panel considered a statement of agreed facts which was signed by Mr Hunt on 19 August 2024.

Decision and reasons

The panel carefully considered the case and reached a decision.

In advance of the meeting, the TRA agreed to a request from Mr Hunt 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.

From September 2016 to approximately April 2019, Mr Hunt was employed as a teacher at the Ark Kings Academy (“the Academy”).

On 29 April 2019, Mr Hunt commenced employment at Bartley Green School (“the School”) as a teacher/lead practitioner of Geography.

In February 2021 and June 2021 respectively, Mr Hunt was accused of sending messages to a pupil and a former pupil of the Academy.

Concerns were first reported to the Academy on 10 June 2021, in response to which a LADO referral was made and the School was informed.

The police were also notified and Mr Hunt was arrested on 11 June 2021.

On 14 June 2021, Mr Hunt was suspended by the School pending the police investigation.

On 3 November 2021, an independent investigation was commenced on behalf of the School.

On 29 November 2021, prior to the investigation being completed, Mr Hunt resigned from his position.

On 6 December 2021, the School held a disciplinary hearing in Mr Hunt's absence.

On 13 December 2021, Mr Hunt was referred to the TRA by the School.

Finally, on 17 March 2023, Mr Hunt accepted a police adult conditional caution.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

- 1. On or around 9 June 2021, you sent communications of an inappropriate and/or sexual nature to Pupil A, a pupil at your former school, who was [REDACTED] at the time.**

Mr Hunt taught Pupil A when he worked at the Academy and was [REDACTED].

Mr Hunt admits that:

- On 9 June 2021, when Pupil A [REDACTED], she sent a friend request to Mr Hunt via Facebook.
- Whilst the request was not accepted, Mr Hunt exchanged messages with Pupil A via Facebook messenger that evening, copies of which were included in evidence.
- Within the messages Mr Hunt asked Pupil A if she fancied him, if she wanted to have sex with him, if she masturbated and if she shaved. For example, Mr Hunt sent messages including the following comments:
 - *"So do you fancy me? x";*
 - *"Did you ever fantasise about me? x";*
 - *"Did you masterbate thinking about us? X";*
 - *"I've thought about you x";*
 - *"So have you stroked thinking of me? x";*
 - *"So do you want sex with me if you could? X";*
 - *"Breast size? x".*

Mr Hunt accordingly admitted the facts of allegation 1.

The panel accepted Mr Hunt's admission, which was consistent with the evidence before it, not least the messages themselves.

The messages were, by their nature, of a sexual nature and inappropriate, which Mr Hunt also admitted. Some of the messages, including those set out above, were sexually explicit. The messages were also inappropriate given Pupil A's age and status as a recent, former pupil of Mr Hunt who remained a pupil at the Academy. Considering the messages as a whole, the panel noted it was Mr Hunt who repeatedly attempted to focus the conversation on matters of a sexual nature, which was an aggravating feature of his conduct.

The panel therefore found allegation 1 proved.

2. On or around 17 March 2023, you accepted a police caution in relation to attempting to cause a female aged 13 or over to engage in sexual activity – no penetration.

Mr Hunt admitted allegation 2.

A copy of the caution, signed by Mr Hunt on 17 March 2023, was included in evidence. It records that Mr Hunt accepted the caution for the offence of attempting to cause a female aged 13 or over to engage in sexual activity. The caution was also recorded on Mr Hunt's PNC record.

The panel therefore found allegation 2 proved.

3. Between 7 February 2021 and 9 February 2021, you sent communications of an inappropriate and/or sexual nature to Pupil J, a pupil at your former school.

Mr Hunt taught Pupil J when he worked at the Academy. By February 2021, she had started [REDACTED].

Mr Hunt admits that:

- Within the period specified, he corresponded with Pupil J via Facebook messenger.
- Within the messages he asked Pupil J if she fancied him and if she wanted sex.

Mr Hunt accordingly admitted the facts of allegation 3.

The panel accepted Mr Hunt's admission, which was consistent with the evidence before it.

Certain of the messages were, by their nature, of a sexual nature and inappropriate, which Mr Hunt also admitted. The messages were also inappropriate having regard to Pupil J's status as a former pupil of Mr Hunt. The messages were relatively innocuous until Mr Hunt, unilaterally, sought to manoeuvre the conversation to matters of a sexual

nature, which Pupil J immediately highlighted as being inappropriate. Having done so, he alluded to Pupil J's appearance, her relationship status and then explicitly sexual matters, which Pupil J had by no means encouraged and, from the messages, clearly led to Pupil J being understandably made to feel uncomfortable. Mr Hunt expressly referenced and therefore sought to leverage his status as Pupil J's former teacher in the exchange, which was a concerning feature of his actions.

The exchange also took place via social media, such that the School's policies were engaged. Mr Hunt expressly held himself out as an educator on social media, which was a further aspect of the inappropriateness of Mr Hunt's actions.

The panel therefore found allegation 3 proved.

4. Your conduct at allegation 1 and/or allegation 3 was sexually motivated.

Having found the facts of allegations 1 and 3 proved, the panel went on to determine whether Mr Hunt's actions were sexually motivated, which he admitted.

On the basis of his conduct and the context in which it occurred, the panel concluded that the appropriate inference to draw was that Mr Hunt, by acting as he did, was sexually motivated in relation to both Pupil A and Pupil J.

Mr Hunt was expressly seeking or intimating sexual contact and there was a persistence and even relentlessness to his actions, even when his overtures were not reciprocated. He made express reference to the Pupil A's and Pupil J's appearance, to whether they were attracted to him and to the express possibility of sex occurring. Some of the sexual references were graphic such that there was no scope for misinterpretation. On that basis, the panel was satisfied that it was clear and obvious that Mr Hunt was seeking sexual gratification and some form of future sexual relationship.

The panel therefore found allegation 4 proved in relation to both allegation 1 and allegation 3

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

Having found all 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.

Whilst this was admitted by Mr Hunt, the panel exercised its own judgement in relation to this issue.

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 Hunt in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Hunt was in breach of the following standards:

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
- 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 Hunt's 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 the offences of sexual activity and sexual communication with a child were relevant and allegation 2 concerned Mr Hunt receiving a caution for such an offence.

Over and above these matters, the panel took into account that Mr Hunt's behaviour involved two young people he had taught, one of whom remained a pupil at the Academy, and that he was sexually motivated towards them. Whilst they may have been former pupils, the panel nonetheless considered that Mr Hunt's behaviour amounted to a breach of his position of trust as a teacher.

His actions also raised safeguarding concerns, having regard to the age and circumstances of both pupils, and occurred notwithstanding that Mr Hunt had received safeguarding training.

Mr Hunt clearly acted contrary to the School's policies and expectations in terms of appropriate conduct online, in circumstances where Mr Hunt expressly identified as an educator on his Facebook profile.

Accordingly, for all these reasons, the panel was satisfied that Mr Hunt was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Mr Hunt's conduct may bring the profession into disrepute, 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.

The findings of misconduct were serious and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on Mr Hunt's status as a teacher and was potentially damaging the public perception, having particular regard to the fact that Mr Hunt expressly utilised his position as a teacher to seek sexual contact with a child and a young adult who, whilst not a child, had been taught by Mr Hunt.

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

In summary, having found the facts of the allegations proved, the panel further found that Mr Hunt'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 and 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 and protection of other members of the public;
- The maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and
- Declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Hunt, which involved sexually motivated behaviour towards two young people he had previously taught, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils. There were clear safeguarding implications to his conduct, which also posed an obvious risk of impacting negatively on both individuals but particularly Pupil A, given her age and the fact she remained a pupil at the Academy at the time the conduct took place.

The panel also considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Hunt were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.

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

In addition to these public interest considerations, the panel considered whether there was a public interest in retaining Mr Hunt in the profession.

Mr Hunt has an otherwise unblemished record. His competence had not been called into question. However, there was no evidence before the panel to suggest Mr Hunt had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his professional conduct. In light of this and having regard to the nature of the allegations found proved in this case, the panel concluded there was not a strong public interest in retaining him in the profession.

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 Hunt.

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 Hunt.

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;
- 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 disclosures;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;

- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- an abuse of any trust, knowledge, or influence gained through their professional position in order to advance a romantic or sexual relationship with a pupil or former pupil;
- sexual misconduct, e.g. involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature and/or that use or exploit the trust, knowledge or influence derived from the individual's professional position.

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.

The panel considered that the following mitigating factors are present in this case:

- Mr Hunt appeared to have had an otherwise unblemished record.
- The panel was presented with some positive references regarding his practice as a teacher and Mr Hunt's abilities as an educator had not been challenged.
- Mr Hunt had engaged with the TRA and made full admissions.
- The panel was presented with evidence in relation to personal and health difficulties at the relevant time, [REDACTED] Weighed against this, the aggravating features in this case included that:
 - Mr Hunt's behaviour was deliberate and he was not acting under duress. Whatever personal difficulties Mr Hunt may have been experiencing, there was no medical evidence presented and they did not excuse his actions. At all times, he remained responsible for his behaviour.
 - Mr Hunt's actions amounted to a clear breach of the Teachers' Standards and raised serious public and child protection concerns.
 - Mr Hunt had behaved in a sexually motivated way towards two former pupils, one of whom was under the age of 18 and remained at the Academy, such that he exploited or sought to exploit his position as their former teacher. The messages, which were sexually explicit and highly inappropriate for the reasons outlined, expressly alluded to the previous teacher/pupil relationship.
 - His actions in relation to Pupil A also amounted to a criminal offence.
 - His actions involved the potential for harm and had obvious safeguarding implications.

- There was no evidence of insight, regret or remorse. A submission received by the TRA from Mr Hunt focussed on himself and his family, whilst making no reference to the pupils or the implications of his actions.

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 was sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Hunt of prohibition.

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate, concluding that Mr Hunt's actions were fundamentally incompatible with his being a teacher. He had behaved in a sexually motivated way towards a child, who was a former pupil, and a young adult who was a former pupil. By definition, this was not, therefore, an isolated incident and this was conduct which was at the serious end of spectrum. There was also no evidence of regret, remorse or insight.

As such, the panel decided the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Hunt. There was, in a particular, a significant public interest consideration in this case in terms of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils.

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 to recommend that a review period of the order should be considered.

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 behaviours that, if proved, would militate against the recommendation of a review period.

These include:

- serious sexual misconduct e.g. where the act was sexually motivated and resulted in, or had the potential to result in, harm to a person or persons, particularly where the individual has used their professional position to influence or exploit a person or persons;

- any sexual misconduct involving a child.

These were both directly applicable in this case.

In light of this and the panel's comments, above, regarding the seriousness of Mr Hunt's actions, the panel decided its findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate.

The public interest considerations that Mr Hunt's actions give rise to were such that this was necessary, appropriate and proportionate.

The panel repeats that his behaviour was fundamentally incompatible with his being a teacher.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

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

In this case, the panel has found all of the allegations proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

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

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
 - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
 - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
- 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 Hunt fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of sexually motivated communications with two former pupils, one of whom was [REDACTED] at the time. They also include a finding of accepting a police caution for attempting to cause a female aged 13 or over to engage in sexual activity – no penetration.

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 Hunt, 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. The panel has observed:

“In light of the panel’s findings against Mr Hunt, which involved sexually motivated behaviour towards two young people he had previously taught, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils. There were clear safeguarding implications to his conduct, which also posed an obvious risk of impacting negatively on both individuals but particularly Pupil A, given her age and the fact she remained a pupil at the Academy at the time the conduct took place.”

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. The panel has noted that Mr Hunt had engaged with the TRA and made full admissions, but also commented that “There was no evidence of insight, regret or remorse. A submission received by the TRA from Mr Hunt focussed on himself and his family, whilst making no reference to the pupils or the implications of his actions.” In my judgement, the lack of insight and remorse means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel has observed:

“The findings of misconduct were serious and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on Mr Hunt’s status as a teacher and was potentially damaging the public perception, having particular regard to the fact that Mr Hunt expressly utilised his position as a teacher to seek sexual contact with a child and a young adult who, whilst not a child, had been taught by Mr Hunt.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding of sexually motivated behaviour towards two former pupils 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 Hunt himself. The panel has commented, “Mr Hunt has an otherwise unblemished record. His competence had not been called into question. However, there was no evidence before the panel to suggest Mr Hunt had demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his professional conduct.” The panel also noted that it had been presented with some positive references regarding Mr Hunt’s practice as a teacher.

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Hunt 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 seriousness of the misconduct and the lack of insight or remorse. The panel has said:

“The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate, concluding that Mr Hunt’s actions were fundamentally incompatible with his being a teacher. He had behaved in a sexually motivated way towards a child, who was a former pupil, and a young adult who was a former pupil. By definition, this was not, therefore, an isolated incident and this was conduct which was at the serious end of spectrum. There was also no evidence of regret, remorse or insight.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Hunt 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 insight and remorse, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

For these reasons, I have concluded that a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest in order to achieve the intended aims of a prohibition order.

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended that no provision should be made for a review period.

I have considered the panel's comments that the Advice indicates that among the behaviours that militate against the recommendation of a review period are serious sexual misconduct and any sexual misconduct involving a child. The panel finds that both are directly applicable in this case.

I have considered whether not allowing a review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the serious nature of the misconduct found proven and the lack of either insight or remorse.

I consider therefore that allowing for no review period is necessary to maintain public confidence and is proportionate and in the public interest.

This means that Mr Mark Hunt is prohibited from teaching indefinitely and cannot teach in any school, sixth form college, relevant youth accommodation or children's home in England. Furthermore, in view of the seriousness of the allegations found proved against him, I have decided that Mr Hunt shall not be entitled to apply for restoration of his eligibility to teach.

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

Mr Mark Hunt 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: David Oatley

Date: 27 September 2024

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