



Teaching
Regulation
Agency

Mr Ben Hough Professional conduct panel outcome

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

July 2025

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Witnesses	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 Ben Hough
Teacher ref number:	0547381
Teacher date of birth:	23 August 1984
TRA reference:	19780
Date of determination:	5 August 2025
Former employer:	Time Plan Education Group Limited, Southampton

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened between 4 and 5 August 2025 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Hough.

The panel members were Mrs Shabana Robertson (lay panellist – in the chair), Mr Paul Hawkins (lay panellist) and Mrs Kate Hurley (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Ms Jamila Bernard-Stevenson of Blake Morgan LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Zahra Evans of Capsticks LLP solicitors.

Mr Hough was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 10 April 2025.

It was alleged that Mr Hough was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and/or having been convicted of a relevant offence, in that:

1. On 25 February 2008 at Chichester Magistrates Court, you were convicted of driving a motor car with excess alcohol on 1 January 2008, contrary to Road Traffic Act 1988 s5(1)(a).
2. While working as a teacher through Time Plan Education agency, on or around 20 June 2020, you consumed a Class A drug (cocaine).
3. On 5 November 2020 at East Hampshire Magistrates Court, you were convicted of two counts of driving a motor vehicle with the proportion of specified controlled drug above the specified limit on 29 February 2020, contrary to Road Traffic Act 1988 s5A(1)(a).
4. On 26 April 2021 at East Hampshire Magistrates Court, you were convicted of two counts of driving a motor vehicle with the proportion of specified controlled drug above the specified limit on 14 August 2020, contrary to Road Traffic Act 1988 s5A(1)(a).

Mr Hough has not indicated whether he admits the facts of the allegations or whether he admits that allegation 1, 3 and/or 4 amounted to a conviction of a relevant offence. Therefore, the panel treated the allegations as though they were denied.

Summary of evidence

Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology and list of key people – pages 3 to 5

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 6 to 18

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 43 to 58

Section 4: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 59 to 71

Service bundle consisting of 110 pages

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

In the consideration of this case, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession 2022, (the “Procedures”).

Witnesses

The panel heard oral evidence from [REDACTED] Witness A called by the presenting officer.

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 Hough was engaged as a supply teacher at Time Plan Education Group Limited. Time Plan Education Group Limited (“the Agency”) is a recruitment agency. Mr Hough was placed as a PE teacher and/or supply teacher at a number of schools by the Agency. Mr Hough’s role with the Agency ended on 23 September 2020.

On 25 February 2008, Mr Hough was convicted of driving a motor car with excess alcohol on 1 January 2008, contrary to section 5(1) (a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988.

On the same date, Mr Hough was sentenced to a £200 fine and disqualified for a period of 16 months.

On or around 20 June 2020, it was alleged that Mr Hough consumed a Class A drug (cocaine).

On 5 November 2020, Mr Hough was convicted of two counts of driving a motor vehicle with the proportion of a specified controlled drug above the specified limit on 29 February 2020 contrary to section 5A(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 (“the Act”). Mr Hough was disqualified for a period of 18 months and fined the sum of £750 for one of these offences. No separate penalty was imposed for the other offence.

On 26 April 2021, Mr Hough was convicted of two counts of driving a motor vehicle with the proportion of specified controlled drug above the specified limit on 14 August 2020 contrary to section 5A(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988. Mr Hough was sentenced to a Rehabilitation Activity Requirement and an unpaid work requirement and was disqualified from driving for a period of 18 months for both offences.

On 2 February 2021, the Agency submitted a [REDACTED] referral in relation to Mr Hough.

The panel made its own independent decision based on the evidence presented to it.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

- 1. On 25 February 2008 at Chichester Magistrates Court, you were convicted of driving a motor car with excess alcohol on 1 January 2008, contrary to Road Traffic Act 1988 s5(1)(a).**

The panel was presented with a certified court extract from Chichester Magistrates Court.

This confirmed that Mr Hough was convicted, on 25 February 2008, of driving a motor vehicle with excess alcohol on 1 January 2008, contrary to section 5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988. The sentence received by Mr Hough on this date was clearly set out.

The panel accepted the certified court extract as conclusive proof of the commission of the offence by Mr Hough and the sentence received.

Mr Hough did not provide any submissions in relation to this allegation.

The panel accordingly found allegation 1 proved.

- 2. While working as a teacher through Time Plan Education agency, on or around 20 June 2020, you consumed a Class A drug (cocaine).**

The panel was presented with a witness statement from Witness A [REDACTED] dated 18 October 2024. In this witness statement, Witness A states that:

- He attended the scene of an incident on 20 June 2020.
- Upon his arrival, Mr Hough was laying on the floor and paramedics were advised that he had recently suffered a seizure.
- He described Mr Hough as being in a postictal state.
- He explained that Mr Hough informed him that he had taken one gram of cocaine at around 14.30.

In his oral evidence, Witness A provided evidence under affirmation which was broadly consistent with the content of his witness statement.

The panel was presented with a [REDACTED] referral which had been completed by the Agency. This document stated that Mr Hough was engaged by the Agency between 3 March 2020 and 23 September 2020. Whilst working with the Agency, Mr Hough was engaged to provide supply teaching services.

The panel noted that Witness A stated that during a telephone conversation [REDACTED] told him that Mr Hough was a 'regular user of cocaine.' During this

conversation, [REDACTED] also stated that in the last few weeks he had experienced 4 seizures. Witness A stated that he believed that Mr Hough's presentation on 20 June 2020 was consistent with someone who had experienced a drug induced seizure. Witness A further stated that Mr Hough had reluctantly informed him that he had taken one gram of cocaine at around 2.30pm and that he saw drug paraphernalia including a 'melting spoon' and IV needles at Mr Hough's home address. [REDACTED] Witness A explained that whilst in the [REDACTED], Mr Hough claimed that he would continue to use cocaine.

The panel noted that on two occasions, 29 February 2020 and 14 August 2020, Mr Hough had consumed cocaine and driven whilst over the specified limit, offences to which he later pleaded guilty.

Mr Hough did not provide any submissions in relation to this allegation.

On the balance of probability, the panel found allegation 2 proved.

3. On 5 November 2020 at East Hampshire Magistrates Court, you were convicted of two counts of driving a motor vehicle with the proportion of specified controlled drug above the specified limit on 29 February 2020, contrary to Road Traffic Act 1988 s5A(1)(a).

The panel was presented with a certified memorandum of conviction from East Hampshire Magistrates Court.

This confirmed that Mr Hough was convicted, on 5 November 2020, of two counts of driving a motor vehicle with the proportion of specified controlled drug above the specified limit on 29 February 2020, contrary to section 5A(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988. The sentence received by Mr Hough on this date was clearly set out.

The panel accepted the certified memorandum of conviction as conclusive proof of the commission of the offence by Mr Hough and the sentence received

Mr Hough did not provide any submissions in relation to this allegation.

The panel accordingly found allegation 3 proved.

4. On 26 April 2021 at East Hampshire Magistrates Court, you were convicted of two counts of driving a motor vehicle with the proportion of specified controlled drug above the specified limit on 14 August 2020, contrary to Road Traffic Act 1988 s5A(1)(a).

The panel was presented with a certified memorandum of conviction from East Hampshire Magistrates Court.

This confirmed that Mr Hough was convicted, on 26 April 2021, of two counts of driving a motor vehicle with the proportion of specified controlled drug above the specified limit on 14 August 2020, contrary to section 5A(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988. The sentence received by Mr Hough on this date was clearly set out.

The panel accepted the certificate of conviction as conclusive proof of the commission of the offence by Mr Hough and the sentence received.

Mr Hough did not provide any submissions in relation to this allegation.

The panel accordingly found allegation 4 proved.

Findings as to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and/or conviction of a relevant offence

Having found allegation 2 proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of the allegation 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 first considered whether the conduct of Mr Hough in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers’ Standards.

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Hough 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:
 - not undermining fundamental British values [...] the rule of law, [...]

The panel also considered whether Mr Hough’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 serious driving offences, particularly those involving alcohol or drugs was relevant.

The panel determined that consuming Class A drugs whilst engaged by an agency to provide supply teaching services, fell significantly below the standard expected.

Consuming illegal substances such as Class A drugs could impair Mr Hough's judgment and consequently impact the safety of members of the public.

The panel noted that the allegations took place outside the education setting. However, the nature of the conduct (i.e. knowingly driving whilst under the influence of a Class A drug) calls into question Mr Hough's judgment. Such behaviour clearly jeopardises the safety of members of the public and potentially exposes pupils to harm.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Hough amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mr Hough was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Mr Hough's 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.

In considering the issue of disrepute, the panel also considered whether Mr Hough's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice.

Witness A explained that he made a safeguarding referral pertaining to Mr Hough as he was concerned that the role of a teacher placed him in a position of trust. The panel noted that in addition to concerns raised by Witness A, [REDACTED].

The conduct of Mr Hough could impact the public's perception of a teacher, at the material time, Mr Hough was a cocaine user and has a conviction for driving with excess alcohol. The panel noted that with respect to Mr Hough's conviction for driving a motor vehicle with excess alcohol, Mr Hough's blood test results revealed that he had a reading of 135mg of alcohol in 100ml of blood. The panel concluded Mr Hough's use of illegal drugs and alcohol could impact his ability to work safely as a teacher.

As set out above in the panel's findings as to whether Mr Hough was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that the serious driving offences involving alcohol was relevant.

The findings of misconduct are serious, and the conduct displayed would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher.

For these reasons, the panel determined that Mr Hough's actions constituted conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

Findings as to conviction of a relevant offence

Having found allegations 1, 3 and 4 proved, the panel went on to consider whether these convictions amounted to convictions of a relevant offence, which Mr Hough admitted at court.

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 Hough in relation to the facts it found proved involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards. The panel considered that by reference to Part 2, Mr Hough 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 [..]
- not undermining fundamental British values [..] the rule of law, [..]

The panel found that these convictions were for relevant offences as outlined in the Advice:

- serious driving offences, particularly those involving alcohol or drugs;

In addition to the above, the panel determined that Mr Hough's actions were relevant to teaching and working with children as at least one of the allegations pertains to conduct which took place during the period that Mr Hough was eligible to work with children in schools.

The panel determined that both the nature and gravity of these offences were serious. The panel noted that Mr Hough's conduct (by taking class A drugs and driving) was repeated and sustained.

In conclusion and for all these reasons, the panel found that the seriousness of the offending behaviour that led to the convictions was directly relevant to Mr Hough's ongoing suitability to teach. The panel considered that a finding that these convictions were relevant offences was necessary to reaffirm clear standards of conduct so as to maintain public confidence in the teaching profession.

Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State

Given the panel's findings in respect of unacceptable professional conduct, conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and 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 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 a 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 other members of the public.
- The maintenance of public confidence in the profession; and
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Hough which included that he had driven a vehicle whilst under the influence of alcohol and illegal drugs, there was a strong public interest consideration in the protection of members of the public (including pupils).

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

The panel was not provided with any evidence regarding Mr Hough's competence as an educator nor were any character references provided. The panel concluded there is currently not a strong public interest consideration in retaining him in the profession.

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 ought to act with integrity and in accordance with ethical standards at all times.

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 Hough.

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;

Even though 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:

- There had been no prior adverse findings in these proceedings in relation to Mr Hough.

Weighed against this and the behaviours set out above, the panel considered there were aggravating features in this case, including that:

- Mr Hough had been convicted of and sentenced for serious offences involving driving whilst under the influence of drugs and alcohol.
- Mr Hough's actions were deliberate.
- Mr Hough's conduct amounted to a sustained pattern of behaviour.
- Mr Hough had displayed a disregard for the law on multiple occasions.
- There was no evidence that Mr Hough had shown remorse for his behaviour and the panel noted that Mr Hough had advised Witness A that he intended to continue using cocaine.
- Mr Hough failed to demonstrate insight into his behaviour.
- There was no evidence that Mr Hough had successfully remediated his conduct.
- There were no protective factors that would reduce the risk of Mr Hough re-offending.
- There is a high risk of repetition.

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

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, 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 Hough 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 Hough. The persistency of Mr Hough's offending and his failure to engage with these proceedings 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 it would be appropriate 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 further indicates that there are certain types of case where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period. None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel's findings.

The Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases 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.

The panel noted that Mr Hough had shown no insight or remorse regarding his conduct. Further, he failed to provide any evidence or submissions in relation to these proceedings. The fact that Mr Hough's conduct amounted to a sustained pattern of behaviour which is underpinned by a problematic relationship with drugs and alcohol was a cause for significant concern to the panel. There was no evidence before the panel that Mr Hough had sought (and/or obtained) professional support for these issues.

Therefore, the panel concluded that a review period of 7 years would be appropriate and proportionate in this case.

A period of 7 years will afford Mr Hough sufficient time and opportunity, should he wish to do so, to take steps to fully rehabilitate and remediate his conduct and demonstrate that he has insight into the nature, cause and effect of his conduct.

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/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute and/or a relevant conviction.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that Mr Ben Hough should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of 7 years.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Hough 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:
 - not undermining fundamental British values [...] the rule of law, [...]

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of convictions for driving offences involving alcohol and a controlled drug.

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, conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute and 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 Hough, 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:

“The panel noted that the allegations took place outside the education setting. However, the nature of the conduct (i.e. knowingly driving whilst under the influence of a Class A drug) calls into question Mr Hough’s judgment. Such behaviour clearly jeopardises the safety of members of the public and potentially exposes pupils to harm.”

“The panel concluded Mr Hough’s use of illegal drugs and alcohol could impact his ability to work safely as a teacher.”

“In the light of the panel’s findings against Mr Hough which included that he had driven a vehicle whilst under the influence of alcohol and illegal drugs, there was a strong public interest consideration in the protection of members of the public (including pupils).”

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 has set out as follows:

“There was no evidence that Mr Hough had shown remorse for his behaviour and the panel noted that Mr Hough had advised Witness A that he intended to continue using cocaine.”

“Mr Hough failed to demonstrate insight into his behaviour.”

“There was no evidence that Mr Hough had successfully remediated his conduct.”

“There were no protective factors that would reduce the risk of Mr Hough re-offending.”

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:

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

I am particularly mindful of the finding of being convicted for multiple serious offences involving driving whilst under the influence of drugs and alcohol 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, conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute and 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 Hough himself. The panel has commented:

“The panel was not provided with any evidence regarding Mr Hough’s competence as an educator nor were any character references provided. The panel concluded there is currently not a strong public interest consideration in retaining him in the profession.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Hough 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:

“The panel determined that both the nature and gravity of these offences were serious. The panel noted that Mr Hough’s conduct (by taking class A drugs and driving) was repeated and sustained.”

“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 Hough. The persistency of Mr Hough’s offending and his failure to engage with these proceedings was a significant factor in forming that opinion.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the findings of the panel that Mr Hough had shown no insight or remorse, and that there was a high risk of repetition.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Mr Hough 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 or 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 a 7-year review period.

The Advice indicates that where a case involves possession (including for personal use) of any Class A drug, the public interest will have great relevance and weigh in favour of a longer review period.

I have considered the panel's comments:

"The panel noted that Mr Hough had shown no insight or remorse regarding his conduct. Further, he failed to provide any evidence or submissions in relation to these proceedings. The fact that Mr Hough's conduct amounted to a sustained pattern of behaviour which is underpinned by a problematic relationship with drugs and alcohol was a cause for significant concern to the panel. There was no evidence before the panel that Mr Hough had sought (and/or obtained) professional support for these issues."

"A period of 7 years will afford Mr Hough sufficient time and opportunity, should he wish to do so, to take steps to fully rehabilitate and remediate his conduct and demonstrate that he has insight into the nature, cause and effect of his conduct."

I have considered whether a 7-year 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 shorter review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the multiple convictions for serious offences, the lack of either insight or remorse, and the risk of repetition.

I consider therefore that a 7-year review period is required to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

This means that Mr Ben Hough 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 06 August 2032, 7 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 Hough remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr Hough has a right of appeal to the High Court within 28 days from the date he is given notice of this order.

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

Decision maker: David Oatley

Date: 6 August 2025

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