



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Patrick Cambridge: Professional conduct panel outcome**

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

**December 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         | 13 |
| Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State | 17 |

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

**Teacher:** Mr Patrick Cambridge

**Teacher ref number:** 0305189

**Teacher date of birth:** 19 June 1967

**TRA reference:** 23112

**Date of determination:** 9 December 2025

**Former employer:** St Bede's School, Redhill

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 8 December 2025 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Patrick Cambridge.

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

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

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Charlotte Watts of Browne Jacobson LLP solicitors.

Mr Cambridge was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public save that portions of the hearing were heard in private and the hearing was recorded.

## Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Proceedings dated 24 September 2025.

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

1. Whilst applying for the role of Teacher of Computing at St Bede's School and/or whilst employed as a Teacher at St Bede's School, he:
  - a. Failed to disclose that he had been employed as a Teacher at Redehall School between 11 November 2023 to 07 December 2023;
  - b. Failed to provide his most recent employer, Redehall School, as a reference on his application form;
  - c. Stated on his application form that he was working on his holiday home between September and December 2023, when in fact he was employed at Redehall School;
  - d. Failed to disclose that he was and/or had been the subject of an investigation relating to physical contact towards a child
2. His conduct as may be found proven at allegation 1 above lacked integrity and/or was dishonest

In the absence of the teacher, the allegations were not admitted.

## Summary of evidence

### Documents

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

Section 1: Notice of Proceedings and response – pages 5 to 27

Section 1: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements – pages 29 to 146

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency documents – pages 148 to 260

Section 4: Teacher documents – pages 262 to 267

In addition, the panel agreed to accept the following additional documents from the TRA containing the below:

Email from Mr Cambridge responding to TRA's email on 12 March 2024.

Email from the TRA to Mr Cambridge on 12 August 2024.

Correspondence Request Form filled out by Mr Cambridge on 30 January 2025.

Email exchanges between Mr Cambridge's representative and the TRA between 7 May 2025 and 29 May 2025.

Email exchanges between Mr Cambridge's representative and the TRA between 24 September 2025 and 30 October 2025.

Email exchanges between Mr Cambridge's representative and the TRA between 31 October 2025 and 13 November 2025.

Email exchanges between Mr Cambridge's representative and the TRA between 24 October 2025 and 21 November 2025.

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

In the consideration of this case, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: Disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession 2020, (the "Procedures").

## **Witnesses**

The panel heard oral evidence from the following witnesses called by the presenting officer:

Witness A - [REDACTED]

Witness B - [REDACTED]

## **Decision and reasons**

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

Mr Cambridge was employed as a teacher at Redehall School from 11 November 2023.

On 5 December an incident took place at Redehall School involving Mr Cambridge and a pupil. The panel did not consider details of this incident as it did not form part of the allegations before it.

Mr Cambridge was interviewed for a role at St Bede's School ("the School") on 7 December 2023 and began his employment as a teacher of computing on 2 January 2024. He was subsequently dismissed on 29 January 2024 following disciplinary proceedings.

The referral was made to the TRA on 30 January 2024 by the School and Redehall School.

## **Findings of fact**

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

- 1. Whilst applying for the role of Teacher of Computing at St Bede's School and/or whilst employed as a Teacher at St Bede's School, you:**
  - a. Failed to disclose that you had been employed as a Teacher at Redehall School between 11 November 2023 to 05 December 2023;**

The panel considered the evidence from Witness A 's witness statement and exhibits, that the School received Mr Cambridge's CV on 30 November 2023 via an agency and subsequently an application form on 12 December 2023 directly from Mr Cambridge. Mr Cambridge was interviewed by the School on 7 December 2023.

In Mr Cambridge's CV, his last recorded employment is listed as "[REDACTED]" as "Special Education Teacher and IT Teacher" from April 2022 – August 2023.

In the job application section "*Details of Present or Most Recent Teaching Appointments*" [REDACTED] is provided with dates of April 2022 – August 2023.

In the section "Periods When Not Working" of the job application, Mr Cambridge stated that he was "*Working on holiday home in Scotland whilst looking for IT teaching post*" from "*Sept 2023*" to "*until now*".

The panel also noted that on the "*Referees*" section of the job application it states that "*The first referee provided must be your present or most recent employer*" and Mr Cambridge listed Referee 1 as the [REDACTED].

The panel noted that on 9 January 2024, Witness A was informed by the LADO that Mr Cambridge was subject to an investigation involving a child from Redehall School and that the School was unaware at this stage that Mr Cambridge previously worked at Redehall School or that he was subject to an investigation.

On 10 January 2024, Mr Cambridge sent an email to Witness A in which he stated “*I would be grateful if I could have time out to attend an important meeting. This is not the email I wanted to send the second week as a newbie to the HT. (Wednesday 17<sup>th</sup> morning to mid afternoon) In short, I was attacked last year and despite giving my statement to the solicitor and Police, they have requested I attend an interview. I have managed to move it to the morning, but they cannot move it to my day off on a Tuesday. I am not looking forward to reliving the incident again. Apologies for the lateness of this request but I had to wait them to change the time to an earlier slot*”. The panel found this email to be carefully worded by Mr Cambridge, not to disclose to Witness A that the incident involved a pupil, took place while at his previous employment as a teacher, specifically not disclosing his previous employment at Redehall School and that he was subject to an investigation.

Later the same day, Witness A held a meeting with Mr Cambridge to discuss the information provided by the LADO and Mr Cambridge’s email. The panel considered minutes of this meeting, which recorded that Mr Cambridge confirmed his previous employment at Redehall School. Witness A indicated to Mr Cambridge that he had not been honest on his application form, and Mr Cambridge agreed that he had been “*naughty*” in omitting this. Mr Cambridge was informed that he would be suspended from the School pending an internal investigation. In response, he “*apologised for omitting information on his application and for putting the School in this position*”.

Further, the minutes note that Mr Cambridge “*said he was really sorry for putting [REDACTED] [Witness A] and the School in this position but he didn’t feel there were any safeguarding issues and he was not putting the School at risk*”.

The panel also noted that Mr Cambridge disputed some details of the minutes from this meeting in an email dated 12 January 2024. This related to when he informed Redehall School of his job interview with the School and the date on which he received his P45 from Redehall School. The panel found these points irrelevant to the allegations before it; however, Mr Cambridge did not dispute the admissions recorded in the minutes.

As part of the internal investigation, Mr Cambridge was interviewed on 10 January 2024 by [REDACTED]. When asked why he did not disclose his employment at Redehall School on his application form or in his CV, Mr Cambridge’s recorded responses in the minutes were:

“*Only there for a couple of weeks*

“*The incident that occurred did not reflect his 25-year teaching career.*”

“*confirmed that he had been dishonest on his application to Saint Bede’s about his employment there and that in hindsight he should not have done this.*

*“confirmed there had been an incident with a pupil at the School leading to his sudden resignation. He did not think the incident that occurred there was going anywhere until he got a phone call over Christmas. “*

Mr Cambridge was subject to disciplinary proceeding, and a hearing took place on 29 January 2024, following which Mr Cambridge was dismissed from his employment at the School. Minutes of that disciplinary proceeding were provided in the bundle, the panel noted that in the representations made by Mr Cambridge it is noted *“He did not want Redehall to ruin his career. He realises the decision not to mention Redehall might now have cost him his career. He made the decision under duress and panic.”*

The panel considered Mr Cambridge’s account provided in his emails to the TRA on 12 March 2024 and in his statement from 13 November 2025. In his email on 12 March 2024, Mr Cambridge made representations in relation to his involvement with the recruitment agency and that it was aware of his employment at Redehall School. In addition, that the DBS certificate showed to the School on his first day had the address of “[REDACTED] School” and therefore, claimed that he did not wish to hide this information from the School. Mr Cambridge did not produce any documentation in relation to the recruitment agency or his DBS certificate which would not have contained a list of his previous employers.

In addition, the following was noted from the same email: *“The School did ask me to fill in an application form and being in word format I can see how my iMac which is not Microsoft had not included several details. They asked for this on the last day of term and I had to rush off for my Christmas holidays with my family waiting in the car. It had confused me that Otto Ltd had already done this and the School wanted the same details again. ”*

In the email submitting his job application, Mr Cambridge stated: *“I have completed this in a bit of a rush and of course on an iMac that was misbehaving with the document. Please do let me know if you have any difficulty opening it...”*

The panel also noted that, following submission of his application, Mr Cambridge was asked by the School to clarify parts of it in follow-up emails between 12 and 15 December 2023. These queries related to some of his previous employment predating his time at Redehall School and additional references that could be obtained, as the School had only been able to secure a certificate confirming dates of service with the [REDACTED] rather than a full reference. The panel found this significant as it provided Mr Cambridge with the opportunity to reflect on his application and correct any errors in failing to disclose his employment at Redehall School. When a further reference was requested, he again failed to provide Redehall School as a reference.

The panel found that Mr Cambridge personally completed the job application and, in that application, he not only omitted Redehall School as his most recent employment, but he

also stated that he was unemployed throughout November and December 2023 while working on his holiday home. Furthermore, he failed to include Redehall School as his most recent employer when asked to provide references. The panel found this to be repeated failures to disclose his employment at Redehall School.

For these reasons, the panel found Mr Cambridge's explanations in his emails to the TRA and to the School not credible or reliable.

The panel therefore found this allegation proven.

**b. Failed to provide your most recent employer, Redehall School, as a reference on your application form;**

The panel applied the same considerations as above at allegation 1a in reaching this finding and, with particular focus on the application form submitted by Mr Cambridge on 12 December 2023 to the School, which evidenced that Redehall School was omitted as his most recent employer and reference.

The panel therefore found this allegation proven.

**c. Stated on your application form that you were working on your holiday home between September and December 2023, when in fact you were employed at Redehall School;**

The panel applied the same considerations as above at allegation 1a in reaching this finding and, with particular focus on the application form submitted by Mr Cambridge on 12 December 2023 to the School. In the section of "Periods When Not Working" Mr Cambridge stated that he was "*Working on holiday home in Scotland whilst looking for IT teaching post*" from "*Sept 2023*" to "*until now*". The panel noted that Mr Cambridge was employed at Redehall School at the same time.

The panel therefore found this allegation proven.

**d. Failed to disclose that you were and/or had been the subject of an investigation relating to physical contact towards a child**

The panel considered the evidence provided by Witness B, who was informed of an incident that took place on 5 December 2023 between Mr Cambridge and a pupil. She held a de-brief with Mr Cambridge the same day before he went home. In her oral evidence, Witness B stated that she contacted Mr Cambridge to inform him that he was subject to an investigation, following which he resigned.

The panel also considered the email of resignation sent by Mr Cambridge on 7 December 2023, which stated:

*"For my own safety I am giving you notice of my resignation from today as advised by my union. I am however willing and able to comply with any further investigations required to*

*conclude the safeguarding investigation. However, I will not be returning to my job role with yourselves as of today.”*

The panel found this email significant in concluding that Mr Cambridge was aware at the time that an investigation was underway in respect of the incident on 5 December 2023.

This email contradicts the information Mr Cambridge provided to Witness A during the meeting on 10 January 2023 that “*The matter was not investigated by Redehall as far as he is aware*” and Mr Cambridge’s own email to the TRA on 12 March 2024 in which he stated: “*The School didn’t follow the investigation and unbeknownst to me had sacked me two days after the incident so that they didn’t have to proceed with the investigation*”.

The panel further considered Mr Cambridge’s account in his email to the TRA on 12 March 2024 in respect of this allegation, which stated: “*At the time I was unaware of the ‘disclosure’ from the Police until the day before when it was sent to my solicitor. It was then that I realised my assault had in fact been turned into an allegation of assaulting. ... Therefore, I hadn’t deceived the School intentionally*” and “*I was unable to tell them about the incident at the previous School on the day of the interview as I was upholding the procedure that told me not to mention it to anyone... I was told not to discuss it with anyone.*” It was not clear from Mr Cambridge’s email who had told him, “*not to mention it to anyone*”.

The panel, therefore, found Mr Cambridge’s account to be inconsistent.

The panel carefully considered the application form that Mr Cambridge submitted to the School on 12 December 2023 and asked Witness A during his oral evidence where Mr Cambridge would have been expected to disclose the information of the investigation on the application form. Witness A pointed to the “*Declarations*” section of the application form, which states: “*You will also be required to disclose any other information that would suggest that you may be unsuitable to work with children.*”

Witness A also confirmed that, once employed, Mr Cambridge was required to disclose any such investigation under the School’s staff code of conduct. The panel further noted the wording in the “*Referees*” section of the application form, which specifies: “*If you are currently working with children, your present employer will be asked about any disciplinary offences relating to children (whether current or time expired), whether you have been subject of any substantiated child protection concerns and, if so, the outcome of these investigations. If you are not currently working with children, but have done so previously, these issues will be raised with your former employer.*”

The panel also considered what it found to be a carefully worded email that Mr Cambridge sent to Witness A on 10 January 2024 to inform the School that he was attending an interview, in particular: “*In short, I was attacked last year and despite giving my statement to the solicitor and Police, they have requested I attend an interview.*” Mr

Cambridge omitted in this email that he was subject to an investigation both by Redehall School and by the police relating to physical contact towards a pupil.

The panel found that Mr Cambridge was required to inform the School, both at the time of his application and during his employment, of the investigation, and he failed to do so. The panel determined that, on the balance of probabilities, Mr Cambridge was aware of the nature of the investigation involving the police and Redehall School, that he was the subject of an investigation relating to physical contact towards a child, and that he was aware of his obligation to disclose this during the application stage and during his employment at the School.

The panel, therefore, found this allegation proven.

## **2. Your conduct as may be found proven at allegation 1 above lacked integrity and/or was dishonest**

The panel considered the test for dishonesty as set out in *Ivey v Genting Casinos*. This requires a decision-maker to consider:

- a) What was the teacher's knowledge or belief as to the facts; and
- b) Was the conduct dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people?

The panel determined that ordinary decent people would consider Mr Cambridge's actions in these circumstances to be dishonest.

In making that determination, the panel considered the same factors as in Allegation 1. On the evidence before it, particularly the job application form, the panel found repeated attempts by Mr Cambridge to withhold information about his employment at Redehall School. He omitted Redehall School as his most recent employer, stated that he was unemployed and working on his holiday home during the period of his employment, and failed to list Redehall School as a reference. In addition, when the School queried the application and requested a further reference, Mr Cambridge again failed to put forward Redehall School. The panel found this to be an intentional attempt to conceal the truth of his employment due to the ongoing investigation involving a pupil. The panel also found that withholding information from the School about the ongoing investigation was intentional.

Mr Cambridge admitted that omitting his employment at Redehall was "*naughty*" when Witness A indicated during their meeting on 10 January 2024 that he had not been honest on the application form.

In considering integrity, the panel noted the high ethical standards expected of a teacher and determined that Mr Cambridge's actions demonstrated a failure to meet those standards and therefore lacked integrity.

The panel therefore found this allegation proven, that Mr Cambridge's conduct was both dishonest and lacked integrity.

## **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.

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 Cambridge, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel noted the pre-amble states that: "Teachers act with honesty and integrity".

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Cambridge 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
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the School in which they teach...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel also considered whether Mr Cambridge'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 offence of fraud or serious dishonesty was relevant.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Cambridge 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 Cambridge was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Mr Cambridge'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 Cambridge's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences in the list that begins on page 12 of the Advice.

As set out above in the panel's findings as to whether Mr Cambridge was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that the offence of fraud or serious dishonesty was relevant.

The panel considered that Mr Cambridge's conduct could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Cambridge's actions constituted 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, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

In light of the panel's findings, Mr Cambridge engaged in repeated acts of dishonesty and demonstrated a lack of integrity by concealing his previous employment at Redehall

School, where there was an ongoing investigation involving physical contact towards a child. These actions attempted to circumvent the strict recruitment processes designed to safeguard pupils. The panel considered that this conduct raised a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils.

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

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

The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Cambridge 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 a high level of integrity and 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 Cambridge.

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 were relevant in this case were:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity, including the deliberate concealment of their actions or purposeful destruction of evidence, especially where these behaviours have been repeated or had serious consequences, or involved the coercion of another person to act in a way contrary to their own interests;
- collusion or concealment including:
  - lying to prevent the identification of wrongdoing;

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 found that Mr Cambridge's actions were deliberate and that there was no evidence to suggest that Mr Cambridge was acting under extreme duress.

Mr Cambridge did not provide any testimonial statements attesting to his character or teaching ability. The panel asked both Witness A and Witness B about Mr Cambridge's character and teaching abilities. Neither witness was able to comment due to the short length of time Mr Cambridge had spent at each school. However, Witness B did state that "*With regard to subject knowledge, it was strong for some aspects of his teaching timetable.*"

The panel further noted Mr Cambridge's statement to the TRA on 13 November 2025 in which he stated: "*I qualified as a teacher in 2006 and went on to serve as Head of Department by 2008. My career has included leading ICT infrastructure, completing the Outstanding Teachers Programme, chairing a school council that received a national award, peer mentoring initiatives, and contributing to governance and local county educational initiatives. My dedication to teaching and to the wellbeing of children has always been at the heart of my work, along with the profession.*" In addition to: "*I remain proud of my years of service, my contribution to pupils and colleagues, and the values that guided me throughout my teaching career*".

The panel accepted that Mr Cambridge did have a previous good history and was an experienced teacher, but he did not demonstrate exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or having contributed significantly to the education sector.

Although Mr Cambridge initially made admissions and apologised to the School, which could indicate some insight and understanding of seriousness of his actions, this was undermined by subsequent correspondence. In his email of 12 March 2024 to the TRA and statement of 13 November 2025, Mr Cambridge failed to accept responsibility and instead attributed blame to both schools and the recruitment agency. The panel found that in his reflections, Mr Cambridge sought to minimise his actions.

The panel therefore concluded that Mr Cambridge did not demonstrate genuine remorse or insight and failed to take full accountability for 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 would be sufficient would

unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Cambridge 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 Cambridge. The repeated dishonesty and lack of integrity found proven 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 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.

This includes:

- fraud or serious dishonesty;

The panel found this relevant to its findings of dishonesty and considered Mr Cambridge's actions to amount to serious dishonesty, given that they were repeated over a period of time. The panel therefore gave this factor greater weight in favour of imposing a longer review period.

The panel considered that Mr Cambridge has the capacity to understand and reflect upon his actions during a review period. He demonstrated some understanding when he initially admitted his wrongdoing to the School. The panel considered that a review period of four years would provide Mr Cambridge with adequate time to reflect, remediate and demonstrate insight. The panel also considered that the findings against Mr Cambridge did not justify imposing a prohibition order without a review period.

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 of four 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 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 Patrick Cambridge should be the subject of a prohibition order, with a review period of four years.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Cambridge 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
  - 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 Cambridge fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession.

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include findings of repeated acts of dishonesty and a lack of integrity.

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 Cambridge, 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, “In light of the panel’s findings, Mr Cambridge engaged in repeated acts of dishonesty and demonstrated a lack of integrity by concealing his previous employment at Redehall School, where there was an ongoing investigation involving physical contact towards a child. These actions attempted to circumvent the strict recruitment processes designed to safeguard pupils. The panel considered that this conduct raised a strong public interest consideration in respect of the safeguarding and wellbeing of 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 sets out as follows, “Although Mr Cambridge initially made admissions and apologised to the School, which could indicate some insight and understanding of seriousness of his actions, this was undermined by subsequent correspondence. In his email of 12 March 2024 to the TRA and statement of 13 November 2025, Mr Cambridge failed to accept responsibility and instead attributed blame to both schools and the recruitment agency. The panel found that in his reflections, Mr Cambridge sought to minimise his actions.” 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 and confidence in the profession. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

I have gone on to consider the extent to which a prohibition order would maintain public confidence in the profession. The panel observe, “the panel considered that public confidence in the profession could be seriously weakened if conduct such as that found against Mr Cambridge were not treated with the utmost seriousness when regulating the conduct of the profession.” I am particularly mindful of the finding of dishonesty in this case and the impact that such a finding has on the reputation of the profession.

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

I have considered whether the publication of a finding of unacceptable professional conduct and conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute, in the absence of a prohibition order, can itself be regarded by such a person as being a proportionate response to the misconduct that has been found proven in this case.

I have also considered the impact of a prohibition order on Mr Cambridge himself and the panel comment “The panel accepted that Mr Cambridge did have a previous good history and was an experienced teacher, but he did not demonstrate exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or having contributed significantly to the education sector.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Cambridge 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 lack of full insight or remorse. The panel has said, “The panel therefore concluded that Mr Cambridge did not demonstrate genuine remorse or insight and failed to take full accountability for his actions.”

I have also placed considerable weight on the finding that “The panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Cambridge in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.”

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore, to the contribution that Mr Cambridge 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 remorse or 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 4 year review period.

I have considered the panel’s comments “The panel considered that Mr Cambridge has the capacity to understand and reflect upon his actions during a review period. He demonstrated some understanding when he initially admitted his wrongdoing to the School. The panel considered that a review period of four years would provide Mr Cambridge with adequate time to reflect, remediate and demonstrate insight. The panel also considered that the findings against Mr Cambridge did not justify imposing a prohibition order without a review period.”

In this case, factors mean that allowing a lesser review period is not sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the dishonesty found and the lack of full insight or remorse.

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

**This means that Mr Patrick Cambridge 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 16 December 2029, 4 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 Cambridge remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr Patrick Cambridge 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 "Sarah Buxcey".

**Decision maker: Sarah Buxcey**

**Date: 11 December 2025**

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