



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Edward Webb: Professional conduct panel outcome**

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

**January 2026**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	6
Findings of fact	6
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	20
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	25

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

**Teacher:** Mr Edward Webb

**Teacher ref number:** 9637127

**Teacher date of birth:** 18 October 1964

**TRA reference:** 22696

**Date of determination:** 9 January 2026

**Former employer:** Cove School, Farnborough

## **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 5 January 2026 to 9 January 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Webb.

The panel members were Ms Amanda Godfrey (teacher panellist – in the chair), Mrs Shabana Robertson (lay panellist) and Dr Mark Sanderson (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr James Corrish of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Jessica Bass of Capsticks LLP solicitors.

Mr Webb was present and was represented by Mr Nicholas Kennan of Cornwall Street Barristers.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

## Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 8 October 2025.

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

1. On 2 May 2023, he did not provide any or any adequate health and safety instruction to pupils, in that he:
  - (a) failed to tell one or more pupils who were using and/or about to use equipment / machinery to:
    - i. wear aprons;
    - ii. tie their hair back;
    - iii. tuck in their ties;
    - iv. wear goggles.
  - (b) allowed one or more pupils to:
    - i. use tools and/or equipment incorrectly and/or in an unsafe manner;
    - ii. touch the pillar drill and/or attempt to remove Pupil A's hair from the pillar drill whilst it was live.
2. He gave a false account about his conduct during the lesson on 2 May 2023, in that he told Pupil A, "*I told you to put your hair up or out the way*" or words to that effect when that was not the case
3. His conduct at Allegation 2 above was dishonest.

Mr Webb admitted allegations 1(a) (i) (ii) (iii) and (iv) and 1(b) (i) and (ii). Mr Webb accepted, in connection with allegation 2, that he told Pupil A, "*I told you to put your hair up or out the way*" or words to that effect but otherwise denied allegation 2. Mr Webb denied allegation 3. Mr Webb accepted that the allegations he had admitted were capable of constituting unacceptable professional conduct and conduct which could bring the profession into disrepute.

## Summary of evidence

### Documents

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

Section 1: Chronology, anonymised pupil list and list of key people – pages 5 to 8

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 9 to 33

Section 3: TRA witness statements and exhibits – pages 34 to 593

Section 4: Other relevant TRA documents – pages 594 to 618

Section 5: Teacher documents – pages 619 to 687

Section 6: CMH Application – pages 688 to 695

Video CCTV footage of lesson of 2 May 2023.

In addition, the panel agreed to substitute the signed version of the witness statement of Individual L for the version which it had in the bundle and agreed the late admission of the statement of Individual H which was already within the bundle.

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle and viewed the CCTV footage, in advance of the hearing as well as 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];
- Witness C – [REDACTED]; and
- Witness D – [REDACTED]
- Pupil O – [REDACTED];

Mr Webb also gave oral evidence.

## 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 Webb had been employed at Cove School from 4 June 2020 as a Design & Technology (“DT”) teacher.

On 2 May 2023, Pupil A caught his hair in a piece of machinery during a DT lesson in which Mr Webb was the teacher.

Pupil A attended the School’s health and welfare office and the School telephoned Pupil A’s mother to inform her of the incident. The School’s Health and Welfare Assistant then reported the incident to the School’s Bursar.

On 11 May 2023, an investigation was conducted by Hampshire Inspection and Advisory Service into allegations that Mr Webb had failed to provide adequate safety instructions to pupils, that he had allowed pupils to use machines incorrectly and allowed a pupil to touch the drill when it was still live during his DT lesson on 2 May 2023.

On 19 October 2023 the matter was referred to the TRA.

## Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

In respect of all the allegations, the panel carefully considered the oral and written witness evidence and exhibits, and the additional documents provided.

The panel scrutinised the entire bundle including the TRA’s documents concerning the investigations and the meetings of the School and other evidence surrounding the matters to which the allegations relate.

The panel noted that the evidence within many of these documents was hearsay but considered that the evidence was relevant and formed part of the official investigations. The panel noted that the hearsay evidence should be considered carefully and cautiously, including in relation to the appropriate amount of weight to be placed on it.

The panel noted that Mr Webb had admitted to large parts of the allegations facing him but as some elements of those allegations were denied or not fully admitted it proceeded on the basis that this was a fully disputed hearing and determined that it would carefully consider all the evidence before it.

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

1. **On 2 May 2023, you did not provide any or any adequate health and safety instruction to pupils, in that you:**
  - a. **failed to tell one or more pupils who were using and/or about to use equipment / machinery to:**
    - i. **wear aprons;**

The panel noted that Mr Webb admitted the entirety of allegation 1 but nevertheless proceeded to consider all the evidence carefully before making its findings.

In connection with all elements of allegation 1 the panel took note of the fact that Mr Webb was a highly experienced DT teacher whom it had been informed was previously a head of a DT department at another school.

The panel's attention was drawn to, and it considered, the documents within the bundle that demonstrated the courses of training which Mr Webb had had during his time at the School from an external provider including on 13 December 2021, 10 March 2023, 15 March 2023 and 21 April 2023.

The panel also considered the detailed health and safety documents within the bundle concerning appropriate health and safety instructions for DT classes and for the use of a pillar drill. The panel noted that Mr Webb's evidence was that he understood and agreed with the health and safety guidance, including with regard to the use of a pillar drill and the appropriate steps to be taken to ensure pupils were protected in class.

The panel carefully considered the CCTV footage of Mr Webb's DT lesson of 2 May 2023 as well as the transcript of that CCTV footage. The panel was taken to various parts of this footage by the presenting officer.

The panel noted that it was not contested that Mr Webb was the teacher within the CCTV footage and that this was one of his year 10 classes. The panel understood that this was classroom 31 at the School and was not the classroom in which Mr Webb most frequently taught.

The CCTV footage clearly showed a DT lesson in which the majority of the pupils were engaged in practical work including use of drilling machinery being the two pillar drills. The panel's attention was also drawn to a belt sander. The identity of these machines was established in evidence.

The panel noted a number of occasions on the CCTV footage when Mr Webb was assisting pupils using the two pillar drills in the room, where Mr Webb appeared to fail to provide health and safety instructions. These included instances when pupils were, variously, without aprons, did not have their ties tucked in, did not wear goggles or did

not tie their hair back. Pupils then proceeded to repeatedly use these machines without taking these steps.

The panel noted that the transcript of the CCTV footage did not contain evidence of Mr Webb instructing pupils to wear aprons, tie their hair back, tuck in their ties or wear goggles.

The panel considered the oral and written evidence of Pupil O. Pupil O's evidence was that Mr Webb did not tell pupils to wear aprons unless they were painting. Pupil O stated that there were posters around the classroom to remind pupils of the safety measures.

The panel considered the notes of a meeting with Pupil O dated 3 May 2023 where she was recorded as having said that pupils were not reminded of the safety measures, such as wearing aprons, tying hair up and tucking ties in at the start of each lesson, but that Mr Webb reminded pupils every now and then when they were using machines. Pupil O was also recorded as stating that Mr Webb "*does not ever tell [the pupils] about wearing an apron*" and that the pupils do not wear aprons regularly.

The panel considered the evidence of the Pupil J, Pupil G and Pupil M in connection with the lesson of 2 May 2023 but did not find that it was necessary to place material weight on their statements in order as to reach their conclusions. It did note though that, whilst disagreeing in some areas, these pupils' evidence was broadly consistent with that of Mr Webb and Pupil O.

The panel considered the oral and written evidence of Witness B who explained that she was present for part of Mr Webb's year 10 DT lesson on 2 May 2023 to provide individual support for a pupil. Witness B indicated within her evidence that Mr Webb was passionate and knowledgeable about health and safety and that in the lesson previous to 2 May 2023 Mr Webb "*gave the children a really big briefing about safety in DT prior to when they started their practical lessons*".

Witness B indicated that in Mr Webb's safety briefing in that previous lesson Mr Webb retold incidents where safety measures had not been followed and how to avoid accidents. Witness B stated that Mr Webb explained safety precautions which included tying long hair back, wearing goggles, wearing an apron and having awareness of the stop button if a pupil had difficulty with a machine.

Witness B could not recall how often Mr Webb reminded pupils of safety measures during his previous DT classes more generally and could not recall whether Mr Webb provided a safety briefing on 2 May 2023 and explained that her focus was to provide support to the individual to whom she was assigned.

The panel carefully considered the oral and written evidence of Mr Webb. Mr Webb informed the panel he had only had three hours sleep during the bank holiday weekend

which immediately preceded the lesson due to factors including marking, [REDACTED]. He also informed the panel that he had contemplated not coming in that day and had only come in so as to facilitate urgent submission of coursework for year 11 students.

Mr Webb informed the panel that he didn't recognise the practises of the teacher he was viewing on the CCTV footage (i.e. himself) and informed the panel that his repeated and acknowledged failures to address various health and safety concerns within the room on that day were a one-off aberration owing to [REDACTED].

Mr Webb stated that he did not request all students to wear aprons during his lesson on 2 May 2023 because half the group were doing theory and design. Mr Webb stated in his written evidence that he would usually request the pupils to wear aprons in practical lessons. Within Mr Webb's oral evidence though he acknowledged that he had become more relaxed about the use of aprons in this year 10 class over a period of time because there were some students who were reluctant to use them.

Mr Webb acknowledged in cross examination that it was his responsibility to make sure that pupils did wear aprons, tie their hair back, tuck in their ties and wear goggles, and that he did not do so on a number of occasions during the lesson on 2 May 2023. Mr Webb confirmed he was aware that long hair and loose clothing can become entangled in moving parts of the drilling machine and the belt sander and that the children should wear aprons and goggles.

The panel found that it was clear that Mr Webb accepted he had an obligation to provide adequate health and safety instruction to pupils including to tell them to wear aprons and that from the CCTV it appeared that only one pupil in this lesson appeared to be wearing an apron in spite of a large number of pupils engaging in practical activity.

Having considered the evidence before it, the panel was satisfied that the TRA had proven, on the balance of probabilities, that Mr Webb had failed to tell one or more pupils who were using and/or about to use equipment/machinery during his class on 2 May 2023 to wear an apron when using machinery and that this was a failure to provide any adequate health and safety instruction.

The panel therefore found allegation 1(a)(i) proven on the balance of probabilities.

**ii. tie their hair back;**

Mr Webb admitted allegation 1(a)(ii). Notwithstanding this the panel made a determination of the facts based on the evidence available. The panel noted and reminded themselves of their general findings in respect of allegation 1 (a) (i).

The panel again reviewed the CCTV footage and transcript. The transcript made no reference to Mr Webb speaking to pupils about tying their hair back until after Pupil A's

hair became stuck to the drill where Mr Webb said “*this is why you have to be so careful yeah*” and “*This is what we say about people with long hair.*”

The panel was drawn to, and observed, several occasions on the CCTV footage, including around the pillar drill at the back of the room and the pillar drill and belt sander at the front right of the room, when a number of individual students with long hair were clearly taking steps to use, and then using, machinery without their hair tied back.

The panel noted that there were a significant number of occasions where this occurred within Mr Webb's direct sightline, or even with Mr Webb facilitating the use of the machine, and there was no evidence from the CCTV footage of Mr Webb taking steps to address the pupils' failures to follow the health and safety requirements.

The panel again considered the written and oral evidence of Pupil O. Pupil O stated that she could not recall whether Mr Webb reminded pupils to tie their hair back or whether Mr Webb explicitly gave any other safety advice during the lesson of 2 May 2023. Pupil O stated that she did not have her hair tied up in the lesson on 2 May 2023 because she was not using machinery. Pupil O explained that she had “*understood from Mr Webb's safety reminders that [hair tying] was only necessary when using the machinery*”.

Pupil O stated that “*Mr Webb would provide reminders about safety measures, such as tying hair back, around every other lesson.*” Pupil O's further stated that “*if Mr Webb saw a pupil with their hair down whilst using the machinery or not following another safety measure, he would tell them off and make sure they followed the measures going forward.*”.

The panel again considered Witness B's evidence which stated that she could not recall whether Mr Webb discussed safety measures with the pupils on 2 May 2023 but that Mr Webb had given safety briefings to the pupils prior to the lesson on 2 May 2023 which included tying hair back. The panel noted that Witness B had left Mr Webb's classroom before Pupil A's hair became stuck in the pillar drill.

The panel considered Mr Webb's written and oral evidence. Mr Webb stated that he did not tell Pupil A to tie his hair back on 2 May 2023. Mr Webb's evidence was that he had reminded all pupils to tie their hair up in previous lessons. Mr Webb stated that he did not see Pupil A's hair as an issue because Pupil A's hair sat above his ears. Mr Webb explained that his understanding was that a pupil's hair was only a safety concern if it is below the level of their ears but acknowledged that he should have assessed Pupil A's voluminous hair and hairstyle.

Mr Webb stated that he asked two or three girls to tie their hair back on a few occasions during the lesson on 2 May 2023.

The panel carefully considered all the evidence and found it clearly demonstrated, including on the CCTV footage, that in this DT lesson on 2 May 2023 Mr Webb did not

provide any adequate health and safety instruction to pupils in that on a number of occasions within the lesson he failed to tell one or more pupils who were using and/or about to use equipment/machinery to tie their hair back.

Whilst the panel reached no finding on whether Mr Webb instructed certain pupils to tie their hair back, as he submitted, the panel considered that it was clear, including from the CCTV footage, that any instructions which were given were not followed. The panel considered that it would clearly have been appropriate for Mr Webb to repeat his instructions to those individuals at the very least on every occasion on which he saw the same individuals using or about to use the equipment or machinery, but that it appeared he did not do so. Further there were clearly other individuals using machinery with long hair not tied up within the footage who did not appear to receive any instruction from Mr Webb.

The panel found allegation 1(a)(ii) proven on the balance of probabilities.

**iii. tuck in their ties;**

Mr Webb admitted allegation 1(a)(iii). Notwithstanding Mr Webb's admission, the panel made a determination of the facts based on the evidence available. The panel noted and reminded themselves of its general findings in respect of allegation 1 (a) (i).

The panel again reviewed the CCTV footage and transcript. The panel found no evidence within these that Mr Webb spoke to pupils in that lesson about tucking in their ties. The panel noted that the footage clearly displayed a number of pupils using/about to use machinery without their ties tucked in.

The panel also noted that Pupil O's evidence and Witness B's evidence was that neither could recall whether Mr Webb discussing safety measures with the pupils on 2 May 2023.

The panel again considered Mr Webb's written and oral evidence. Mr Webb stated that he did not recall asking pupils to tuck their ties in during this lesson but that there were posters displayed in the classroom which asked pupils to do so, and Mr Webb had previously instructed pupils to do so. Mr Webb stated that he ought to have been completely clear with the students on this, insisting they tuck in their ties and not proceeded with the lesson until it was safe to do so.

The panel noted that Mr Webb himself did not model safe behaviour that day including that he did not tuck his tie in until over halfway through the lesson.

The panel carefully considered all the evidence and found it clearly demonstrated, including on the CCTV footage that, in this DT lesson on 2 May 2023, Mr Webb did not provide any adequate health and safety instruction to pupils in that on a number of occasions within the lesson he failed to tell one or more pupils who were using and/or about to use equipment/machinery to tuck in their ties.

The panel found allegation 1(a)(iii) proven on the balance of probabilities.

**iv. wear goggles.**

Mr Webb admitted allegation 1(a)(iv). Notwithstanding Mr Webb's admission, the panel made a determination of the facts based on the evidence available. The panel noted and reminded itself of its general findings in respect of allegation 1 (a) (i).

The panel again reviewed the CCTV footage and transcript. The panel noted that whilst there was some evidence in class of goggles being used on occasion the footage also displayed pupils using/about to use machinery without goggles.

The panel again considered Pupil O's evidence and Witness B's evidence that neither could recall whether Mr Webb discussed safety measures with the pupils on 2 May 2023. The panel considered Witness B's evidence which stated that Mr Webb had given safety briefings to the pupils prior to the lesson on 2 May 2023 and that this included wearing goggles.

The panel considered the oral and written evidence of Mr Webb. Mr Webb stated he thought he had warned Pupil A and other pupils to wear goggles pointing to one in particular whom he noted was not wearing goggles using the pillar drill which led to her putting goggles on. Mr Webb also stated that he constantly reminded pupils to wear goggles.

The panel carefully considered all the evidence and found it demonstrated, including on the CCTV footage, that whilst Mr Webb appeared to have raised the issue of goggles with one pupil on at least one occasion during the lesson Mr Webb did not provide any adequate health and safety instruction to pupils in that on a number of occasions within the lesson on 2 May 2023 he failed to tell one or more pupils who were using and/or about to use equipment/machinery to wear goggles.

The panel found allegation 1(a)(iv) proven on the balance of probabilities.

**b. allowed one or more pupils to:**

**i. use tools and/or equipment incorrectly and/or in an unsafe manner;**

Mr Webb admitted allegation 1(b)(i). Notwithstanding Mr Webb's admissions, the panel made a determination of the facts based on the evidence available.

The panel considered Mr Webb's written and oral evidence. Mr Webb stated that Pupil A used equipment without his hair tied up and without the machine vice or machine guard in place. Mr Webb stated that he should have noticed the guard on the machine that Pupil A was using would not have been large enough to cover the whole drill.

Mr Webb further stated that he addressed several students incorrect use of equipment during the lesson on 2 May 2023. Mr Webb stated that he told pupils who were sitting down using the chisels to stand up, to use the chisel with two hands instead of one hand and to not use excessive force when chiselling timber to prevent splinters. Mr Webb stated that the CCTV footage showed him informing pupils that they were chiselling incorrectly when walking around the classroom and supervising the other pupils.

Mr Webb acknowledged however that he missed multiple opportunities to correct the way that some other pupils were using the tools.

The panel carefully considered the CCTV evidence and transcript and noted a significant number of occasions where Mr Webb had seen pupils use machinery and/or equipment without taking the appropriate health and safety steps and Mr Webb had appeared to allow this to continue.

The panel noted that under cross examination Mr Webb acknowledged his understanding that the safety measures for the pillar drill included that the pupils should wear eye protection, tie back long hair and cover loose clothing by a secure apron or overall. Mr Webb also confirmed that his understanding of the safety measures for using the belt sander included that long hair and clothing should be secured and eye protection worn at all times.

The panel also observed that during cross examination Mr Webb was taken through certain parts of the CCTV footage and the presenting officer identified 11 occasions where Mr Webb agreed in evidence that pupils were using the pillar drills in an incorrect or unsafe manner, and two occasions where a pupil was using the belt sander in an incorrect or unsafe manner.

The panel reflected that it had found allegation 1 (a) proven in its entirety. The panel considered that its findings within allegation 1 (a), insofar as Mr Webb had failed to provide any or any adequate health and safety instruction to pupils in this class, clearly demonstrated, insofar as pupils were shown on the CCTV as proceeding to use the equipment/machinery without the appropriate protections, that Mr Webb had allowed one or more pupils to use tools and/or equipment incorrectly and/or in an unsafe manner.

Having considered the evidence before it, the panel was satisfied that the TRA had provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate that Mr Webb did not provide any or any adequate health and safety instruction to pupils, in that he had allowed one or more pupils to use tools and/or equipment incorrectly and/or in an unsafe manner.

The panel found allegation 1(b)(i) proven on the balance of probabilities.

**ii. touch the pillar drill and/or attempt to remove Pupil A's hair from the pillar drill whilst it was live.**

At the hearing Mr Webb admitted allegation 1(b)(ii). Notwithstanding Mr Webb's admission, the panel made a determination of the facts based on the evidence available.

The panel considered the written and oral evidence of Pupil O who stated that Pupil M took the hair from the drill and placed it in a bag and that Pupil M said that they were going to give the hair to Pupil A.

The panel considered Mr Webb's written and oral evidence. Mr Webb stated in his written evidence that another pupil had already begun removing Pupil A's hair when Mr Webb was approaching the drill to check on Pupil A but in oral evidence he acknowledged that this was not the case.

Also, in his oral evidence Mr Webb stated that he did not switch off the machine and pull the plug immediately following the accident as he was in a state of shock at the time. Mr Webb stated that the machine was not rotating when the hair was removed but he acknowledged that it was live.

The panel again carefully considered the CCTV evidence. The panel noted from the CCTV footage that Mr Webb was the first person to approach Pupil A after the incident and arrived before the pupils began removing hair from the pillar drill. The panel considered that the CCTV evidence demonstrated that Mr Webb was in a primary position to isolate the machine and to move students away from it but that he did not do so.

The panel considered that the CCTV evidence showed that a pupil was recording the removal of the hair on their phone whilst Mr Webb watched. Mr Webb is recorded on the CCTV as saying that he wanted a copy of the photo/s to be emailed to him.

Having considered the evidence before it, the panel was satisfied that the TRA had provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate that Mr Webb did not provide any or any adequate health and safety instruction to pupils, in that he had allowed one or more pupils to touch the pillar drill and/or attempt to remove Pupil A's hair from the pillar drill whilst it was live during his class on 2 May 2023.

The panel found allegation 1(b)(ii) proven on the balance of probabilities.

**2. You gave a false account about your conduct during the lesson on 2 May 2023, in that you told Pupil A, "I told you to put your hair up or out the way" or words to that effect when that was not the case**

Mr Webb partially admitted allegation 2 in that he acknowledged he did tell Pupil A "*I told you to put your hair up or out the way*" or words to that effect, when this was not the

case, on 2 May 2023, but he denied that he had given a false account about his conduct during the lesson.

The panel again considered the CCTV transcript. The transcript showed that after Pupil A caught their hair in the drill, Mr Webb said "*this is why you have to be so careful yeah. This is what we say about people with long hair.*".

The panel considered Witness C's email dated 3 May 2023 to Individual N which explained that Pupil A came to her on 2 May 2023 after the incident had occurred. The email indicates that after Witness C spoke to Pupil A's mother on the phone Mr Webb entered Witness C's room to ask how Pupil A was. In the email Witness C stated that Mr Webb said to Pupil A "*I told you to put your hair up or out of the way*" and Pupil A then said "*no you didn't sir*".

Witness C's written witness statement and oral evidence was broadly consistent with the email dated 3 May 2023 though she denied having any recollection that Mr Webb had asked after the health of Pupil A instead saying that the interaction was purely limited to Mr Webb's comment and Pupil A's response.

Mr Webb explained in his evidence that he had not considered Pupil A's hair to be a safety concern because Pupil A's hair sat above his ears.

The panel considered the oral and written evidence of Mr Webb. Mr Webb stated that he accepted that he did not instruct Pupil A to tie his hair during the lesson on 2 May 2023.

Mr Webb's stated that he said words to the effect of "*I told you to put your hair up or out the way*" to Pupil A after the incident because of the stress of the situation. Mr Webb explained that he meant he regularly told the pupils with long hair to tie their hair in lessons. In cross examination Mr Webb asserted that he was confused and in shock and concerned both for Pupil A and for his own position given the seriousness of the incident and that he misspoke.

The panel found that it was clearly acknowledged by Mr Webb that he had made the statement to Pupil A "*I told you to put your hair up or out the way*" or words to that effect and that this statement was made by him during his visit to the School's health and welfare office. The panel found that this having occurred was further supported by the written and oral evidence of Witness C and by the email which she had sent at the time.

The panel noted that it was not denied by Mr Webb that this statement was inaccurate in that he acknowledged he had not, either in the lesson which had occurred that day or previously, instructed Pupil A to put his hair up.

The panel found that it had been demonstrated on the balance of probabilities that the statement made within the School's health and welfare office was intended as a direct reference to Pupil A rather than a more generic statement regarding what Mr Webb had

said to the wider year 10 class. The panel found it proven that Mr Webb had said “*I told you to put your hair up or out the way*” or words to that effect when that was not the case. The panel found this to be a false account about his conduct during the lesson on 2 May 2023.

The panel interpreted the word “false” for the purposes of this allegation to simply mean ‘incorrect/inaccurate’.

The panel found allegation 2 proven.

### **3. Your conduct at Allegation 2 above was dishonest.**

The panel noted that Mr Webb denied allegation 3.

The panel noted their findings under allegation 2 that Mr Webb had made a false account of his conduct in the lesson of 2 May 2023 to Pupil A.

The panel considered whether Mr Webb had acted dishonestly and, in doing so, had regard to the case of *Ivey v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd t/a Crockford*.

The panel firstly sought to ascertain the actual state of Mr Webb’s knowledge or belief as to the facts.

The panel took account of Mr Webb’s admission that he did not tell Pupil A to tie his hair up during the lesson on 2 May 2023 or at any time previously. Mr Webb’s position was that he did not recognise Pupil A’s hair to be a health and safety risk prior to the incident.

The panel also considered Mr Webb’s written statement that Mr Webb was referring to the instances where he reminded pupils with long hair to tie their hair up in his previous lessons. The panel also considered Mr Webb’s acknowledgement in cross examination that he did not know why he had made this statement and that he ultimately acknowledged that the statement was inaccurate.

The panel was satisfied that Mr Webb was aware at the relevant time that he made the statement that the statement he was making was incorrect, but the panel did not consider it to be proven on the balance of probabilities that he was intending to be dishonest.

The panel then went on to consider whether the teacher’s conduct was dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people.

The panel again considered the notes of the investigatory and disciplinary meetings with Mr Webb which were contained within the bundle and noted that it did not appear that Mr Webb had, other than on this occasion, sought to assert that he had instructed Pupil A to put his hair up indeed, and notwithstanding that he would be aware that this would raise potential concerns about this conscientiousness generally, his position was consistently that he had not seen Pupil A’s hair to be a health and safety issue.

Although the panel had no medical evidence before it, it noted Mr Webb's position that he was in shock and not making rational decisions at the time.

The panel simply did not consider it had sufficient evidence to conclude to the standard of the balance of probabilities that Mr Webb's actions that day were deliberate or intentionally dishonest or that his actions would be considered to be dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people.

The panel found allegation 3 unproven.

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

Having found a number of the allegations proved, the panel went on to consider whether the facts of those proved allegations amounted to unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

In doing so, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: The prohibition of teachers, which is referred to as "the Advice".

The panel first considered whether the conduct of Mr Webb, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel's attention had been drawn by the presenting officer to Part 1 of the Teachers Standards specifically the statement within Part 1 bullet point 1 which provided that teachers should set high expectations which inspire, motivate and challenge pupils and establish a safe and stimulating environment for pupils, rooted in mutual respect.

The panel's attention had also been drawn to Part 1 paragraph 7 which stated that teachers should manage behaviour effectively to ensure a good and safe learning environment including managing classes effectively, using approaches which are appropriate to pupils' needs in order to involve and motivate them.

The panel considered that these 2 standards had not been met.

The panel considered that further, by reference to Part 2, Mr Webb 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 Webb's conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice. The panel found that none of these offences were relevant.

The panel carefully again considered what it had found proven. As had been very clearly demonstrated from the CCTV footage which it had viewed, and as admitted by Mr Webb, the panel had found a very serious failure by Mr Webb to instruct pupils on or enforce any meaningful level of health and safety protection for his pupils within the lesson of 2 May 2023.

These failures, including his repeated failure to provide adequate safety instructions with regard to the wearing of aprons, to the tying back of hair, to the tucking in of ties and to the wearing of goggles, before using equipment/machines placed pupils at serious risk and could potentially have led to very serious injury.

Indeed, these failures clearly did contribute to the environment within which Pupil A was injured. Following Pupil A's injury Mr Webb's failure to take appropriate action including, at the least, isolating the machinery where the injury had occurred and preventing pupils from seeking to manually extract hair from that live machine transparently represented further safeguarding failures which again could have led to serious injury. It is clear from the CCTV footage that Mr Webb had many opportunities to provide adequate health and safety instruction to pupils in their use of potential hazardous machines and simply, and repeatedly, did not do so.

The panel carefully considered the evidence of good character provided by Mr Webb and the other matters which Mr Webb had put forward in his defence. These matters included his submissions that the School had not appropriately supported him, including in not replacing the departed DT technician thereby increasing his workload. The panel also considered Mr Webb's submissions that this incident was a one-off aberration owing to his extreme exhaustion and stress including his wider personal circumstances at the time.

Whilst not able, on the evidence, to make any definitive finding as to whether or not Mr Webb's actions that day were out of the ordinary, the panel noted that there was very limited evidence that this class applied these most basic health and safety standards as a matter of routine. Mr Webb himself acknowledged he had ceased to insist on aprons being used in this class. The panel did not consider that the mitigating circumstances presented by Mr Webb provided any sufficient justification for a teacher of Mr Webb's knowledge and experience to have so significantly and consistently disregarded the basic health and safety requirements needed to keep pupils safe within his lesson and thereby place them so clearly at risk of harm.

For the above reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Webb 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 Webb was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct.

In relation to whether Mr Webb'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 Webb'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 Webb was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that none of these offences were relevant.

The panel considered that a member of the public fully informed about the facts of the situation would be extremely concerned and worried at the clear health and safety risks facing the pupils within Mr Webb's class as a result of Mr Webb's actions and/or inaction.

The panel considered that a member of the public would be likely to consider, as the panel had, that even if Mr Webb's position, which appeared to be in essence that he was in no position to teach that day, was accurate, this was no defence under any circumstance for him having placed these pupils at risk.

The panel considered that Mr Webb was an experienced teacher well aware of the hazards of the DT room who should also be aware, even at his lowest point, that pupils would require a teacher who was in a fit state to teach and take appropriate steps to protect them.

The panel noted that Mr Webb had failed to model good behaviour and had failed to take any practical steps to ensure that such behaviour was practised in his class and that his permissive attitude would clearly be at risk of filtering down to the pupils in their use of potentially dangerous machinery.

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

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

The panel then found that Mr Webb's actions under allegation 1 constituted unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute.

The panel did not though consider that Mr Webb's actions as found proven under allegation 2 were, of themselves, sufficiently serious as to constitute unacceptable professional conduct or 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. The panel was conscious that 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 including the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and the declaring and upholding of proper standards of conduct within the teaching profession.

The panel's findings against Mr Webb involved his multiple failures, in the lesson of 2 May 2023, to adequately provide pupils with standard safety instructions regarding their use of aprons, goggles and the tying back of hair and the tucking away of ties as well as his allowing pupils to use equipment/machines unsafely. In the light of these findings, and the serious health and safety risks for pupils which arose from them, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils

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

The panel was of the view that a public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Mr Webb 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 Webb in the profession. Whilst the panel noted Mr Webb's long experience as an educator, the panel considered

that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Webb 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 maintain an exemplary 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 Webb.

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;
- misconduct seriously affecting the education and/or safeguarding and well-being of pupils, and particularly where there is a continuing risk;
- failure in their duty of care towards a child, including exposing a child to risk or failing to promote the safety and welfare of the children (as set out in Part 1 of KCSIE);

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order could 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.

Whilst the panel again noted the mitigating circumstances which Mr Webb had provided, including in relation to his level of exhaustion on 2 May 2023, there was no evidence that his actions were not deliberate.

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

The panel did not have sufficient evidence before it to demonstrate that Mr Webb had showed exceptionally high standards in both his personal and professional conduct or had contributed significantly to the education sector.

Highly conscious that the panel's findings, and the vast majority of the evidence, related to purely one lesson on one day the panel found themselves with only limited ability to analyse, by reference to direct evidence, the extent to which this lesson was a one off

aberration, noting Mr Webb's assertion that it was. The panel had no basis to determine whether the incident was out of character.

Mr Webb submitted a number of character references to attest to his abilities as a teacher. The panel considered written statements from the following individuals:

- Individual A, [REDACTED];
- Individual B, [REDACTED];
- Individual C, [REDACTED];
- Individual D, [REDACTED];
- Individual E, [REDACTED];
- Individual F, [REDACTED];
- Individual G, [REDACTED];
- Individual H, [REDACTED];
- Individual I, [REDACTED];
- Individual J, [REDACTED];
- Individual K, [REDACTED];
- Individual L, [REDACTED];
- Individual M, [REDACTED]

The panel noted the following comments in particular:

- “[Mr Webb] was very reliable. Eddie is a caring person with high expectations Eddie seemed very proactive in my time working with him.”  
Individual A, [REDACTED]
- “I knew Mr Webb to be a competent teacher with excellent subject knowledge and teaching skills... His classroom management skills were second to none which meant he was highly respected by the pupils, who knew where they stood with him.”

Individual E, [REDACTED]

*“Eddie placed strong emphasis on health and safety. Before pupils used any machinery, he would deliver a safety briefing and check personal protective equipment. From my recollection, he required us to: wear aprons and goggles; tie long hair back; tuck in ties and secure loose clothing; and demonstrate correct tool use before operating machinery. He circulated continuously while we worked, corrected unsafe technique immediately, and stopped work if needed until issues were resolved”.*

Individual K, [REDACTED];

*“Edward's commitment to maintaining a safe learning environment is commendable. He meticulously adheres to health and safety regulations, ensuring that practical workshops are conducted with utmost care and consideration for all participants.”*

Individual L, [REDACTED]

The panel noted Mr Webb's written and oral evidence which stated he found it tough working at the School. [REDACTED].

[REDACTED].

Mr Webb further stated that he was *“tired and exhausted”* coming into work on 2 May 2023 due to excessive workload and working the prior weekend and having only had circa three hours' sleep that bank holiday weekend.

Mr Webb had informed the panel that the department technician left in summer 2022 which made it difficult to manage practical lessons. Mr Webb further explained that the pupils in the class on 2 May 2023 were challenging and stated that whilst he requested classroom support from the School, he did not receive any support.

The panel again carefully considered Mr Webb's witness statement and the reflection statement which he had provided.

The panel noted that Mr Webb had been a forthcoming witness and had fully participated both with the initial investigations and the TRA's subsequent investigation and hearing.

The panel noted that Mr Webb had fully acknowledged his wrongdoing as found proven and appeared entirely aware of why and how his behaviour was wrong. The panel noted that Mr Webb stated he was ashamed, shocked and appalled by his actions and found it hard to mentally relive the events that took place.

The panel noted that Mr Webb acknowledged that he should have ensured that he was clear, strict and consistent with students about health and safety procedures and refused to allow the class to proceed until all students had put on the correct safety attire.

The panel noted Mr Webb's statement as to practises he would seek to introduce with regard to health and safety in any future classes. The panel noted Mr Webb's evidence that, were he to return to teaching, he would put clear plans in place to ensure that there was no repeat of any of the conduct in question. Mr Webb stated that he would ensure that he had proper systems in place to look after his health and wellness, and take careful steps to ensure he was fully up-to-date and cognisant of health and safety procedures, and all other mandatory training. He stated that he would ensure he maintained clear communication with leadership to raise any concerns early on.

The panel 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.

Although the panel was very conscious of the seriousness of Mr Webb's actions on 2 May 2023 and the public interest requirements which indicated that behaviour of this type should not be tolerated, it was of the view that, taking all of the above matters into account, and applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, the recommendation of no prohibition order would be both a proportionate and an appropriate response in these circumstances.

Whilst the panel had found that the unacceptable behaviour in this case was serious, it considered that, with the mitigating factors that were present, a recommendation for a prohibition order would not be appropriate or assist in this case. The panel failed to see how prohibiting Mr Webb for a period of at least two years would produce any material change or serve any useful purpose.

The panel formed this view for reasons including that it was clear that Mr Webb had reflected extensively and developed a very clear level of insight into his actions. The panel noted that Mr Webb had described that his actions and their potential consequences for the students and the School were a source of remorse and concern for him on an ongoing basis, and the panel found the prospect of his ever repeating such actions/inaction to be low.

The panel again noted that it had little evidence of any course of misconduct on Mr Webb's part outside the lesson of 2 May 2023. The panel noted that the allegations which it had found proven, whilst unacceptable and serious and constituting serious risks for pupils, were concerned solely with the events of one class on one day.

The panel also noted that it appeared to have before it, extensive evidence from colleagues and pupils, albeit mostly hearsay, that the events it had seen displayed on the CCTV footage were not consistent with Mr Webb's general performance as a teacher.

The panel noted the evidence which it had received as to Mr Webb's dedication to the teaching profession and passion for teaching.

The panel considered that the publication of the adverse findings it had made was sufficient to send an appropriate message to Mr Webb as to the standards of behaviour that are not acceptable, and that publication would, in the particular circumstances of this case, meet the public interest requirements of safeguarding and declaring proper standards of the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct.

The panel noted with approval that Mr Webb had sought additional training and wished to emphasise that its view was that if and when Mr Webb returned to the classroom he should seek all available support from colleagues at his then employer and ensure that he never again allowed himself to be in a position where health and safety and safeguarding of pupils were not the absolute principal considerations in his classroom.

The panel then decided that it would be proportionate to recommend to the Secretary of State, in all the circumstances of the case, that the findings be published and no prohibition order being made.

## **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 sanction.

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

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

In this case, the panel has found some of the allegations not proven. I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

The panel has made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that the findings of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute should be published and that such an action is proportionate and in the public interest.

In particular, the panel has found that Mr Edward Webb 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 was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Webb involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance 'Keeping children safe in education'.

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

The findings of misconduct are serious as they include a teacher failing to provide adequate health and safety instruction to pupils during a Design and Technology class, in the course of which a pupil sustained an injury.

I have to determine whether the imposition of a prohibition order is proportionate and in the public interest. In assessing 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 that may 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 Webb, 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 provides these observations:

"The panel carefully again considered what it had found proven. As had been very clearly demonstrated from the CCTV footage which it had viewed, and as admitted by Mr Webb, the panel had found a very serious failure by Mr Webb to instruct pupils on or enforce any meaningful level of health and safety protection for his pupils within the lesson of 2 May 2023.

These failures, including his repeated failure to provide adequate safety instructions with regard to the wearing of aprons, to the tying back of hair, to the tucking in of ties and to the wearing of goggles, before using equipment/machines placed pupils at serious risk and could potentially have led to very serious injury.

Indeed, these failures clearly did contribute to the environment within which Pupil A was injured. Following Pupil A's injury Mr Webb's failure to take appropriate action

including, at the least, isolating the machinery where the injury had occurred and preventing pupils from seeking to manually extract hair from that live machine transparently represented further safeguarding failures which again could have led to serious injury. It is clear from the CCTV footage that Mr Webb had many opportunities to provide adequate health and safety instruction to pupils in their use of potential hazardous machines and simply, and repeatedly, did not do so.”

A prohibition order would therefore prevent such a risk from being present in the future.

I have also taken into account the panel’s comments on insight and remorse, which the panel sets out as follows:

“The panel noted that Mr Webb had fully acknowledged his wrongdoing as found proven and appeared entirely aware of why and how his behaviour was wrong. The panel noted that Mr Webb stated he was ashamed, shocked and appalled by his actions and found it hard to mentally relive the events that took place.

The panel noted that Mr Webb acknowledged that he should have ensured that he was clear, strict and consistent with students about health and safety procedures and refused to allow the class to proceed until all students had put on the correct safety attire.

The panel noted Mr Webb's statement as to practises he would seek to introduce with regard to health and safety in any future classes. The panel noted Mr Webb's evidence that, were he to return to teaching, he would put clear plans in place to ensure that there was no repeat of any of the conduct in question. Mr Webb stated that he would ensure that he had proper systems in place to look after his health and wellness, and take careful steps to ensure he was fully up-to-date and cognisant of health and safety procedures, and all other mandatory training. He stated that he would ensure he maintained clear communication with leadership to raise any concerns early on.”

Elsewhere, the panel comments as follows:

“The panel formed this view for reasons including that it was clear that Mr Webb had reflected extensively and developed a very clear level of insight into his actions. The panel noted that Mr Webb had described that his actions and their potential consequences for the students and the School were a source of remorse and concern for him on an ongoing basis, and the panel found the prospect of his ever repeating such actions/inaction to be low.”

I have therefore given this element some 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 provides this observation:

“The panel considered that a member of the public fully informed about the facts of the situation would be extremely concerned and worried at the clear health and safety risks facing the pupils within Mr Webb's class as a result of Mr Webb's actions and/or inaction.

The panel considered that a member of the public would be likely to consider, as the panel had, that even if Mr Webb's position, which appeared to be in essence that he was in no position to teach that day, was accurate, this was no defence under any circumstance for him having placed these pupils at risk.”

I am particularly mindful of the finding in this case of a teacher allowing pupils to operate potentially hazardous machinery without proper health and safety instruction during a class in which a pupil was injured and the very negative impact that such a finding could have 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 Webb himself. The panel notes having had the benefit of considering a number of pieces of evidence testifying to his good character and his commitment to creating a safe environment for pupils, as summarised in these comments:

“The panel again noted that it had little evidence of any course of misconduct on Mr Webb's part outside the lesson of 2 May 2023. The panel noted that the allegations which it had found proven, whilst unacceptable and serious and constituting serious risks for pupils, were concerned solely with the events of one class on one day.”

It also records having heard mitigating evidence as to factors that had affected Mr Webb's performance on the day of the events in question.

However, I have also noted the following remarks:

“The panel did not have sufficient evidence before it to demonstrate that Mr Webb had showed exceptionally high standards in both his personal and professional conduct or had contributed significantly to the education sector.

Highly conscious that the panel's findings, and the vast majority of the evidence, related to purely one lesson on one day the panel found themselves with only limited ability to analyse, by reference to direct evidence, the extent to which this lesson was a one off aberration, noting Mr Webb's assertion that it was. The panel had no basis to determine whether the incident was out of character."

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Webb 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, while acknowledging the evidence of Mr Webb's insight and remorse and the other mitigations cited, placed considerable weight on the serious nature of the misconduct found by the panel and the grave risk of harm to pupils it created:

"The panel carefully again considered what it had found proven. As had been very clearly demonstrated from the CCTV footage which it had viewed, and as admitted by Mr Webb, the panel had found a very serious failure by Mr Webb to instruct pupils on or enforce any meaningful level of health and safety protection for his pupils within the lesson of 2 May 2023.

These failures, including his repeated failure to provide adequate safety instructions with regard to the wearing of aprons, to the tying back of hair, to the tucking in of ties and to the wearing of goggles, before using equipment/machines placed pupils at serious risk and could potentially have led to very serious injury.

Indeed, these failures clearly did contribute to the environment within which Pupil A was injured. Following Pupil A's injury Mr Webb's failure to take appropriate action including, at the least, isolating the machinery where the injury had occurred and preventing pupils from seeking to manually extract hair from that live machine transparently represented further safeguarding failures which again could have led to serious injury. It is clear from the CCTV footage that Mr Webb had many opportunities to provide adequate health and safety instruction to pupils in their use of potential hazardous machines and simply, and repeatedly, did not do so."

I have also noted the panel's comments suggesting that the events in question were not necessarily an isolated incident, but part of a wider failure by Mr Webb to ensure compliance with procedures designed to ensure the safety of pupils:

"...the panel noted that there was very limited evidence that this class applied these most basic health and safety standards as a matter of routine. Mr Webb himself acknowledged he had ceased to insist on aprons being used in this class. The panel did not consider that the mitigating circumstances presented by Mr Webb provided any sufficient justification for a teacher of Mr Webb's knowledge and experience to have so significantly and consistently disregarded the basic health and safety requirements

needed to keep pupils safe within his lesson and thereby place them so clearly at risk of harm. “

In my judgment, even though the panel suggests the risk of repetition is “low”, the serious jeopardy to the safety and wellbeing of pupils created by Mr Webb’s misconduct mean that, in my view, a prohibition order is both proportionate and necessary due to the residual risk.

I have also noted the panel’s finding that there was no evidence that Mr Webb’s actions were not deliberate, that he was acting under duress or had made an outstanding contribution to the education sector.

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the evidence of insight and remorse and mitigating factors in this case, and agree with this comment provided by the panel: “Whilst the panel noted Mr Webb’s long experience as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Webb in the profession.”

In my view therefore, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to uphold standards and maintain public confidence in the profession given the very serious risk of harm to pupils that Mr Webb’s behaviour created. A published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

For these reasons, I disagree with the recommendation of the panel and have concluded therefore 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 doing so I have referred to the Advice which states the following:

“Where a case involved any of the following, 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:

- arson and other “major” criminal damage;
- possession (including for personal use) of any class A drug;
- possession with intent to supply another person, supply (selling, dealing or sharing) and production of any class A, B, C or unclassified drugs;
- fraud or serious dishonesty;
- theft from a person or other serious cases of theft;

- intolerance and/or hatred on the grounds of race, religion, sexual orientation or protected characteristics;
- violence”

None of these factors appear to have been present in this case.

I consider therefore that a two-year review period is sufficient and appropriate to satisfy the maintenance of public confidence in the profession.

**This means that Mr Edward Webb 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 23 January 2028, two 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 Webb remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

Mr Webb 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 "Marc Cavey", enclosed in a thin oval border.

**Decision maker: Marc Cavey**

**Date: 16 January 2026**

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