



Teaching  
Regulation  
Agency

# **Mr Carl Dixon: Professional conduct panel outcome**

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

**February 2026**

## Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	5
Documents	5
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	6
Findings of fact	7
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	19
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	24

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

**Teacher:** Mr Carl Dixon

**Teacher ref number:** 9002991

**Teacher date of birth:** 24 April 1963

**TRA reference:** 19043

**Date of determination:** 27 February 2026

**Former employer:** Davies Lane Primary School, London

### **Introduction**

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 23 to 27 February 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Dixon.

The panel members were Mr Paul Hawkins (lay panellist – in the chair), Mrs Jill Wells (lay panellist) and Ms Aruna Sharma MBE (teacher panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Nicholas West of Birketts LLP solicitors.

The presenting officer for the TRA was Ms Amalea Bourne of Browne Jacobson LLP solicitors.

Mr Dixon was present and was represented by Mr Joseph Chiffers of JSC Chambers.

The hearing took place in public and was recorded.

## Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the Notice of Hearing dated 26 November 2025 as amended at the start of the hearing.

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

1. On or around 3 January 2018, whilst applying for the role of Teacher at Davies Lane Primary School and/or following his appointment, he provided false and/or misleading information, and/or failed to disclose relevant information in order to improve his prospects of securing and/or retaining a teaching post, by submitting 'No' in response to the question 'Have you ever been known to any Children's Services department or Police as being a risk or potential risk to children?' when that was not the case;
2. His conduct as may be found proven at 1 above lacked integrity and/or was dishonest;
3. Whilst employed as a Teacher at Davies Lane Primary School between 29 November 2017 and 7 January 2020 he failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with one or more pupils, in that;
  - a. He sent secret and/or personalised notes to one or more pupils during lessons, in that;
    - i. He stuck the note(s) on the back of the pupil(s) book(s);
    - ii. He took the note(s) back and/or destroyed them afterwards;
  - b. He provided a note to Pupil 1 saying 'I miss you a lot' or words to that effect;
  - c. He asked one or more pupils to go on a date or used words to that effect;
  - d. He hugged one or more pupils on one or more occasions;
  - e. He touched Pupil 9's bottom;
  - f. He pressurised Pupil 9 to hug him by saying to one or more pupils that they could do what they wanted if Pupil 9 gave him a hug;
  - g. He asked one or more pupils to join him during lunch, in circumstances of secrecy, in that he told the pupil(s) to hide if a member of staff came;

4. His behaviour as may be found proven at 3(a) and/or 3(b) and/or 3(c) and/or 3(d) and/or 3(e) and/or 3(f) and/or 3(g) above was conduct of a sexual nature and/or was sexually motivated.

Mr Dixon denied all of the allegations.

## Summary of evidence

### Documents

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

Section 1: Anonymised Pupil List and Chronology – pages 6 to 8

Section 2: Notice of Hearing – pages 10 to 24

Section 3: TRA witness statements – pages 26 to 40

Section 4: Teacher's Witness and Character Statements – pages 42 to 58

Section 5: TRA documents – pages 60 to 168

Section 6: Teacher Documents – pages 171 to 298

In advance of the hearing, the panel also received:

- Notice of Hearing dated 26 November 2025.
- An ancillary bundle of documents which included the Teacher's DBS Appeal documents

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents listed above in advance of the hearing.

In the consideration of this case, the panel had regard to the document Teacher misconduct: disciplinary procedures for the teaching profession April 2018, (the '2018 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]

Witness D – [REDACTED]

Witness E – [REDACTED]

Mr Dixon also gave oral evidence and called the following witnesses:

Witness F – [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.

In 2013, Mr Dixon was arrested for alleged indecent exposure.

On 15 July 2013, Blackfriars Crown Court found Mr Dixon not guilty of indecent exposure.

In November 2017, Mr Dixon commenced employment at Davies Lane Primary School (the “School”) through an agency.

On 8 December 2017, Mr Dixon submitted his application to the School for a permanent teacher role.

On 3 January 2018, Mr Dixon allegedly completed the School’s safeguarding declaration form.

In January 2018, Mr Dixon commenced employment as a permanent member of staff and taught a [REDACTED] class from September 2018 until 2019.

From September 2019, Mr Dixon provided PPA cover, including for Witness B’s [REDACTED] class.

On 7 November 2019, two pupils in Witness B’s class disclosed that Mr Dixon had allegedly sent notes to pupils.

On 12 November 2019, Witness C and Witness D (Local Authority Designated Officers (“LADOs”)) visited the School, and a number of disclosures were made by pupils regarding Mr Dixon.

On 7 January 2020, Mr Dixon resigned from his employment with the School.

On 15 January 2020, two pupils from Mr Dixon's [REDACTED] class [REDACTED] made disclosures to midday assistants that Mr Dixon had allegedly asked a pupil on a date, hugged pupils and touched a pupil's bottom.

On 22 January 2020, the matter was referred to the TRA.

## Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

- 1. On or around 3 January 2018, whilst applying for the role of Teacher at Davies Lane Primary School and/or following your appointment, you provided false and/or misleading information, and/or failed to disclose relevant information in order to improve your prospects of securing and/or retaining a teaching post, by submitting 'No' in response to the question 'Have you ever been known to any Children's Services department or Police as being a risk or potential risk to children?' when that was not the case;**

The panel had sight of, and considered, an Employment Self-Declaration and Disclosure form in which the 'No' option was circled for the question '*Have you ever been known to any Children's Services department or Police as being a risk or potential risk to children?*'. The form was signed, included a printed name "*Carl Dixon*" and was dated 3 January 2018.

The panel further had sight of a letter dated 2 September 2013 from the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Children Board to Mr Dixon which stated that Mr Dixon had been referred to the LADO following allegations made against him at the Archway Leisure Centre in January 2013. The Safeguarding Lead for Education, [REDACTED], stated "*A follow-up strategy meeting took place on 15<sup>th</sup> August 2013 to conclude the LADO process following the conclusion of the Court case where, upon the direction of the judge, you were found not guilty based on the unreliability of the witnesses. The outcome of the criminal procedure however, does not impact upon or influence the decision of the LADO process...Therefore having carefully considered the information shared and presented to the members of the strategy meeting it was agreed that on the balance of probabilities, it is likely that you may pose a risk to children and vulnerable adults*".

The panel considered the contemporaneous meeting notes of the disciplinary investigation meeting held on 13 November 2019 which recorded Mr Dixon stating that he did not sign the Employment Self-Declaration and Disclosure Form. Mr Dixon noted in the meeting that the form had a printed copy of his name, but he denied that the signature was his. Mr Dixon stated that he had not seen the form and did not recognise it.

The panel then considered the written and oral evidence of Mr Dixon. The written statement from Mr Dixon stated that he only completed "*the top half of page 1*" of the

Employment Self-Declaration and Disclosure Form. Mr Dixon further stated that the rest of the form was completed by someone else and the signature was not his. Mr Dixon stated that the signature appeared similar to that of [REDACTED], HR Manager at the School, on the bottom of the first page and that the date on page 2 “*exactly replicates*” the writing of the date on page 1. Mr Dixon submitted that it was common for [REDACTED] to retrospectively fill in missing administrative information and she put this, and other forms, in front of him during a training exercise in January 2018.

The panel considered Mr Dixon’s oral evidence to be inconsistent in that he initially stated, “*only part of the form was put in front of me*”, but then stated he was “*asked to sign it in a hurry*” by the HR Manager who was standing over him.

The panel considered the written and oral evidence of Witness A, [REDACTED], who stated that it was a staff member’s responsibility to ensure the form is completed correctly. Witness A also confirmed in his oral evidence that he asked [REDACTED] and she denied completing the form for any staff members stating a “*normal process was followed*”. The panel found Witness A to be a reliable witness and accepted his oral evidence.

On the balance of probabilities, the panel found that Mr Dixon did complete the form and entered ‘No’ in response to the question ‘*Have you ever been known to any Children’s Services department or Police as being a risk or potential risk to children?*’ when that was not the case. The panel relied upon the letter dated 2 September 2013 from the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Children Board to Mr Dixon which clearly stated, “*it is likely that you may pose a risk to children*”. This letter postdated the criminal trial in July 2013, and Mr Dixon should have been aware that he was known to a Children’s Services Department as a potential risk to children when completing the form.

The panel considered that, on the balance of probabilities, Mr Dixon provided this false information in order to improve his prospects of securing and/or retaining his teaching post at the School.

The panel therefore found allegation 1 proven.

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

Having found allegation 1 proven, the panel then went on to consider whether Mr Dixon 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 Dixon’s knowledge or belief as to the facts. The panel again considered the letter dated 2 September 2013 to Mr Dixon from the [REDACTED] Safeguarding Children Board which clearly stated, “*it is likely that*

*you may pose a risk to children*". Mr Dixon's written statement confirmed that he "routinely" disclosed the 2013 allegation to schools as he had been found not guilty and had nothing to hide.

The panel noted that there was no evidence of Mr Dixon disclosing the 2013 allegation to the School on the Employment Self-Declaration and Disclosure Form despite there being a designated space for him to "...provide information below". By circling 'No' on the form, the panel considered whether Mr Dixon knew that he was misleading the School and whether he was therefore acting dishonestly.

The panel then went on to consider whether Mr Dixon's conduct was dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people. In all the circumstances, the panel concluded that Mr Dixon's conduct as found proven at allegation 1 was dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people as Mr Dixon ought to have been honest about a safeguarding issue.

The panel considered whether Mr Dixon's conduct amounted to a failure to act with integrity. In doing so, the panel had regard to *Wingate & Anor v Solicitors Regulation Authority*, which describes integrity as the "higher standards which society expects from professional persons." The panel was mindful that professionals are not required to be "paragons of virtue", but they are expected to act in accordance with the ethical and behavioural standards that underpin their professional role.

The panel was satisfied that, in all the circumstances, Mr Dixon had failed to meet the standards expected of him as an experienced teacher by circling 'No' on the form when it related to a safeguarding question. The panel concluded that Mr Dixon's conduct as found proven at allegation 1 lacked integrity.

Therefore, the panel found allegation 2 proven.

**3. Whilst employed as a Teacher at Davies Lane Primary School between 29 November 2017 and 7 January 2020 you failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with one or more pupils, in that;**

**a. You sent secret and/or personalised notes to one or more pupils during lessons, in that;**

**i. You stuck the note(s) on the back of the pupil(s) book(s);**

**ii. You took the note(s) back and/or destroyed them afterwards;**

The panel considered the written and oral evidence of Witness C who stated that she worked in a dual role as LADO [REDACTED] and in a Safeguarding in Education role. In her oral evidence, Witness C explained that the Safeguarding in Education part of her role involved working with schools, carrying out audits for Office for Standards in

Education, Children's Services and Skills ("OFSTED") readiness and talking to pupils about safe behaviours.

Witness C's written statement confirmed that the School made a referral to the LADO team on 7 November 2019, and the LADO subsequently made a referral to the police which also highlighted "*concerning past behaviours*" relating to Mr Dixon including his 2013 arrest for indecent exposure.

Witness C explained that, during the School's investigation, both she and her colleague, Witness D, attended the School to speak to pupils about what were safe and unsafe behaviours. Witness C accepted in her oral evidence that it would be "*unusual*" to attend schools to speak to pupils in these circumstances, but explained that it was part of her dual role. Following the talk to the class, Witness C recalled that pupils were told that they could speak to her and Witness D in private, which some pupils did choose to do in small groups.

Both Witness C and Witness D were asked in oral evidence about their process for obtaining information from the pupils. Both confirmed that they were experienced social workers and would only ask open questions and would not have asked leading questions as part of this information gathering exercise.

The panel had sight of and considered Witness C's contemporaneous written notes from the individual conversations that she and Witness D had with pupils from the School on 12 November 2019. This document recorded that four pupils mentioned notes from Mr Dixon, and the four pupils all stated that they felt "*uncomfortable*". Witness C stated that the pupils "*didn't like*" the sending of notes.

Witness C's notes recorded Pupil 1 stating that Mr Dixon puts Post-it notes on the "*back of their workbook so that it's not visible*" and the pupils would see the note when they turned the books around. Pupil 1 had said that the whole class was aware of notes passing, that Mr Dixon sent notes to certain pupils and that other pupils had wanted to know what the notes said. Pupil 1 was also recorded as stating that if the note did not contain a question "*he takes it back afterwards and puts the notes in his pocket*".

The panel considered the meeting notes of the disciplinary investigation meeting held on 13 November 2019 which recorded Mr Dixon stating, "*I haven't written a note to a child. I wouldn't do that*" and "*I wouldn't put myself in that position*". Mr Dixon further stated that he did not write notes to the pupils directly.

The panel then went onto consider the written and oral evidence of Mr Dixon who stated that the Post-it notes related to the "*worry-box*" or learning prompts that he used in class. Mr Dixon also stated that he would write short motivational prompts such as "*Much better work today*" and place them on a pupil's work. Mr Dixon stated that the prompts were visible to pupils and staff and were not private communications.

In his oral evidence, Mr Dixon accepted that he did write comments rather than notes, and these were provided to pupils for learning purposes. During questioning, Mr Dixon was unable to identify a clear difference between notes and written comments. The panel found Mr Dixon's oral evidence to be inconsistent with the written statement to the panel. Mr Dixon stated that he would not write directly in the books as marking was scrutinised by the Trust as the School was a 'beacon' school with high expectations to model working practices. Mr Dixon offered other reasons for writing notes such as because it was "*discreet and didn't disturb the other children*" and he was worried about giving the answer away to children.

The panel considered the written and oral evidence of Witness E who was Headteacher at the School at the material time. Witness E's oral evidence confirmed that Post-it notes were not part of the School's marking policy and normal practice was to write in pupils' books in red pen or to give verbal feedback. The panel accepted Witness E's oral evidence that teachers "*want children to see corrections and adapt their work*" and Post-it notes would not be used as they are not permanent and "*easily pulled out or lost*".

The panel also considered the written and oral evidence of Witness B, a class teacher at the School. Witness B confirmed in her oral evidence that teachers would never communicate with pupils using Post-it notes.

Having considered the evidence before it, the panel found that Mr Dixon did send personalised and secret notes to pupils during lessons, and he stuck notes on the back of pupils' books and either took notes back or disposed of them afterwards.

The panel therefore found allegations 3(a)(i) and 3(a)(ii) proven on the balance of probabilities.

**b. You provided a note to Pupil 1 saying 'I miss you a lot' or words to that effect;**

The panel considered the written statement of Witness B dated 7 November 2019 which recorded her stating that Pupil 3 found a note in her tray which said, "*I miss you*" and had a sad face. Witness B had then stated that Pupil 2 had said "*oh Mr Dixon always writes notes*" to Pupil 1. Witness B had then stated that Pupil 1 said that Mr Dixon "*doesn't really write anything on the notes*".

The panel considered the contemporaneous handwritten note dated 7 November 2019 of the conversation that Witness A had with Pupil 1 which had recorded Witness A stating that Pupil 1 had said she enjoyed being in class and liked all the teachers. Pupil 1 had also stated that there were "*no adults [they didn't] like*" and "*nothing [was] worrying*".

The panel again considered Witness C's notes from her meeting with pupils on 12 November 2019 but there was no disclosure of a note which stated "*I miss you*" or words to that effect.

Having considered the evidence before it, the panel found that there was only evidence of a note saying "*I miss you*" having been found in Pupil 3's tray, not Pupil 1.

The panel therefore found that allegation 3(b) was not proven on the balance of probabilities.

**c. You asked one or more pupils to go on a date or used words to that effect;**

The panel considered the handwritten note of a midday assistant at the School, dated 15 January 2020 which stated that two female pupils disclosed to her that Mr Dixon behaved inappropriately towards the pupils in his class "*by asking girls to go on dates*".

The panel also considered the handwritten note of another midday assistant at the School, dated 15 January 2020 which recorded that two [REDACTED] girls stated, "*a teacher that has now left that he was inappropriate to certain children in his class by asking the [ ] his class on dates*".

The panel considered the written and oral evidence of Witness E who explained that she was notified of the disclosures that Pupil 9 and Pupil 10 made to midday supervisors and she "*got them in one at a time from the playground to interview them and find out what they had said to the middays*".

The panel had sight of and considered Witness E's contemporaneous handwritten notes and typed up notes dated 15 January 2020. Witness E's notes recorded Pupil 9 stating "*One day Mr Dixon asked me on a date – then he said 'ooh sorry, don't know what that was about' He laughed. It was awkward for a few weeks after that*" in response to an open question about the conversation she had with the midday supervisors. Witness E's notes also recorded Pupil 10 stating "*he asked Child A if she wanted to go on a date*" in response to an open question about her conversation she had with the midday supervisor. Witness E confirmed in her oral evidence that references to Child A were in respect of Pupil 9 and references to Child B were in respect of Pupil 10 for the purposes of these proceedings.

Although the panel was not able to test the evidence from Pupil 9 and Pupil 10 at the hearing, it considered that the disclosures from Pupil 9 and Pupil 10 were unprompted and the notes of their conversations with both the midday supervisors and Witness E were consistent and contemporaneous. In oral evidence, Witness E confirmed that both Pupil 9 and Pupil 10 "*spoke matter of factly and clearly, and one of them said at the end that she was relieved she had spoken about it now and felt better for it*". The panel

accepted Witness E's oral evidence that the pupils made the disclosures as they were concerned that Mr Dixon was returning to the School.

The panel noted the written and oral evidence of Mr Dixon which denied this allegation, stating, "*The suggestion that I asked a pupil to go on a "date" is absurd and completely untrue*". Mr Dixon's written evidence stated that he was not aware of the identity of the pupil said to have made this claim and he "*covered multiple classes*" but the panel accepted that Mr Dixon was Pupil 9's class teacher [REDACTED].

Having considered the evidence before it, the panel found Mr Dixon had asked Pupil 9 on a date and therefore found allegation 3(c) proven on the balance of probabilities.

**d. You hugged one or more pupils on one or more occasions;**

The panel again considered Witness E's contemporaneous handwritten notes and typed up notes dated 15 January 2020 which recorded Pupil 10 stating, "*Mr Dixon would pick Child A up and hug her sometimes*". The panel noted that Pupil 9 and Pupil 10 did not mention hugs specifically in their initial disclosures to the midday assistants but did refer to Mr Dixon being inappropriate to them. Pupil 9 did not disclose that Mr Dixon hugged her or other pupils in her initial discussion with Witness E on 15 January 2020.

The panel considered further notes from Witness E's meeting with Pupil 9 on 17 January 2020 which recorded Pupil 9 stating that Mr Dixon "*used to hug people sometimes*" and she confirmed that included her when asked. When Pupil 9 was asked for further details she replied, "*sometimes it was just arm on her shoulder and sometimes a tighter hug*". The panel noted that Witness E did ask a leading question to obtain information regarding Mr Dixon hugging Pupil 9, but the evidence was consistent with Pupil 10's disclosure.

As set out above, although the panel was not able to test the evidence from Pupil 9 and Pupil 10 at the hearing, it considered that the initial disclosure from Pupil 10 was unprompted and the notes of both Pupil 9 and Pupil 10's conversations with Witness E were consistent and contemporaneous and could therefore be given appropriate weight.

The panel noted the written and oral evidence of Mr Dixon who denied this allegation, stating, "*I have never hugged a pupil*". During questioning about his practice in relation to hugging a pupil, Mr Dixon replied, "*I distanced myself, I was very uncomfortable*". When asked about his practice if a child was upset or distressed, Mr Dixon responded, "*a hug never came to mind*" and if a child came to hug him, he would distance himself.

Having considered the evidence before it, the panel found Mr Dixon did hug Pupil 9 on at least one occasion and therefore found allegation 3(d) proven on the balance of probabilities.

**e. You touched Pupil 9's bottom;**

The panel again considered Witness E's contemporaneous handwritten notes and typed up notes dated 15 January 2020 which recorded Pupil 10 stating that Pupil 9 had said that Mr Dixon was "*touching her butt*". The panel noted that Pupil 9 and Pupil 10 did not disclose that Mr Dixon had touched Pupil 9's bottom specifically in their initial disclosures to the midday assistants but they did refer to him being inappropriate to them generally. The panel noted that Pupil 9 did not disclose that Mr Dixon had touched her bottom in her initial discussion with Witness E on 15 January 2020.

The panel considered further notes from Witness E's meeting with Pupil 9 on 17 January 2020. When Pupil 9 was asked if Mr Dixon had touched her bottom she replied, "yes" and when she was asked for further details she "*showed the palm of her hand and said it was when he hugged her sometimes*". The panel noted that Witness E did ask a leading question to obtain information regarding Mr Dixon touching Pupil 9's bottom but the evidence Pupil 9 provided was consistent with Pupil 10's disclosure.

As set out above, although the panel was not able to test the evidence from Pupil 9 and Pupil 10 at the hearing, it considered that the initial disclosure from Pupil 10 was unprompted and the notes of both Pupil 9 and Pupil 10's conversations with Witness E were consistent and contemporaneous and could therefore be given appropriate weight.

The panel noted the written and oral evidence of Mr Dixon who denied this allegation, stating, "*I deny all of these allegations absolutely*" and "*I have never hugged a pupil or touched a pupil inappropriately*".

Having considered the evidence before it, the panel found Mr Dixon did touch Pupil 9's bottom and therefore found allegation 3(e) proven on the balance of probabilities.

**f. You pressurised Pupil 9 to hug you by saying to one or more pupils that they could do what they wanted if Pupil 9 gave you a hug;**

The panel again considered Witness E's contemporaneous handwritten notes and typed up notes dated 15 January 2020 which recorded Pupil 10 stating that, on the last day [REDACTED], there was a class party and Mr Dixon said, "*If I have a hug from Child A, you can do anything you want*".

As set out above, although the panel was not able to test the evidence from Pupil 10 at the hearing, it considered that her initial disclosure was unprompted, the notes of her conversation with Witness E were contemporaneous and her evidence could therefore be given appropriate weight.

The panel noted the written and oral evidence of Mr Dixon which denied this allegation, stating, "*I have never hugged a pupil or touched a pupil inappropriately*".

Having considered the evidence before it, the panel found Mr Dixon did pressurise Pupil 9 to hug him by saying to Pupil 10 that they could do what they wanted if Pupil 9 gave

him a hug. The panel therefore found allegation 3(f) proven on the balance of probabilities.

**g. You asked one or more pupils to join you during lunch, in circumstances of secrecy, including that you told the pupil(s) to hide if a member of staff came;**

The panel again considered Witness E's contemporaneous handwritten notes and typed up notes dated 15 January 2020 which recorded Pupil 9 stating *"Mr Dixon had his favourites in class who would get cookies from him at lunchtime", "this happened in class and at lunchtimes when helping in the classroom. He'd call us up to help at lunch – even if we didn't want to go"*. Pupil 10 was recorded as having stated, *"Mr Dixon was choosing girls and giving them cookies at lunchtimes when they stayed in to help him"* and *"One day we were sharpening pencils in lunch break..."*. Pupil 10 further stated to Witness E, *"When [REDACTED] would come into the class, Mr Dixon would say 'quick hide' because [REDACTED] would tell us to go outside"*.

The panel then went onto consider the written and oral evidence of Mr Dixon who stated in his written witness statement *"Sitting with pupils at lunch was normal practice at Davies Lane as part of the school's healthy eating initiative. Occasionally pupils joined me in the classroom at lunchtime. This was permitted and commonplace"*.

In respect of the allegation that Mr Dixon told pupils to hide if a member of staff came, he stated *"I do not recall ever saying "hide if a teacher comes", but if I did, it would have been a light-hearted comment. There was nowhere in the classroom where multiple children could hide, and there was no secrecy. The door was open, and staff regularly walked in and out"*.

During questioning, the panel found Mr Dixon's oral evidence to be inconsistent with the written statement he had provided to the panel. Mr Dixon was asked why his written evidence that pupils joined him in the classroom at lunchtime was against the School's practice that all children had to be outside during lunchtime. Mr Dixon stated, *"pupils are not allowed inside in lunchtime without permission"* and explained some *"children were carrying out duties...taking letters back and forth...attending School Council meetings and carrying out other duties"*. On further questioning, Mr Dixon was asked if he had ever kept a child behind at lunchtime and he replied *"I didn't keep them in at lunchtime. The only time they would have been kept in was for a few minutes at break to finish work"*. Mr Dixon stated, *"I usually went off premises, to the café, or to make phone calls, I was not generally in at lunchtime"*. In his later oral evidence, Mr Dixon stated that he stayed in his classroom *"now and again"* to do marking or clearing away but this was never with pupils.

In respect of the allegation that he told pupils to hide, Mr Dixon was questioned on his written evidence that if he had said *"hide if a teacher comes"* it would have been a light-hearted comment. Mr Dixon explained in his oral evidence that he would get called out of

the staff room if children were in his classroom as they were not supposed to be in there and if they were hiding, he would say, *“I have caught you, you need to leave or something to that nature”*.

The panel considered Witness E’s oral evidence regarding lunchtime arrangements at the School. Witness E stated, *“At school no children are kept in at lunchtime – children need fresh air and to run around and we wouldn’t want a teacher to be on their own in the classroom – no children are allowed to stay in at lunch”*. Witness E’s oral evidence was consistent with Pupil 10’s disclosure that [REDACTED] was the phase leader and would enforce this practice when she saw children being kept in over lunchtime.

Having considered the evidence before it, the panel was satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that Mr Dixon had asked Pupil 9 and Pupil 10 to join him in his classroom during lunch, in circumstances of secrecy, and noted it was against the School’s lunchtime policy. The panel also accepted that Mr Dixon told pupils to hide if a member of staff came in by virtue of the fact that the lunchtime policy was monitored by staff. The panel therefore found allegation 3(g) proven on the balance of probabilities.

**4. Your behaviour as may be found proven at 3(a) and/or 3(b) and/or 3(c) and/or 3(d) and/or 3(e) and/or 3(f) and or 3(g) above was conduct of a sexual nature and/or was sexually motivated.**

Having found allegations 3(a), 3(c), 3(d), 3(e), 3(f) and 3(g) proven, the panel then went on to consider whether Mr Dixon’s conduct was of a sexual nature and/or was sexually motivated.

The panel’s attention was drawn to section 78 of the Sexual Offences Act 2003 and to the cases of *Sait v The General Medical Council [2018]*, *Basson v General Medical Council [2018]* and *The General Medical Council v Haris [2020]*.

The panel considered that Mr Dixon’s conduct as found proven at allegations 3(c), 3(d), 3(e) and 3(f) in that he asked Pupil 9 on a date, hugged her, touched her bottom and pressurised her to hug him, was inherently sexual in nature.

It noted guidance from *Basson v General Medical Council [2018]* that: *“A sexual motive means that the conduct was done either in pursuit of sexual gratification or in pursuit of a sexual relationship”*.

The panel further noted that in *General Medical Council v Haris*, it was stated that, *“In the absence of a plausible innocent explanation for what he did, the facts spoke for themselves. A sexual motive was plainly more likely than not; I would go so far as to say that that inference was overwhelming.”*

The panel again carefully considered the allegations as it had found proven at allegations 3(a), 3(c), 3(d), 3(e) and 3(f) to determine whether they were sexually motivated. The

panel accepted that there was no evidence that Mr Dixon's conduct as found proven was for sexual gratification or in pursuit of a sexual relationship. The panel considered that the conduct as found proven at 3(a), 3(c), 3(d) and 3(f) was inappropriate but did not meet the threshold for being sexually motivated.

The panel noted Mr Dixon's written evidence which stated, "*I deny this entirely. None of my actions were sexual in nature or intent*".

However, the panel could find no plausible innocent explanation for Mr Dixon's conduct as found proven at allegation 3(e), namely that he had touched Pupil 9's bottom. The panel therefore considered that, in the absence of a plausible innocent explanation, this conduct must have been sexually motivated.

The panel concluded that the TRA had demonstrated, on the balance of probabilities, that Mr Dixon's conduct as found proven at allegations 3(c), 3(d), 3(e) and 3(f) was sexual in nature and his conduct as found proven at allegation 3(e) was also sexually motivated.

The panel therefore found allegation 4 proven.

### **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.

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

The panel considered that, by reference to Part 2, Mr Dixon was in breach of the following standards:

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

- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Dixon, in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education (“KCSIE”).

The panel considered that Mr Dixon was in breach of provision 7 of the various versions of KCSIE in force at the material times between 2016-2019 which state: “*All [school and college] staff have a responsibility to provide a safe environment in which children can learn*”.

The panel also considered whether Mr Dixon’s conduct displayed behaviours associated with any of the offences listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Advice.

The Advice indicates that where behaviours associated with such an offence exist, a panel is likely to conclude that an individual’s conduct would amount to unacceptable professional conduct.

The panel found that the offences of sexual activity, controlling or coercive behaviour and serious dishonesty were relevant. The panel considered that Mr Dixon’s conduct as found proven at allegations 3(c), 3(d), 3(e) and 3(f) amounted to sexual activity as this conduct was found to be of a sexual nature. Mr Dixon’s conduct as found proven at allegation 3(f) amounted to controlling or coercive behaviour as he was found to have pressurised Pupil 9 to hug him. Mr Dixon’s conduct as found proven at allegations 1 and 2 was serious because his dishonesty related to safeguarding and sought to bypass Safer Recruitment procedures which would have required the School to carry out a safeguarding risk assessment.

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

In relation to whether Mr Dixon’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 Dixon'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 Dixon was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that the offences of sexual activity, controlling or coercive behaviour and serious dishonesty were relevant.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Dixon'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 and the protection of other members of the public, the maintenance of public confidence in the profession and declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct within the teaching profession.

In light of the panel's findings against Mr Dixon, which involved acting dishonestly by failing to disclose relevant information to improve his prospects of securing and/or retaining a teaching post, sending secret and personalised notes to pupils, asking a pupil to go on a date, hugging a pupil, touching a pupil's bottom, pressurising a pupil to give him a hug and asking pupils to join him on lunch in circumstances of secrecy, including asking pupils to hide, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils.

The panel made very serious findings that Mr Dixon's conduct failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries and in particular that his conduct in touching Pupil 9's bottom was sexually motivated.

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

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

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 Dixon in the profession. Whilst there was character evidence provided by Mr Dixon suggesting he had some ability as an educator, particularly in the area of sport, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweighed any interest in retaining Mr Dixon in the profession. The panel considered Mr Dixon's behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher, and he sought to exploit his position of trust. The panel considered that retaining Mr Dixon in the profession would only lead to further risk to the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils.

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. The panel noted that a teacher's behaviour that seeks to exploit their position of trust should be viewed very seriously in terms of its potential influence on pupils and be seen as a possible threat to the public interest.

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 Dixon.

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;
- abuse of position or trust (particularly involving pupils);
- sexual misconduct, e.g. involving actions that were sexually motivated or of a sexual nature and/or that use or exploit the trust, knowledge or influence derived from the individual's professional position;

- 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);
- violation of the rights of pupils;
- a deep-seated attitude that leads to harmful behaviour;
- dishonesty or a lack of integrity...;
- collusion or concealment including:
  - concealing inappropriate actions;
  - encouraging others to break the rules.

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 whether there were any mitigating factors. Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

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

There was no evidence to suggest that Mr Dixon was acting under extreme duress.

The panel did not consider from the evidence presented that Mr Dixon demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or contributed significantly to the education sector. In fact, there was evidence to suggest that Mr Dixon was not meeting the expected standards of a teacher at the School. The panel considered the written evidence of Witness A which stated, "*We had concerns about the quality of teaching. He was not meeting standards and was placed on an informal support plan. After a year in class we moved Mr Dixon to a PPA cover teacher role*". The panel also noted documentary evidence from [REDACTED], Head Teacher at [REDACTED] Primary School who stated in an email dated 4 December 2019, "*Mr Dixon left us [REDACTED] which centred solely around his teaching and learning skills*".

The panel did not accept that the conduct found proven in these proceedings was out of character. In considering whether Mr Dixon's conduct was out of character, the panel further considered [REDACTED] email dated 4 December 2019 which stated that on 24 January 2017, a parent raised a concern that her child had received notes from Mr Dixon "*requesting to be his friend, some of them containing sad faces*". The panel also had sight of an email from [REDACTED] dated 11 November 2019 which recorded a concern that her child (who was [REDACTED] years old at the time) had said that "[REDACTED] is [Mr Dixon's] best friend" and that Mr Dixon "*always played with her more in the playground*".

The panel noted that there was a lack of insight and remorse on the part of Mr Dixon. The panel noted Mr Dixon's written statement failed to appreciate the impact of his conduct on the pupils affected, his colleagues, the School and community. In respect of Pupil 9 and Pupil 10 in particular, the panel noted the oral evidence of Witness E, who stated they *"clearly remembered what happened in the previous year"* and *"one of them said at the end that she was relieved she had spoken now and felt better for it as she realised it was a bigger deal than she thought it was at the time"* and *"having spoken she understood it was quite serious"*.

The panel concluded that there was no evidence available to suggest that Mr Dixon's concerning and deep-seated attitude to inappropriate behaviour with pupils, which had occurred over a significant period of time, would, or could change.

The panel had sight of six character statements to attest to Mr Dixon's character and the panel noted the following comments from his character statements in particular:

- *"[Mr Dixon] possessed a unique ability to connect with others, demonstrating a deep sense of empathy and understanding. This allowed him to quickly gain the trust of both the staff and, most importantly, the children"*.

[REDACTED]

- *"Carl has been a tireless advocate for these youngsters...[and] showed true commitment in ensuring children, regardless of background or ability were given opportunities to participate."*

[REDACTED]

The panel noted all six character statements did not expressly confirm that they had knowledge of the allegations against Mr Dixon before the panel and therefore could only be given limited weight.

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

The panel was of the view that, applying the standard of the ordinary intelligent citizen, it would not be a proportionate and appropriate response to recommend no prohibition order. Recommending that the publication of adverse findings would be sufficient would unacceptably compromise the public interest considerations present in this case, despite the severity of the consequences for Mr Dixon of prohibition.

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and wholly appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Dixon. The findings relating to Mr Dixon's serious dishonesty, coercive behaviour and

sexually motivated conduct in touching a child's bottom 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.

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

The panel considered that the very serious nature of the findings of Mr Dixon's inappropriate behaviour with pupils in sending secret notes to pupils and engaging in behaviour of a sexual nature, including asking a pupil on a date, hugging a pupil and pressuring a pupil to hug him, weighed in favour of not offering a review period. The panel noted that there was no evidence that a review period would result in a different outcome to rebuild public confidence in Mr Dixon returning to the teaching profession.

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 serious dishonesty.

The panel's findings that Mr Dixon had deliberately misled the School when completing a Safer Recruitment form, sending secret notes which he took back and disposed of, and his direction to Pupil 9 and Pupil 10 to join him during lunch in circumstances of secrecy and his coercive behaviour in pressuring Pupil 9 to hug him, weighed in favour of suggesting a longer period before a review is considered to be appropriate.

The panel found that Mr Dixon's failure to take responsibility for his actions, which occurred over a significant period of time, provides evidence of a real risk of repetition. The panel was not at all convinced that, if Mr Dixon were permitted to return to the teaching profession, similar conduct would not happen to other pupils, particularly as Mr Dixon has not shown any insight into his actions. The panel considered that this undermined it having any confidence in Mr Dixon's ability to maintain safe and appropriate relationships with pupils in the future.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would not be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended without provisions for a review period.

## **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 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 allegation 3(b) not proven and I have therefore put that matter entirely from my mind.

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

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by:
  - treating pupils with dignity, building relationships rooted in mutual respect, and at all times observing proper boundaries appropriate to a teacher's professional position
  - having regard for the need to safeguard pupils' well-being, in accordance with statutory provisions
  - showing tolerance of and respect for the rights of others
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Dixon involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE).

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding of conduct that failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries with pupils and that was of a sexual nature or sexually motivated. They also included a finding of conduct that lacked integrity and was dishonest.

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

In this case, I have considered the extent to which a prohibition order would protect children and safeguard pupils. The panel has observed:

“In light of the panel’s findings against Mr Dixon, which involved acting dishonestly by failing to disclose relevant information to improve his prospects of securing and/or retaining a teaching post, sending secret and personalised notes to pupils, asking a pupil to go on a date, hugging a pupil, touching a pupil’s bottom, pressurising a pupil to give him a hug and asking pupils to join him on lunch in circumstances of secrecy, including asking pupils to hide, there was a strong public interest consideration in the safeguarding and wellbeing of pupils.

The panel made very serious findings that Mr Dixon’s conduct failed to maintain appropriate professional boundaries and in particular that his conduct in touching Pupil 9’s bottom was sexually motivated.”

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

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

“The panel noted that there was a lack of insight and remorse on the part of Mr Dixon. The panel noted Mr Dixon’s written statement failed to appreciate the impact of his conduct on the pupils affected, his colleagues, the School and community.”

“The panel concluded that there was no evidence available to suggest that Mr Dixon’s concerning and deep-seated attitude to inappropriate behaviour with pupils, which had occurred over a significant period of time, would, or could change.”

In my judgement, the lack of insight and remorse means that there is some risk of the repetition of this behaviour and this puts at risk the future wellbeing of pupils. I have therefore given this element considerable weight in reaching my decision.

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

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

I am particularly mindful of the finding of conduct that was sexual in nature and sexually motivated 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 Dixon himself. The panel has commented:

“The panel did not consider from the evidence presented that Mr Dixon demonstrated exceptionally high standards in his personal and professional conduct or contributed significantly to the education sector. In fact, there was evidence to suggest that Mr Dixon was not meeting the expected standards of a teacher at the School.”

The panel has noted that it had sight of 6 character statements that attested to Mr Dixon’s character but noted that these “statements did not expressly confirm that they had knowledge of the allegations against Mr Dixon before the panel and therefore could only be given limited weight.”

A prohibition order would prevent Mr Dixon from teaching. A prohibition order would also clearly deprive the public of his contribution to the profession for the period that it is in force.

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel's findings relating to Mr Dixon's serious dishonesty, coercive behaviour and sexually motivated conduct in touching a child's bottom.

I have also placed considerable weight on the panel's comments about the lack of insight and remorse on the part of Mr Dixon and the risk of Mr Dixon repeating similar behaviour in the future. The panel has said:

"The panel found that Mr Dixon's failure to take responsibility for his actions, which occurred over a significant period of time, provides evidence of a real risk of repetition. The panel was not at all convinced that, if Mr Dixon were permitted to return to the teaching profession, similar conduct would not happen to other pupils, particularly as Mr Dixon has not shown any insight into his actions. The panel considered that this undermined it having any confidence in Mr Dixon's ability to maintain safe and appropriate relationships with pupils in the future."

I have given less weight in my consideration of sanction therefore to the contribution that Mr Dixon has made to the profession. In my view, it is necessary to impose a prohibition order in order to maintain public confidence in the profession. A published decision, in light of the circumstances in this case, does not in my view satisfy the public interest requirement concerning public confidence in the profession.

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

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

I have considered the panel's comments:

"The panel considered that the very serious nature of the findings of Mr Dixon's inappropriate behaviour with pupils in sending secret notes to pupils and engaging in behaviour of a sexual nature, including asking a pupil on a date, hugging a pupil and pressuring a pupil to hug him, weighed in favour of not offering a review period. The panel noted that there was no evidence that a review period would result in a different outcome to rebuild public confidence in Mr Dixon returning to the teaching profession."

"The panel's findings that Mr Dixon had deliberately misled the School when completing a Safer Recruitment form, sending secret notes which he took back and disposed of, and his direction to Pupil 9 and Pupil 10 to join him during lunch

in circumstances of secrecy and his coercive behaviour in pressuring Pupil 9 to hug him, weighed in favour of suggesting a longer period before a review is considered to be appropriate.”

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

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

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

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

Mr Dixon 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 'D Oatley', written in a cursive style.

**Decision maker: David Oatley**

**Date: 2 March 2026**

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