



Mr Rowan Barnicoat: Professional conduct panel outcome

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

June 2026

Contents

Introduction	3
Allegations	4
Summary of evidence	4
Documents	4
Witnesses	5
Decision and reasons	5
Findings of fact	5
Panel's recommendation to the Secretary of State	11
Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State	14

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

Teacher: Mr Rowan Barnicoat
Teacher ref number: 1882498
Teacher date of birth: 8 January 1997
TRA reference: 23347
Date of determination: 24 June 2026
Former employer: Pool School, Cornwall

Introduction

A professional conduct panel (“the panel”) of the Teaching Regulation Agency (“the TRA”) convened on 22 - 24 June 2026 by way of a virtual hearing, to consider the case of Mr Rowan Barnicoat.

The panel members were Mr Gamel Byles (teacher panellist – in the chair), Ms Jill Wells (lay panellist) and Mr Scott Evans (lay panellist).

The legal adviser to the panel was Mr Jermel Anderson of Blake Morgan solicitors.

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

Mr Rowan Barnicoat was not present and was not represented.

The hearing took place in public.

Allegations

The panel considered the allegations set out in the notice of proceedings dated 23 March 2026 and as amended at the hearing.

It was alleged that Mr Rowan Barnicoat was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute in that while employed as a teacher at the Pool School ('the School'), he:

1. On one or more occasions he was in possession of and/or consumed and/or was under the influence of illegal drugs
2. On or around 7 December 2023 he said to Person B "I am never skint. I always have cash from dealing" or words to that effect
3. He sought to influence Person A's account to the School of your conduct in relation to allegation 1 by telling Person A "You and [Person C] need to get your story straight, you are now part of our friendship whether you like to not, you need to come out and meet us now" or words to that effect.
4. His conduct as may be proven at allegation 3 above was dishonest and/or lacked integrity

In the absence of Mr Barnicoat, the panel treated all allegations as denied.

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 4 to 7

Section 2: Notice of proceedings and response – pages 8 to 50

Section 3: Teaching Regulation Agency witness statements and documents– pages 51 to 461

Section 4: Teacher's documents – nothing received

The panel members confirmed that they had read all of the documents within the bundle, 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 2020, (the "Procedures").

Witnesses

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

Person B – [REDACTED]

Witness E – [REDACTED]

Witness F - [REDACTED]

Whilst they were not called as witnesses by the TRA, the panel also considered the hearsay accounts of:

Person A – [REDACTED]

Person C – [REDACTED]

Person D – [REDACTED]

Decision and reasons

The panel announced its decision and reasons as follows:

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

Mr Barnicoat commenced his employment at Pool Academy ('The School) as a Teacher of Mathematics on 1 September 2022. On 7 December 2023 he attended a Christmas party, that was organised through the school, with colleagues. On 11 December 2023, allegations were made to Witness F, [REDACTED] by Person B that Mr Barnicoat had consumed drugs at the Christmas party.

The school conducted a subsequent investigation into Mr Barnicoat's alleged conduct. Mr Barnicoat resigned from the school on 8 February 2024. The investigation concluded on 29 February 2024 when a safeguarding hearing was convened. Mr Barnicoat was then referred to the TRA on 7 March 2024.

Findings of fact

The findings of fact are as follows:

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

You are guilty of unacceptable professional conduct and/or conduct that may bring the teaching profession into disrepute in that, while employed as a teacher at Pool School (“the School”):

1. On one or more occasions you were in possession and/or consumed and/or were under the influence of illegal drugs

When considering this allegation, the panel first considered that it was asked to determine whether there was likely any possession or consumption of illegal drugs. It was also asked to consider whether Mr Barnicoat was under the influence of illegal drugs during the time when he was employed by the School.

The panel heard directly from Person B who gave evidence to the effect that on the night of the Christmas Party 7 December 2023, Mr Barnicoat had stated to him “I’ve got something stronger back in [REDACTED]” whilst [REDACTED]. Person B also recounted that after the party they [REDACTED]. It was his account that Person A had gone to Mr Barnicoat’s [REDACTED], alongside Mr Barnicoat and Person C. Person B stated that he felt uncomfortable with this and therefore went to [REDACTED], having concern for Person A’s welfare. He then stated that upon entering Mr Barnicoat’s [REDACTED], he observed Mr Barnicoat searching through a suitcase. It was his account that Mr Barnicoat then took two bags of powder from the suitcase. He stated that Mr Barnicoat then took the powder from the bags, placed it on the table, began breaking it up with a credit card. He recalled that Mr Barnicoat then rolled up a £5 note up into a tube, through which he snorted the powder. Person B was also consistent both in his oral and written evidence, that Mr Barnicoat had relayed to him that the powder was “cocaine”, and that he had believed it to be so.

Whilst she did not appear in evidence, the panel also considered the written account of Person A which was considered hearsay. It noted that by Person A’s account, she had observed Mr Barnicoat removed two white bags of powder from his wallet and then place them in a suitcase within his [REDACTED], prior to the Christmas party. Her account was that Mr Barnicoat had stated to her that he was not taking it to the party as members of the senior leadership team were there. She also commented that Mr Barnicoat had made multiple references to taking cocaine throughout the night. The panel acknowledged that Person A’s account was hearsay for the purpose of these proceedings, it however determined that it could place significant weight upon this aspect of it. Notably, the presence of the two separate bags of white powder within the suitcase, and the observation of assertions by Mr Barnicoat that they were cocaine, were directly corroborated by the evidence given by Person B. The panel also noted that a further hearsay witness, Person D, also had commented that Mr Barnicoat had made frequent mention of “cocaine” throughout the evening.

The panel determined that a white powdered substance as seen by at least two witnesses, who both asserted that Mr Barnicoat had referred to it as “cocaine” was more likely than not to have been cocaine. Additionally, it determined that the presence of the two bags, and the snorting as observed by Person B, was sufficient to be construed as both possession and consumption of cocaine. Whilst not hearing evidence on the point directly, the panel considered that cocaine is an illegal drug within the meaning of the allegation.

It was acknowledged by the panel that the evidence that it heard did not directly engage with the effect of any illegal drugs upon Mr Barnicoat. It noted that whilst consumption had been observed, there was nothing put before the panel detailing how he was affected by it. The panel accordingly did not consider that it could properly make a determination as to whether Mr Barnicoat had been under the influence of cocaine or any other drugs.

The panel found that it was more likely than not that on the night of the Christmas party, Mr Barnicoat was in possession of cocaine and had consumed it. The panel therefore found Allegation 1 proved.

2. On or around 7 December 2023 you said to Person B “I am never skint. I always have cash from dealing” or words to that effect

The panel noted that it had heard directly from Person B in relation to this allegation. It considered that he had given a consistent account, whereby Mr Barnicoat had made this remark to him in relation to covering the cost of a taxi on the night of the Christmas party. Person B suggested that Mr Barnicoat had made this comment, directly refusing any contribution from him, upon arrival at a destination. The panel noted that Person B had given the same account both in his initial investigative statement, his subsequent witness statement and in his oral evidence.

The panel considered the evidence of Person B persuasive in the circumstances and determined that it was more likely than not that the remark was made by Mr Barnicoat. It noted that Mr Barnicoat had provided a denial to the allegation during the initial investigation, and it was careful to take this in consideration in fairness to him in his absence. However, it considered it more likely than not that the remark was made when considering Person B’s compelling and consistent account.

The panel accordingly found allegation 2 proved.

3. You sought to influence Person A’s account to the School of your conduct in relation to allegation 1 by telling Person A “You and [Person C] need to get your story straight, you are now part of our friendship whether you like to not, you need

to come out and meet us now” or words to that effect.

When considering this allegation, the panel was mindful that it emanated from the hearsay account of Person A. It noted that Person A had initially given an account during the school’s investigative process that she was contacted by Person C and Mr Barnicoat via a Snapchat call during which they used words to the effect of “You and [Person C] need to get your story straight, you are now part of our friendship whether you like to not, you need to come out and meet us now”. She explained that Person C had first made the remarks, but that Mr Barnicoat had also made remarks to the same effect and had repeated the words of Person C to her during the same phone call whilst on loudspeaker. Person A’s account was that the context of the interaction was that she had been approached by Mr Barnicoat and Person C in relation to the School’s investigation into Mr Barnicoat’s conduct and had been asked to meet them.

The panel noted that within Person A’s initial witness statement, she had stated that the remark was made by Person C; it also noted that Person A had made a subsequent disclosure whereby she clarified the position, stating that both Mr Barnicoat and Person C had made the comment to her.

The panel noted that the comment appeared to have been made some time between the initial investigative statement that was made on 19 December 2023 and the subsequent statement on 15 January 2024. It was apparent from Person A’s account that she had been in contact with Mr Barnicoat during this period, though the panel noted that there was limited information available as to what this communication amounted to. It was also noted that Person A was not asked whether she considered that Mr Barnicoat had sought to influence her account, during the School’s investigative process. Given her non-attendance at the hearing, this could not be further explored with Person A any further.

Having regard to the wording as suggested by Person A, the panel considered that it was more likely than not that the remark was made. Whilst maintaining a degree of caution regarding Person A’s hearsay evidence, it however did not consider that it could properly draw the inference that the remark was made to influence Person A. It noted that in the absence of Person A, the context of the phone call could not be explored in greater detail, in particular, whether Person A believed whether the comment was made to influence her account as part of the School’s investigation.

When exploring the question of whether Mr Barnicoat sought to influence Person A’s account to the School, the panel considered it notable, that by Person A’s account that the rest of the call had continued in a friendly manner, with Mr Barnicoat wishing Person A well. She recalled that he remarked “look after yourself and I hope it is you that takes my job”. The panel considered that the call ending in this manner, further undermined its ability to draw the inference that in making the call, Mr Barnicoat had sought to influence

Person A's account to the School's investigation. It additionally noted that there had been no apparent animosity prior to this call and that there had been no subsequent contact between the parties, by Person A's account.

The panel considered that in the absence of more explicit language, or behaviour that was suggestive of an attempt to influence Person A's account in relation to the School's investigation, it could not properly determine this to be the purpose of this language.

The panel accordingly found Allegation 3 not proved.

4. Your conduct as may be proven at allegation 3 above was dishonest and/or lacked integrity

Having not found Allegation 3 proved, the panel did not consider Allegation 4.

The panel accordingly found Allegation 4 not proved.

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

Having found Allegation 1 and Allegation 2 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 Barnicoat in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

The panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Barnicoat in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of the Teachers' Standards.

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - not undermining..., the rule of law
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards...

- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was not satisfied that the conduct of Mr Barnicoat in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Keeping Children Safe In Education (“KCSIE”).

The panel was not satisfied that the conduct of Mr Barnicoat in relation to the facts found proved, involved breaches of Working Together to Safeguard Children.

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

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

The panel found that the offence of possession (...for personal use...) of class A drugs was relevant.

The panel noted that the allegations as found proved may be considered to have taken place outside the education setting. It however considered that the conduct found within Allegation 1 directly affected the way that he fulfilled his teaching role, due to the fact that the conduct concerned illegal substances and took place at a staff party, in the presence of colleagues.

For these reasons, the panel was satisfied that the conduct of Mr Barnicoat amounted to misconduct of a serious nature which fell significantly short of the standards expected of the profession in relation to Allegation 1.

The panel considered that the conduct within Allegation 2 was not serious enough to reach this threshold. Notably, in the absence of any proper context or evidence of actual drug dealing, it considered that what could merely be an inappropriate remark was too inconsequential to be construed as falling significantly short of the standards expected of a teacher.

Accordingly, the panel was satisfied that Mr Barnicoat was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct in relation to Allegation 1.

In relation to whether Mr Barnicoat’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 Barnicoat'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 Barnicoat was guilty of unacceptable professional conduct, the Panel found that the offence of possession (...for personal use)... of class A drugs was relevant.

The panel considered that the findings of misconduct are serious, and the conduct displayed as found within Allegation 1 would be likely to have a negative impact on the individual's status as a teacher.

The panel considered that Mr Barnicoat's conduct as found proved at Allegation 1 could potentially damage the public's perception of a teacher. The panel however did not consider that Mr Barnicoat's conduct could potentially damage the public perception in relation to Allegation 2. As addressed above in relation to the question of unacceptable professional conduct, Mr Barnicoat's language may have been inappropriate, but there was no evidence provided that indicated that it was made in a serious manner or was accurate.

For these reasons, the panel found that Mr Barnicoat's actions in relation to Allegation 1 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/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 a punitive effect.

The panel had regard to the particular public interest considerations set out in the Advice and, having done so, found a number of them to be relevant in this case, namely:

- the maintenance of public confidence in the profession
- declaring and upholding proper standards of conduct within the teaching profession

In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Barnicoat which involved the possession and consumption of illegal drugs, there was a strong public interest consideration in relation to the maintenance of public confidence in the profession. This behaviour was outside of what is expected of a teacher and had the potential to cause reputational harm to the education profession.

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

The panel was of the view that a strong public interest consideration in declaring proper standards of conduct in the profession was also present as the conduct found against Mr Barnicoat 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 Barnicoat in the profession. It noted that he an Early Careers Teacher in his second year and therefore, any contribution that he may have made to the profession would have been limited. Whilst no criticism had been raised regarding Mr Barnicoat's abilities as an educator, the panel considered that the adverse public interest considerations above outweigh any interest in retaining Mr Barnicoat in the profession, since his behaviour fundamentally breached the standard of conduct expected of a teacher.

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 Barnicoat.

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, the following was relevant in this case:

- serious departure from the personal and professional conduct elements of the Teachers' Standards;

Even though some of the behaviour found proved in this case indicated that a prohibition order would be appropriate, the panel went on to consider the mitigating factors. Mitigating factors may indicate that a prohibition order would not be appropriate or proportionate.

In the light of the panel's findings:

The panel noted that Mr Barnicoat did have a previous good history and had not previously been subject to any regulatory or disciplinary findings.

The panel considered that there was no evidence that Mr Barnicoat's actions were not deliberate. It also considered that there was no evidence to suggest that he was acting under extreme duress.

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 Barnicoat of prohibition.

The panel was of the view that prohibition was both proportionate and appropriate. The panel decided that the public interest considerations outweighed the interests of Mr Barnicoat. The fact that he had consumed illegal drugs in the presence of colleagues was a significant factor in forming that opinion. Accordingly, the panel made a recommendation to the Secretary of State that a prohibition order should be imposed with immediate effect.

The panel went on to consider whether or not it would be appropriate for it to decide to recommend a review period of the order. The panel was mindful that the Advice states that a prohibition order applies for life, but there may be circumstances, in any given case, that may make it appropriate to allow a teacher to apply to have the prohibition order reviewed after a specified period of time that may not be less than 2 years.

The Advice indicates that there are certain types of case where, if relevant, the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of not offering a review period.

None of the listed characteristics were engaged by the panel's findings.

The Advice also indicates that there are certain other types of cases where it is likely that the public interest will have greater relevance and weigh in favour of a longer period before a review is considered appropriate.

One of these was present:

- possession (including for personal use) of any class A drug;

The panel considered that it had not had sight of any remorse that Mr Barnicoat had shown, other than through Person A's account whereby she stated that he had apologised to her for getting her involved in the School's investigative process. It additionally considered that he had not demonstrated any insight into his actions or the impact that it could have upon the profession, or upon his colleagues.

Mr Barnicoat had not demonstrated any rehabilitative steps and did not engage with this hearing, meaning that the panel was very limited in terms of its consideration of what mitigating factors were present within the case. It noted that within the investigative report, and in response to the TRA, Mr Barnicoat had simply denied the allegations and had provided nothing further.

The panel determined that the risk of repetition in this case was high. It noted that whilst it was careful not to place significant reliance upon this, it had sight of the notes from comments made by Mr Barnicoat during the School's investigative process.

[REDACTED]. The panel considered that whilst it had not had the opportunity to test this disclosure, it did raise some concern, particularly in the absence of any steps taken to address this issue or evidence or rehabilitation. [REDACTED]. Whilst not affording significant weight to this evidence, the panel formed the view that it was indicative of a high risk of repetition in this case.

The panel considered that whilst Mr Barnicoat had not demonstrated any insight, remorse, or remediation, and whilst the risk of repetition remained high, he could in time take steps to rectify his behaviour. It noted that Mr Barnicoat's conduct did not directly place pupils at risk of harm, and considered that his conduct may be remediable.

The panel decided that the findings indicated a situation in which a review period would be appropriate and, as such, decided that it would be proportionate, in all the circumstances, for the prohibition order to be recommended with provisions for a review period.

The panel recommend to the Secretary of State that the minimum review period should be one of 5 years.

Decision and reasons on behalf of the Secretary of State

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

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

In this case, the panel has found allegation 1 proven and found that those proven facts amount to unacceptable professional conduct and conduct that may bring the profession into disrepute. The panel has found some of the allegations not proven, and found that allegation 2, whilst proven, does not amount to unacceptable professional conduct or conduct likely to bring the profession into disrepute. I have therefore put those matters entirely from my mind.

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

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

- Teachers uphold public trust in the profession and maintain high standards of ethics and behaviour, within and outside school, by
 - not undermining..., the rule of law
- Teachers must have proper and professional regard for the ethos, policies and practices of the school in which they teach, and maintain high standards...
- Teachers must have an understanding of, and always act within, the statutory frameworks which set out their professional duties and responsibilities.

The panel was not satisfied that the conduct of Mr Barnicoat, involved breaches of the responsibilities and duties set out in statutory guidance Keeping children safe in education (KCSIE) or involved breaches of Working Together to Safeguard Children.

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

The findings of misconduct are particularly serious as they include a finding that the proven conduct concerned consumption of illegal substances which took place at a staff party, in the presence of colleagues.

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

In this case, the panel has found that although the proven conduct took place outside of the education setting, it directly affected the way in which Mr Barnicoat fulfilled his teaching role. However, the panel has also found that Mr Barnicoat's conduct did not directly place pupils at risk of harm,

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

"The panel considered that it had not had sight of any remorse that Mr Barnicoat had shown, other than through Person A's account whereby she stated that he had apologised to her for getting her involved in the School's investigative process. It additionally considered that he had not demonstrated any insight into his actions or the impact that it could have upon the profession, or upon his colleagues.

Mr Barnicoat had not demonstrated any rehabilitative steps and did not engage with this hearing, meaning that the panel was very limited in terms of its consideration of what mitigating factors were present within the case. It noted that within the investigative report, and in response to the TRA, Mr Barnicoat had simply denied the allegations and had provided nothing further."

In my judgement, the lack of evidence of any insight or 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 observe,

"In the light of the panel's findings against Mr Barnicoat which involved the possession and consumption of illegal drugs, there was a strong public interest consideration in relation to the maintenance of public confidence in the profession. This behaviour was outside of what is expected of a teacher and had the potential to cause reputational harm to the education profession."

I am particularly mindful of the finding of the consumption of illegal drugs 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 Barnicoat himself. The panel comment, *"The panel noted that Mr Barnicoat did have a previous good history and*

had not previously been subject to any regulatory or disciplinary findings.” The panel also said that Mr Barnicoat was “...*an Early Careers Teacher in his second year and therefore, any contribution that he may have made to the profession would have been limited.*”

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

In this case, I have placed considerable weight on the panel’s comments concerning the lack of any evidence of insight or remorse as well as the panel’s findings on the seriousness of the conduct.

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

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

I have gone on to consider the matter of a review period. In this case, the panel has recommended a five-year review period.

The panel has considered the Advice and it has identified 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.*”

One of these was present:

- *possession (including for personal use) of any class A drug;”*

I have also considered the panel’s comments “*The panel considered that whilst Mr Barnicoat had not demonstrated any insight, remorse, or remediation, and whilst the risk of repetition remained high, he could in time take steps to rectify his behaviour. It noted that Mr Barnicoat’s conduct did not directly place pupils at risk of harm, and considered that his conduct may be remediable.*”

The panel has also said that a five-year review period would be both appropriate and proportionate in all of the circumstances.

I have considered whether a five-year review period reflects the seriousness of the findings and is a proportionate period to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence

in the profession. In this case, factors mean that allowing a five-year review period is sufficient to achieve the aim of maintaining public confidence in the profession. These elements are the seriousness of the conduct and the lack of any evidence of insight, remorse or remediation.

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

This means that Mr Rowan Barnicoat 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 30 June 2031, five 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 Barnicoat remains prohibited from teaching indefinitely.

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

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



Decision maker: Stuart Blomfield

Date: 25 June 2026

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